

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 18 DECEMBER 2012 AT 1.30PM

		Page No:
1.	Procedure for Speaking	1
2.	List of Persons Wishing to Speak	2
3.	Briefing Update	4
ITEM 5.3	Petition from Residents	8
ITEM 5.6	Letter and Photographs from Mr and Mrs Shackell	12

**UPDATE REPORT &  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

BLANK

**PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL**

**PUBLIC SPEAKING SCHEME - PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**Procedural Notes**

1. Planning Officer to introduce application.
2. Chairman to invite Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives to present their case.
3. Members' questions to Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives.
4. Chairman to invite objector(s) to present their case.
5. Members' questions to objectors.
6. Chairman to invite applicants, agent or any supporters to present their case.
7. Members' questions to applicants, agent or any supporters.
8. Officers to comment, if necessary, on any matters raised during stages 2 to 7 above.
9. Members to debate application and seek advice from Officers where appropriate.
10. Members to reach decision.

**The total time for speeches from Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives shall not exceed ten minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.**

**The total time for speeches in respect of each of the following groups of speakers shall not exceed five minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.**

1. Objectors.
2. Applicant or agent or supporters.

BLANK

**PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 18 DECEMBER 2012 AT 1.30PM**  
**LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK**

<b>Agenda Item No.</b>	<b>Page No</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Objector/Applicant/Agent/Supporters/Parish Council/Town Council/Neighbourhood Representatives</b>
5.1	17	12/01334/WCPP – LAND TO THE EAST OF ALWALTON HILL, FLETTON PARKWAY, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Olive Leonard Mrs Olive Main Mr Christopher Walford Mr David Shaw Mr Harry Yearsley Mr David Thompson (LDA Design)	Parish Councillor (Hampton) Objector Objector Agent Applicant Supporter
5.2	53	12/01385/FUL – LAND ADJACENT AND TO THE SOUTH OF 14 LINCOLN ROAD, GLINTON, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Diane Lamb Councillor R.W Johnson	Ward Councillor Parish Councillor
5.3	65	12/01430/R3FUL – HELTWATE SCHOOL, HELTWATE, BRETTON, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Sheila Wood Ms Anita Fellowes Mr Rowan Wilson	Parish Councillor Objector Objector
5.4	73	12/01563/HHFUL – COMPASS BARN, MAIN STREET, UFFORD, PETERBOROUGH	Mr Scott Weavers-Wright Miss Kate Wood (Provisional)	Applicant Agent
5.5	81	12/01726/FUL – 3 JOHN WESLEY ROAD, WERRINGTON, PETERBOROUGH, PE4 6ZP	Councillor Lucia Serluca Mr David Shaw	Supporter Agent

5.6	91	12/01784/HHFUL – 26 HEATH ROAD, HELPSTON, PETERBOROUGH, PE6 7EG	Mrs Rosey Shackell Mr Paul Hutchings	Objector Agent
-----	----	--------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------	-------------------

## BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 18 December 2012

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	12/01334/WCPP	<b>Land To The East Of Alwalton Hill, Fletton Parkway, Peterborough.</b> Variation of condition 5 of outline planning permission 09/01369/OUT to allow a higher building (not exceeding 35m) to be built on plot E2.1 to meet the requirements of an occupier. The first sentence of condition 5 would read - Building heights shall not exceed a maximum height of 15 m except on plot E7 where the maximum height shall not exceed 17 m and on plot E2.1 where the maximum height shall not exceed 35 m

1. As members will be aware from the main report this applicant seeks establish the principle of allowing a 35 metre building on tranche E2.1. At this stage no detailed scheme showing the final layout of the site or the design of the building is available. If this application is approved the applicant would then make a further detailed (reserved matters application), however the principle of the building height would be established and could not be revisited.

Following on from member site visits, however, that the applicant has been asked to confirm the extent of the building which would be over 35 metres. The applicant has advised that not more than 30% of the total site area to be developed would have a building(s) over 35 metres. The remaining building sections would be lower although the applicant has advised that a proportion would need to be up to 25 metres in height. The applicant has confirmed that not more than 17% of the area to be developed would have a building of 25 metres. In light of this clarification from the agent the following additional condition is recommended:-

Within tranche E2.1 (as identified on Building Heights plan reference PST021 DFP206 Rev B) no more than 30% of the total site area shall be developed with buildings exceeding 15 m in height and not exceeding 35 m in height and no more than 17% of the site area shall be developed with buildings exceeding 15 m in height and not exceeding 25 m in height. The 35m element(s) shall maintain a separation distance of 545m with the boundary of Orton Pit SSSI as shown in fig 3396 ECO001 unless an additional shadow analysis is undertaken, based upon the methodology of the approved shadow analysis, which demonstrates that a taller element located closer to the boundary of Orton Pit SSSI would not result in adverse shadowing. This analysis if needed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of any subsequent reserved matters application.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect Orton Pit SSSI/SAC in accordance with the supporting Environmental Statement in accordance with policy CS16 of the Adopted Core Strategy and policy PP18 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

It is recommended that this new condition become condition C6 and that all the remaining conditions referred to in the report to members are thereafter renumbered.

2. The applicant has provided some additional information to explain why permission is being sought for a 35 metre high building.

The applicant has confirmed that Peterborough is a desirable location for food based distribution but that the proposal needs to be commercially competitive for the Yearsley Group. The building would utilise a crane based rack clad system and whilst it is technically possible to build a smaller crane based rack system the fixed costs prohibit this from being a viable option. Cranes, conveyors, lifts, software etc are required regardless of building height. In a building of this nature this costs typically account for some 50% of the total costs. If the racking is lower than the knock on effect is that the cost per pallet increases thereby decreasing competitiveness with other distribution companies.

In the last 5 years nearly all rack clad systems have been between 30-42 metres in height. For example

- Partner Logistics Wisbech 35m (Cold Store)
- QVC, Liverpool 35m
- Quinns Glass, Liverpool 34m
- Quinns Radiators, Wales 42m

- Pepsi, Partner Logistics, AG Barr, etc all completed recent years between 30 – 40 meters.

The applicant has confirmed that the optimum building height for the proposed system would be 40 metres in height but that the building height was intentionally reduced to 35 metres for planning purposes.

The applicant has also confirm that a building of this height would allow the storage of more pallets on a smaller footprint thereby making more efficient use of land and, closely linked to this, the running costs of the building per cubic metre would be some 30% less than with a lower building.

Comments received from Councillor Scott:

Dear Vicky,

I am sorry that I cannot be at the planning meeting today but I have an all day cabinet meeting.

I would be grateful if you could pass on to the committee my views on the planning application on behalf of Yeadsley. These are also the views Councillor David Seaton.

I have 2 concerns.

1 the building will be the first view of development in the City that visitors arriving via the A1 will have. If the application is successful I hope that all steps will be taken to mitigate the impact of such an enormous building on the "street scene".

2 I am concerned that giving permission for this building will make a precedent for other buildings on the site. Is it possible to have a narrative attached to the application that makes it clear that this is not setting a precedent.

With all good wishes.

Sheila Scott

Cllr Sheila Scott

Orton with Hampton Ward

2.	12/01385/FUL	<b>Land Adjacent And To The South Of 14 Lincoln Road, Glington, Peterborough.</b> Construction of 5 bed detached dwelling and double garage.
----	--------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The 'Recommendation' should read: **GRANT** subject to the signing of a **LEGAL AGREEMENT** and relevant conditions

Further highway comments:

The LHA recommend that the application is refused as the addition of the dwelling would result in a shared access of substandard width directly adjoining a classified road (The B1443). Two vehicles would be unable to pass within the first part of the access road potentially leading to vehicles blocking and reversing onto the highway (B1443)

Further Landscape Officer comments:

I have no further comments to add above and beyond those that were submitted on 12<sup>th</sup> Oct, the changes are a minor positive improvement, but do not resolve the major concerns that I raised.



3.	12/01430/R3FUL	<b>Heltwate School, Heltwate, Bretton, Peterborough.</b> Installation of security fence and gates.
----	----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### Highways

Further to writing the Case Officer report the Local Highways Authority has requested the proposed gates be repositioned. The reason for this is the gates as originally submitted are located on adopted highway. The LHA have advised it is possible to reposition the gates without having an unacceptably adverse impact on Highway safety, therefore the following condition is proposed;

Notwithstanding the drawings hereby approved and prior to commencement of development details of the relocated gate position ( and associated sections of boundary fencing) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The gates shall thereafter be positioned in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to accord with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

#### Representation

An additional letter of representation was received raising the following issues;

- Negative impact on streetscape
- The fence would isolate the school
- Intensified use
- Loss of existing local facility
- Poor access
- Traffic

The above matters have been addressed as part of the case officer report. Other non-planning matters were raised with respect to the increase in intensity of the school and future pressures. These matters do not relate directly to the application, which is for the erection of a fence, and therefore cannot be taken into consideration.

#### Petition

Further to the petition received on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2012, which contained 43 addresses, an updated petition has been forwarded with an additional 3 addresses, which object to the proposal.

4.	12/01563/HHFUL	<b>Compass Barn, Main Street, Ufford, Stamford,</b> Construction of tree house (retrospective).
----	----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

No Further Comments

5.	12/01726/FUL	<b>3 John Wesley Road, Werrington, Peterborough, PE4 6ZP.</b> Installation of a temporary mobile home for occupation by managers of Peterborough Dairies.
----	--------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The City Council's Landscape Officer has responded and raised no objections to the proposal.

6.	12/01784/HHFUL	<b>26 Heath Road, Helpston, Peterborough, PE6 7EG.</b> Construction of two storey extension to side and rear of existing dwelling and replacement of existing windows.
----	----------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### Helpston Parish Comments

Object to the application on the following grounds:

- the proposal is not visually attractive and would detract from the symmetry of this semi-detached property;
- the proposal would double the footprint of the existing dwelling;
- the proposed extension has an appearance of tandem development when viewed from Heath Road;
- result in an unacceptably adverse impact on the street scene;
- result in an unacceptably adverse effect on and overlooking of the adjacent neighbour (No. 24 Heath Road);

- the proposal is contrary to the aims/objectives of the Village Design Statement (2010);

#### Neighbour Representation

An email and letter of objection has been received from No. 28 Heath Road, raising the following concerns;

- The proposed two storey extension is too large and would have a detrimental appearance on the original dwelling. Prefer drawing (12032/SKO6) submitted for pre-application advice due to less obtrusive and more visually pleasing roof design;
- The proposed single storey rear extension would extend 1.8m further than No.28s single storey rear extension. This would reduce the outlook from ground floor windows and No. 28's garden would effectively become a courtyard, between the proposed single storey rear extension and No.28's existing garage.

The author requests that the scheme be amended to reflect concerns outlined above.

#### Bat Survey

The Wildlife Officer has requested a bat survey be submitted in support of the application.

It has been confirmed by the Agent that the survey will not be undertaken in time for Planning Committee (18<sup>th</sup> December), however an Ecological Survey would be submitted before the determination date (18<sup>th</sup> January 2013). Therefore subject to no objections being raised by the submitted Ecological Survey, Condition 3 on the original Case Officer report shall be removed entirely, or if necessary a bespoke condition shall be attached advising any required mitigation.

#### Landscape Officer

The Landscape Officer has responded advising that the Yew tree at the front of the site is worthy of note, and should planning permission be granted a condition be attached with respect to providing details of protective fencing that shall be retained throughout construction works.

*Condition: No works or development shall take place until a scheme for protection of the Yew Tree at the front of the property, that complies with BS5837-2012, has been implemented. The tree protection shall remain in place, and undamaged for the duration of the development.*

*Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the health of the trees to be retained in accordance with Policy CS20 of Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP16 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).*

Petition objecting to proposed gates,  
 fencing and turnstiles at  
 Heltwate school, Bretton.  
 Ref: 12/01430/R3 FUH

Name	Address
A [unclear]	: A [unclear]
L Craig	: Ellindon
Atellus (P.P.)	: Ellindon
P.A. BUNNEY	Ellindon
Tracey Pearson	ELLINDON
Amy Thomas	Ellindon
DAVID THOMAS	Ellindon
MANDY TURNER	. HELTWATE
ANDY MURRAY	HELTWATE
Vania Madeira	ELLINDON
Sam Zimble	Ellindon.
Tracey Wood	ELLINDON
Paul Derbyshire	ELLINDON.
Maija Stempkowska	ELLINDON.
Stuart Martin	S Ellindon

Name	Address
Mr P Green	ELLINDON
Mrs N Green	Ellindon
Mr. T. King	Ellindon
Miss TOMA. W.	ellindon
Mr. J Adams	ELLINDON
Mrs S Adams	Ellindon.
S. OWENS	ELLINDON
C GOLDSMITH	ELLINDON.
ALAN FORREST	ELLINDON
M. HORSPOOK	ELLINDON.
C Hoerpool	ELLINDON.
J. BWAKE	ELLINDON
M Wood	ELLINDON
S. wood.	ellindon.
M Wood	ELLINDON
T wood	ELLINDON
D. wood	ELLINDON
A Osborton	Ellindon.
D. Vale	Ellingdon.
J. Wade	ellindon.
A. Kidd	Ellindon
<del>J. Wade</del>	ELLINDON.

Name	Address
KERRY BEITRE	ELLINDON
ZORAVKO GUNTAROV	ELLINDON
R. COLLINS	ELLINDON
J. POULOS	ELLINDON
A. HODGES	, ELLINDON
<del>R. BEITRE</del>	Ellindon.
D. WARD	Ellindon.
J. MERTILL	ELLINDON
Roger Wood	ELLINDON.
Emma Sheen.	
Cassie Jones	Adderley.
Sandra Jones	Adderley.
Mandy Jones	Adderley.
Natalie Houghton	Heltwater.
Aramand	Heltwater
Dan Simpson	Heltwater
Rachel Hooker	Heltwater.
Angelica da Silva	Heltwater.
UMAR ARIF	.. Heltwater

Name

Address.

Sastia Onkui  
MATEUSZ KRUK  
L CRAVEN

R. CLAYDON

D. BAUTRUSMITE

S Pilkington  
CONNOR D

V Wakeford

~~S-WAKEFIELD~~

Sophia. Marsh

Heltwate  
HELTWATE

HELTWATE

HELTWATE  
ELLINDON

ellindon

ellindon

ELLINDON

ELLINDON

Heltwate

f.



## ITEM 5.6

28 Heath Road  
Helpston  
Peterborough  
PE6 7EG

12.12.12

Re:proposed development Ref 12/01784/HHFUL 26 Heath Road, Helpston, PE6 7EG

Our house is the other half of the semi detached pair (the only 2 semi detached houses in the road). We would like to object to certain aspects of the proposed development next door.

- The new build size is very big compared with our house. As a pair of identical houses we feel that from the Street view the new build looks like a new house built on the back. This is mainly because, in our opinion, the roof of the proposed new build is far too big. We were shown the original drawing plans taken to the pre-planning meeting by Mr and Mrs Tighe and completely agree with them that the roof on those original drawings (number 12032/SKO6) would be preferable for the following reasons:
  - a) It is smaller and there are less roof tiles visible
  - b) The angle of the roof is more in keeping with the original property and our property
  - c) It is less obtrusive and visually pleasing than the huge roof currently proposed
  - d) It is more subservient to the original house
  
- The rear single story extension is much larger than our single story extension. We object to this and feel that the size of this should be modified for the following reasons
  - a) The new build extends 1.8 (6 feet) further out than our single story extension. This would mean that from our back patio door instead of having a 180 degree view of the woods and the trees at the back we

would only have a very limited view of about 90 degrees as there would be a large brick wall on the boundary blocking our view.

- b) We also hoped to match the angle and tiling/windows of the two single story extensions and had hoped they would be the same size to make them match and look like a pair as the two houses are.
- c) If the proposed single story extension only extended a small way further out than ours ie 0.5 of a metre it would not affect our view and outlook in such a detrimental way and we would not object so strongly to that although we feel that the houses would look better if they were the same

We would like to make it clear that we are not objecting to the proposed development as a whole but solely to these factors, which we believe are reasonable adjustments. We are hoping these issues can be resolved.

Yours sincerely,

Rosey and Ray Shackell







