



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL  
PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 3 SEPTEMBER 2013**

**Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Vice Chairman), Hiller, North, Todd, Sylvester, Lane and Harrington

**Officers Present:** Jonathan Lewis, Assistant Director Education and Resources (Item 5.1)  
Nick Harding, Group Manager Development Management  
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)  
Carrie Denness, Senior Solicitor  
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Serluca (Chairman), Councillor Simons and Councillor Shabbir.

**2. Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

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

Councillor Todd declared that she would be speaking as Ward Councillor on item 5.3, 229 Star Road.

Councillor Harrington declared that he would be speaking as Ward Councillor on item 5.6, E1 Enforcement Action in Newborough Ward.

**4. Minutes of the Meetings held on:**

**4.1 9 July 2013**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2013 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**4.2 23 July 2013**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2013 were approved as a true and accurate record.

**5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

## **5.1 13/00649/FUL - Construction of 52 new dwellings and garages and supporting infrastructure, Land Off, Thorney Road, Eye, Peterborough**

The application site was approximately 1.77 hectares of agricultural land and was located on the north side of Thorney Road, Eye. The site lay to the east of the Larkfleet residential development that had recently been completed. To the north of the site there was a mature hedge and the A47 was approximately 50 metres beyond this boundary; directly abutting the east of the site there was a two storey dwelling with commercial buildings to the rear beyond which was paddock land. Further to the east was a row of bungalows and Dalmark Seeds lay approximately 70 metres from the site boundary. There were trees and hedging along the site frontage to the south.

The application sought planning permission for 52 dwellings (revised down from 58 units), including 12 affordable dwellings comprising two number 2-bed dwellings, 32 number 3-bed dwellings, 10 number 4-bed dwellings and seven number 5-bed dwellings. An area of open space was proposed in the centre of the site. The majority of the development would be accessed via the adjacent Larkfleet development (Millport Drive). A new private drive access serving eight dwellings was proposed off Thorney Road.

The Group Manager Development Management provided an overview of the application and the main issues for consideration. It was advised that there had been a number of further submissions made in relation to the application following publication of the committee report. These were outlined in full in the update report and in summary included:

- An amended layout plan, changes which included the extension of the footway across the site frontage, changes in the turning area to plot 52 and the addition of speed calming;
- A response from the Environment Agency stating that there were no objections to the application subject to the imposition of a condition relating to details of a scheme, including phasing, for the provision of mains foul water drainage on and off site being submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
- An email received from Ward Councillor Dale McKean containing an amendment to a previously submitted objection relating to the density of the development;
- An email received from Mr Stewart Jackson MP withdrawing his substantive letter of objection to the application with the caveat that wording be noted as follows - "Stewart Jackson MP supports the comments by Councillor Dale McKean and is concerned at the impact of the development on local infrastructure in the village of Eye and would ask both the Local Planning Authority and developer to revisit S106 funding allocations, in light of the concerns of local City Councillors and Eye Parish Council.";
- A further objection email from Mr Stuart Macdougald-Denton, a local resident, including photographs, relating to the inadequacy of Millport Drive to accommodate any further traffic and a request that a condition be imposed stating that construction traffic must access the site from Thorney Road and not Millport Drive; and

- A revised Officer's recommendation, which was one of approval, subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.

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

- It was requested that the application be deferred until the village school and infrastructure had recovered from existing growth. This would be at least until the 2017/18 intake year with the current school conditions;
- Over the last three years, there had been a number of new houses built;
- The Adopted Site Allocations Document was approved for a maximum of 50 houses, at 20 per hectare;
- The Planning Inspector had put in a specific condition relating to the infrastructure in the village being able to cope and a deferral to be sought if that was not the case;
- This application should be for a maximum of 36 houses;
- Information from the Assistant Director of Education and Resources had stated that the school was unable to cope this intake year and the next. The reception year was full until 2017/18;
- The tables submitted in Councillor McKean's objection highlighted the situation with regards to school places. This did highlight availability in future years, but not at the current time;
- The site over the road from the proposal site, for another 50 houses, was a year away from development also;
- An intake of 90 children was not recommended. The school would not be able to cope and all facilities would need to increase;
- The application was for high density development and it would bring in a high proportion of primary school children due to the social housing;
- The level of social housing was having a negative impact on the village and the school;
- The revised application did not address the core objections raised by the local residents;
- It was requested that the number of houses be reduced further to 36 maximum and that the number of affordable social houses be commuted outside of the Eye Village;
- It was requested that more bungalows be built in the village. This would assist with easing pressure on the school;
- Financial viability was a serious concern;
- There were concerns around site access and the fact that there was no access to the site from Thorney Avenue;
- Councillor Sanders had also objected to the application;
- There were concerns around surface water;
- There were concerns around pedestrian access through the site; and
- Thorney Road had significant rat run issues, traffic calming measures along Thorney Road were therefore required.

Mr Tim Slator, on behalf of Larkfleet Homes the joint Applicant for the proposal, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary, key points highlighted included:

- Gratitude was extended to Officers for their support, both throughout the pre-application process and during the formal application process;
- The Planning Officer's report was endorsed and considered to be a fair reflection of the planning position;
- The site was an allocated site within the recently adopted Development Plan. The provision of services and facilities was critical to the site allocation process;
- Peterborough City Council had an adopted process for the provision of infrastructure and services associated with development;
- The entire purpose of the POIS system was to provide funds for services associated with development;
- Education Officers had advised that there was adequate provision and therefore the application had proceeded;
- The site would deliver houses in line with the Government's and Peterborough City Council's growth agenda; and
- With regards to the access for construction traffic, a Construction Management Plan Condition would usually be in place. Taking this traffic away from Millport Drive could be considered.

Following questions to the speakers, the Group Manager Development Management addressed a number of concerns raised relating to the number of dwellings on the site, the viability of the site, the S106 contributions, surface water disposal, access, traffic calming and education provision in the area.

Mr Jonathan Lewis, the Assistant Director Education and Resources was invited to address the Committee and expand on the comments made within the committee report. In summary it was advised that the development would not be of adequate size to warrant an increase in the size of the school.

Members debated the application and raised points for and against. There was obvious strong feeling amongst local residents and Ward Councillors in relation to the application, however all concerns raised had been adequately addressed by Officers. Although there were some remaining concerns around the density of the site and the lack of amenity space, it was felt that the development would be an attractive, well needed, addition to the village.

A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application as per the revised Officer recommendation, an additional condition relating to construction traffic access and any additional condition and highways issues to be dealt with at Officer level. The motion was carried by 5 votes, with 2 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:** (5 For, 2 Abstentions) to approve the application, as per Officer recommendation. The proposal provided for less affordable housing than was required by adopted Council Planning Policy. This was because site viability did not look as if it would allow for full provision to be made. However, the viability assessment negotiations had not yet been finalised and therefore Officers sought authority to grant planning permission subject to:

1. The viability assessment satisfactorily demonstrating that only 12 affordable

- units could be provided;
2. The signing of the S106 as outlined in the committee report;
  3. Any further Highways issues to be dealt with at Officer level;
  4. Conditions numbered C1 to C28 as detailed in the committee report; and
  5. An additional condition relating to access for construction traffic.

**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 an allocated housing site within the Adopted Site Allocations DPD and lay within the village envelope of Eye which was designated as a Key Service Centre;
- The proposed access was at an appropriate standard to serve the development and parking provision would be provided in accordance with parking standards;
- The scale and design of the development would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- The development made adequate provision for the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the properties;
- The development would not result in any adverse impact on the amenity of occupiers of existing neighbouring dwellings;
- The proposal provided an appropriate provision of public open space with play equipment;
- The proposal made satisfactory provision for affordable housing within the site; and
- The proposal made a contribution towards the social and physical infrastructure demands that it would place on the area.

Hence the proposal was in accordance with policies PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12, PP13, PP14 and PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012, policies CS02, CS8, CS10, CS13, CS14, CS16, CS17 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011, policies SA4 and SA5 of the Adopted Peterborough Site Allocations DPD 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**5.2 13/01105/HHFUL – External alterations to the detached garage comprising replacement windows and the insertion of new door to the elevation facing the main dwelling house - revised application. 13 Nottingham Way, Dogsthorpe, Peterborough, PE1 4NF**

The application site comprised a two storey detached residential dwelling, located within a residential estate of uniform character. The main dwellinghouse was set back from the streetscene and sat behind an existing single storey detached double garage. The garage was positioned side-on to the street and shared a driveway with No.11 Nottingham Way. There was a small area of landscaping to the front comprising shrubs and an immature silver birch tree which provided some screening to the dwelling and garage. The garage had a blank gable elevation which fronts the public highway and was constructed of buff brick and brown concrete roof tiles.

The application had been submitted following a similar proposal being refused at Committee for the following reason:

*The alterations to the street facing elevation, with the insertion of two windows, would be detrimental to the appearance of the street scene contrary to the provisions of Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012), both of which sought to ensure that new development made a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment.*

The application differed from the refused scheme as there were no longer any windows proposed to be inserted into the western elevation of the garage. Instead, the only new opening related to the insertion of a door into the eastern elevation (facing the main dwellinghouse).

The proposal was associated with the change of use of the existing garage to an annexe for occupation by a family member associated with the occupation of the main dwellinghouse. This did not require the benefit of planning permission.

The Group Manager Development Management provided an overview of the proposal and advised that further comments had been received from both Councillor John Shearman, who had stated that his comments had been misrepresented within the committee report, in that he had not objected to the application, rather he was acting on behalf of local residents and Councillor John Peach, requesting that the application be called into the Committee should the recommendation be one of approval. It was advised that the Officer's recommendation was one of approval subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.

Ward Councillor John Peach addressed the Committee. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- A while ago, Councillor Peach had been in contact with a Senior Planner who had stated that she was minded to refuse the application. This was later confirmed in an email;
- Why had the application come back again and why was it recommended for approval?
- The application was out of keeping with the area, to the detriment of local residents and the environment;
- Whilst there had been extensions in Nottingham Way in the past, none of these included a free standing annex such as a garage; and
- If permission was granted, it would open the way up for similar development on nearby sites.

Ward Councillor John Shearman addressed the Committee. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There were still strong concerns regarding the application from local residents;

- The development would not be a self-contained development and it would increase movement from the house to the garage. This would impact on nearby neighbours;
- The development would not necessarily create a precedent for other developments, however a similar application would be difficult to turn down; and
- It was never the purpose of the estate to use garages as living accommodation.

Mr Rod McDonald, a neighbour and objector, addressed the Committee. In summary key points highlighted included:

- The conversion was out of keeping for the area and would impact on the amenity of the neighbours;
- Mr McDonald shared a driveway with the Applicant;
- The metal and plastic cladding would not be in-keeping with the area;
- There would be an impact on neighbour privacy, more than the original plan would have had;
- There would be a clear line of vision into Mr McDonald's lounge and upper bedroom window; and
- The conversion would have the appearance of a storeroom with very natural light, not suitable accommodation for a person.

Following questions to the speakers, the Group Manager Development Management reconfirmed that the only change to the application was the removal of windows in the western elevation and the insertion of a door in the eastern elevation.

Members expressed concern at the lack of light that the residents inside the property would have and that this may mean that they would tend to gravitate towards the area around the door. However, the previous reasons for refusal had been in relation to the windows facing the streetscene.

A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application as per Officer recommendation. The motion was carried by 4 votes, with 1 voting against and 2 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:** (4 For, 1 Against, 2 Abstentions) to approve the application, as per Officer recommendation, subject to:

1. Conditions C1 and C2 as detailed in the committee report; and
2. The notes to the Applicant, IN1 to IN3, as detailed in the committee 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 proposed external alterations would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- The proposed door to the eastern elevation would not result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

### **5.3 13/00787/FUL – Proposed demolition of existing factory and construction of two dwellings, 229 Star Road, Eastgate, Peterborough, PE1 5ET**

The application site comprised a detached two storey industrial premises (Use Class B2) located within a predominantly residential area. The building was of a standard pitched roof design, gable to the streetscene, with a two storey flat roof side element, external steel staircase and single storey element. The building had been rendered with green painted wooden windows and doors. There was an area of hardstanding to the front and side of the property which provided some car parking and a single storey lean-to garage which was sited adjacent to 122 Padholme Road.

The site was bound to the front by a 1.5 metre high brick wall and 1.8 metre high steel weldmesh gates.

The surrounding area was varied in character, with both detached and semi-detached residential properties. The former Volunteer Public House, which comprised a number of ground floor retail units, lay immediately opposite the site. No.122 Padholme Road to the north of the site, comprised a first floor residential flat and at ground floor, an office which had previously been in use associated with the application site.

The application sought planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and construction of two semi-detached residential dwellings. The dwellings were both proposed to be 2-bedrooms, each with one off road parking space and a private outdoor amenity space.

The scheme had been amended following referral of the application to Planning Committee. The alterations related to the two storey rear projecting 'wing' elements of the dwellings. There was now a void at ground floor level with an oversailing first floor containing bathrooms to serve each dwelling.

The Group Manager Development Management provided the Committee with an overview of the proposal and the main issues for consideration. It was also advised that comments had been received from Pollution Control requesting that the Developer assess the site for the presence of contamination, and where necessary, submit an appropriate scheme for remediation. The Officer's recommendation was one of refusal.

Ward Councillor Marion Todd, addressed the Committee and responded to



questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The size of the garden was not reason enough to refuse the application, it was adequate for the type of property in the area;
- The parking provision was adequate and there was also on road parking available for a small cost. There had been no accidents relating to the site;
- The house was close to town and therefore residents would not necessarily want cars;
- The properties would not lend themselves to be homes for life, they would be ideal starter homes;
- The majority of houses along Star Road were terrace with no parking and garages; and
- It was not the ideal location for a business premises.

Mrs Annetta Sleight, the Applicant, addressed the Committee. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The premises had been a family business for 60 years and had been recently vacated. Consideration had been given as to how best to use the site;
- The building needed to be demolished and it was felt that the provision of two houses was the best solution;
- Parking was an issue in the area, however many areas in Peterborough had the same issues;
- The first house would have a garage and the second house would be able to utilise an inner space, well within the driveway;
- If people did not like the parking, they would not move there in the first instance;
- Many young people living in the vicinity did not own cars; and
- The garden area would be slightly small, but many young people wanted easy maintainable gardens;

Following questions to speakers, the Highways Officer addressed the Committee and stated that the parking provision on site was inadequate due to the lack of turning space available and as such, he could not support the application.

Members debated the application and raised concerns. It was commented that the development was good in principle, however the parking provision was inadequate for the two proposed dwellings. A single dwelling would be more appropriate for the area.

A motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application as per Officer recommendation. The motion was carried by 6 votes, with 1 abstention.

**RESOLVED:** (6 For, 1 Abstention) to refuse the application, as per Officer recommendation, and:

1. The reasons R1 to R5 as detailed within the committee report.

#### **Reasons for the 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:

- The design of the proposed dwellings, particularly the proposed first floor oversail to the rear, would result in a contrived and incongruous form of development, out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposal would therefore result in an unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance and visual amenity of the locality, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- The application scheme failed to provide sufficient space within the curtilage of the site for the parking demands generated by the proposed dwellings. The proposal would therefore result in additional parking demand on-street in an area which was already heavily congested and without sufficient capacity to accommodate further parking demand. As such, the proposal would result in cars parking in unacceptable and dangerous locations on the public highway, impeding the free flow of traffic and resulting in an unacceptable danger to highway safety, contrary to Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- The application scheme failed to provide an adequate area of turning for vehicles within the curtilage of the site. This would result in vehicles reversing on to the public highway and at an obtuse angle, with limited visibility in terms of oncoming pedestrians and other vehicles. The proposal would result in a conflict with all users of the public highway and result in an unacceptable danger to highway safety, contrary to Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- The proposal failed to provide an adequate area of private outdoor garden/amenity space commensurate with the size and scale of the proposed dwellings. This would afford future occupants an unacceptable level of amenity, contrary to Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- The application proposal failed to make provision for additional infrastructure and community facilities which were necessary as a direct consequence of the proposed development. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD (2010).

#### **5.4 13/00835/R4FUL – Demolition of existing care home, and construction of 17 chalet bungalows and creation of 34 car parking spaces, The Peverels, 34 Pine Tree Close, Dogsthorpe, Peterborough**

The application site was approximately 0.4 hectares and was located at the eastern end of Pine Tree Close, Dogsthorpe. The site contained a former residential care home comprising a single building mainly single storey with two storey element to the east. The care home was now vacant. The site was an island site contained between the two arms of Pine Tree Close and therefore had a street frontage to the north, west and southern boundaries. The east boundary was fenced and abutted existing residential properties on Acacia Avenue. The surrounding area was predominantly residential in character comprising two storey developments with open frontages. The existing Care Home incorporated off-street

parking with access direct from Pine Tree Close as well as a small parking court and garage on the northern part of the site, with provision for approximately 16 car spaces.

Planning permission was sought for the demolition of the existing care home building and the erection of 17 number 2-bed chalet bungalows with associated parking. The development would be 100% affordable.

The Group Manager Development Management provided the Committee with an overview of the proposal and the main issues for consideration. The Officer's recommendation was to approve the application subject to the imposition of relevant conditions and the signing of a legal agreement.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report and it was highlighted that a Construction Management Plan had been submitted and the Highway Section had raised no objections. Condition 7 in the committee report was therefore to be amended to a compliance condition.

Further comments had also been received from Ward Councillor Adrian Miners and Ward Councillor Chris Ash in support of the application.

Ward Councillor Chris Ash, addressed the Committee. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Ward Councillors had been involved at an early stage and it was disappointing that some of their comments had not been included within the committee report;
- The dormer windows made the application look somewhat ugly, and this had been mentioned by Ward Councillors previously;
- There had been a highways issue, relating to additional off parking, which had now been clarified; and
- It was requested that during the demolition and construction phases, the hours of operation be specified within a condition. There were many elderly residents who would not want construction work early in the morning and late at night.

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

- The scheme had evolved from another scheme recently completed in Eye, which was being put forward for a design award;
- The units were designed to be as usable and as flexible as possible by Cross Keys Homes Residents;
- They would be homes for life and sustainable homes and would be secured by design;
- There would be 37 car parking spaces, not 34. Two for each dwelling and three for visitors;
- It was hoped that work could commence by the end of September, should the Committee be minded to grant the application as there was some

Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) monies being awarded to help fund the project;

- A contractor, who was likely to be appointed, was part of the Considerate Contractors Scheme, so residents needs would be taken account of during demolition and construction;
- The hours of working had been specified within a Construction Management Plan;
- The scheme would regenerate the area and should be finished by June 2014.

Following questions to the speakers, Members commended the scheme and stated that it would be an excellent addition to the area.

A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, as per Officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

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

1. Conditions numbered C1 to C18 as detailed in the committee report (C7 to become a compliance condition).

#### **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 proposal would be an efficient and effective use of a brownfield site and would contribute to the overall housing need figures for the Peterborough area;
- The scale and design of the development would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- The development made adequate provision for the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the properties;
- The development would not result in any adverse impact on the amenity of occupiers of existing neighbouring dwellings;
- The proposal provided adequate parking provision for the occupiers of the dwellings and visitors and would not result in any adverse highway implications;
- The proposal would provide affordable dwellings and would meet an identified housing need; and
- The proposal made satisfactory and justified contribution towards the social and physical infrastructure demands that it would place on the city.

Hence the proposal was in accordance with policies CS2, CS8, CS10, CS13, CS14, CS16 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011, policies PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12, PP13, and PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012 and the NPPF.

#### **5.5 13/01159/R4FUL – Demolition of existing Spinney play centre and construction of replacement children's play centre with undercover external dining area, Spinney Adventure Play Centre, Hartwell Way, Peterborough,**

### **PE3 7LE**

The site was located to the south of Hartwell Way, Ravensthorpe and owned by Peterborough City Council. It was host to the Spinney Play Centre which was a parent led support group and registered charity for families with children that had additional needs and disabilities. The site was also used by the local Scouts and other Community Groups.

The site measured 0.45 hectare, and comprised a pre-fabricated concrete single storey building that had come to the end of its useful life and was no longer fit for purpose as a children's play centre. The existing structure had a footprint measuring 23.1 metres (length) x 10.9 metres (depth).

The proposal was to demolish the existing building which had been applied for under application ref: 13/00033/DEMOL and replace the building with a new play centre with a detached covered external seating area that met the needs of the charity.

The replacement building would have a modern design measuring a footprint measuring 27.3 metres (length) x 10.9 metres (depth), with a mono pitch roof that extended to 3.25 metres to the eaves and 3.8 metres at its highest point.

The proposed covered seating area had a footprint of 9 metres x 7.3 metres with a monopitch roof to match the main building measuring 3 metres to the eaves and 4 metres at its highest point. The canopy would be supported by 6no. columns.

The new building would be situated largely in the same location as the existing, with the same orientation, parallel to Hartwell Way. The main change was that the building would be slightly larger and set back deeper into the plot by approximately 4 metres so that it would not encroach on the canopy and root protection area of the mature trees on site.

The Group Manager Development Management provided the Committee with an overview of the proposal and the main issues for consideration. The Officer's recommendation was to approve the application subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report and it was highlighted that revised comments had been received from the Landscape Officer stating that there were no objections raised against the proposal. Further comments had also been received from Ward Councillor Ed Murphy and Ward Councillor Gul Nawaz in support of the application.

Members commended the facility and stated that it would be fantastic for the area and the city. A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, as per Officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

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

1. Conditions numbered C1 to C3 as detailed in the committee 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 proposal was not considered to have any note-worthy detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and would act to improve the locality in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP02 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012;
- The proposal was not considered to be detrimental to the neighbour amenity by way of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP03 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012;
- The proposal was not considered to be detrimental to the adjacent public highway in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012;
- The design had taken into account the tree canopies and root protection areas of the mature trees and therefore the proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policy CS20 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP1 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012; and
- Neither Natural England nor the Peterborough City Council Wildlife Officer had raised objections and therefore the proposal was considered to be in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP16 and PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

## **5.6 E1 – Enforcement Action in Newborough Ward**

Members were asked to determine whether the item, which contained exempt information relating to an individual or would be likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person (including the authority holding that information), as defined by Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of Schedule 12A of Part 1 of the Local Government Act 1972, should be exempt and the press and public excluded from the meeting during the item, or whether the public interest in disclosing the information outweighed the public interest in maintaining the exemption.

The Committee unanimously agreed to the exemption and the press and public were excluded from the meeting.

The Committee received a report requesting it to consider appropriate enforcement action in relation to unauthorised development and whether it was appropriate that supplementary planning policy be prepared in relation to the subject under consideration.

Following debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to agree that enforcement action be taken. The motion was carried unanimously.

A second motion was put forward and seconded to agree that it would not be

appropriate for supplementary planning policy to be prepared.

**RESOLVED:** (Unanimously), to agree that enforcement action be taken, as per Officer recommendation and that it would not be appropriate for supplementary planning policy to be prepared in relation to the subject under consideration.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The Committee considered that enforcement action was required, and that it would not be appropriate for supplementary planning policy to be prepared, as per the reasons outlined in the exempt committee report.

**6. Review of Local List Planning Application Validation Requirements**

A report was presented to the Committee which highlighted the proposed changes to the Local Validation List requirements. On previous occasions, changes to the Local Validation List, which set out what information had to be submitted with planning applications, had been reported to the Committee.

It was proposed to streamline the local list of validation requirements in accordance with the government's aims of simplifying the application process. This would reduce the likelihood of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) being challenged by Applicants on its validation requirements. There was some risk that whilst this would speed up the validation process, in some cases it could cause delay during the consideration of the application; it may become apparent that additional information would be needed to enable the Case Officer to make a proper recommendation. This could result in some applications being refused if the requested information was not provided in a timely manner or otherwise the LPA would require an extension of time from the Applicant in order to try to resolve outstanding issues. This would be at the Officer's discretion, taking into account the circumstances of each case.

To assist potential Applicants with validation requirements, a pre-application advice service was already offered. It was proposed to extend this service to provide a list of validation requirements only (upon request) for a small fee. All of these changes were to be published on the planning and building control pages of the Peterborough City Council website.

**RESOLVED:**

The Committee noted the proposed changes to the Local Validation List requirements as set out in the Council's "One Stop Shop" on the Planning and Building Control web pages.

1.30pm – 4.35pm  
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank