

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 3 SEPTEMBER 2013 AT 1.30PM

	<b>Page No:</b>
1. Procedure for Speaking	<b>1</b>
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak	<b>2</b>
3. Briefing Update	<b>3</b>
Item 5.1 – Photographs Submitted by Mr Macdougald-Denton	<b>7</b>

**UPDATE REPORT &  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

This page is intentionally left 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.**

**MPs will be permitted to address Committee when they have been asked to represent their constituents. The total time allowed for speeches for MPs will not be more than five minutes unless the Committee decide on the day of the meeting to extend the time allowed due to unusual or exceptional circumstances.**

**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.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 3 SEPTEMBER 2013 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	39	13/00649/FUL – LAND OFF THORNEY ROAD, EYE, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Dale McKean Mr Tim Slator (Larkfleet Homes)	Ward Councillor Agent
5.2	61	13/01105/HHFUL – 13 NOTTINGHAM WAY, DOGSTHORPE, PETERBOROUGH, PE1 4NF	Councillor John Peach Councillor John Shearman Mr Rod McDonald (Local Resident)	Ward Councillor Ward Councillor Objector
5.3	71	13/00787/FUL – 229 STAR ROAD, EASTGATE, PETERBOROUGH, PE1 5ET	Councillor Marion Todd Mrs Annetta Sleigh	Ward Councillor Applicant
5.4	81	13/01159/R4FUL – THE PEVERELS, 34 PINE TREE CLOSE, DOGSTHORPE, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Chris Ash Councillor Bella Saltmarsh (Provisional) Mr David Turnock	Ward Councillor Ward Councillor Agent

This page is intentionally left blank

## BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 3 September 2013

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	13/00649/FUL	<b>Land Off Thorney Road, Eye, Peterborough</b> , Construction of 52 new dwellings and garages and supporting infrastructure.

Amended plan received Layout plan PL01 Rev D

Changes include the extension of footway across site frontage to link to existing development, change in turning area to plot 52 and addition of speed calming.

Response from Environment Agency 30<sup>th</sup> August 2013:

No objections to the proposed development subject to the imposition of the following condition:

No development shall commence until details of a scheme, including phasing, for the provision of mains foul water drainage on and off site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

In order to satisfy the condition an adequate scheme would need to be submitted which demonstrates that there is (or will be prior to occupation) sufficient infrastructure capacity for the connection, conveyance, treatment and disposal of quantity and quality of water within the proposed phasing of development.

Reason: To prevent flooding, pollution and detriment to public amenity through provision of suitable water infrastructure and in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Email from Cllr Dale McKean 27<sup>th</sup> August 2013:

Reading the officers report online that is being presented to the Planning and Environmental Committee on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sep I have found some rather concerning information that was not provided through out the discussions with Larkfleet and those I have had with planning offices, it is that the site is actually reduced in size from that of the adopted site allocations DPD from 2.49Ha to 1.77Ha yet the houses have increased from 50 to 52 the document also mentions that the development is relatively dense (condition C21)

So I would like my objection in the email below amended to include the following please

**The Adopted Site Allocations DPD (ref. SA5.5). size was 2.49ha and was approved by the Inspector and the Full Council for there to be 50 houses at a rate of 20 per Hectare. This application is for a 30% reduced plot size of 1.77ha of 52 houses which means a rate of 30per Hectare**

**So I request this application is also refused based on that it is not 20 per hectare as per the agreed site allocations and any re submission be at the site allocations rate of 20 per hectare making it a maximum quantity of 36 houses**

**Please can this amendment to my objection be sent on to all the members of the Planning and Environmental Committee prior to the meeting as pre reading**

Officer Response:

The extent of the application red line has never matched the extent of the site allocation. The site allocation has an area of 2.49 hectares and states the site could accommodate 50 dwellings which is an

indicative figure. The proposed number of dwellings would be 52 which would equate to a density of approximately 30 dwellings per hectare which is considered acceptable for this location.

Email from Mr Stewart Jackson MP 26<sup>th</sup> August 2013:

I am happy to withdraw my substantive letter of objection with regard to this application, given the amendments made in response to initial consultation by the developer, with the caveat that the following should be noted in the report:

“Stewart Jackson MP supports the comments by Cllr 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 s.106 funding allocations, in light of the concerns of local City Councillors and Eye Parish Council.”

I wish to strongly reiterate the previous objections I lodged in respect of the above numbered planning application. The revised proposals do nothing to address my concerns.

Further Objection From Mr Stuart Macdougald-Denton (Photographs attached to update report)

My primary objection is to the development being accessed via Millport Drive (access should be directly off Thorney Road)

Millport Drive is too narrow to accommodate the number of vehicles using it at the moment, let alone any more. The statement made by Transport & Engineering Services in the 'report to committee' is fundamentally untrue. Furthermore, they have failed to produce the calculations to substantiate their position, as requested in my previously lodged objection.

I have attached photographs of the parking on Millport Drive, on the occasion that resulted in us calling the Police, as they obstruct the access to our property and parked dangerously, (incident no. CC30072013-1247). The actual numbers of cars shown in this photographs is far less than there can be, but the main events at the Care Home that cause the worst parking seem to occur during term times (when the Home run classes) and it is the school holidays at the moment.

Very heavy vehicles (mainly delivery trucks to the Care Home) already use this access on many occasions each and every week, from 6.30am, causing havoc during the morning exodus of cars from the development. Ambulances already have to mount the pavement at times to get through.

My secondary complaint concerns construction traffic access.

Any permission hereby granted **must** include a Condition requiring the contractor to access the site directly off Thorney Road and not to use Millport Drive at any time.

If I didn't have un-breakable appointments in London tomorrow, I would have requested the opportunity to speak.

Revised Recommendation

The proposal provides for less affordable housing than is required by adopted Council Planning Policy. This is because site viability does not look as if it will allow for full provision to be made. However, the viability assessment negotiations have not yet been finalised and therefore officers are seeking authority to grant planning permission subject to:

- a) the viability assessment satisfactorily demonstrating that only 12 affordable units can be provided.
- b) the signing of the Section 106 as outlined in the committee report
- c) the conditions in the committee report



2 .	13/01105/HHFUL	<b>13 Nottingham Way, Dogsthorpe, Peterborough, PE1 4NF</b> , 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.
-----	----------------	---

**Councillor Shearman** – The officer report to committee incorrectly states that I object to the application. I neither support nor object to the application and am only acting as a conduit by which residents' views can be tested and examined by the Planning Committee.

**Councillor Peach** – Request that the application is referred to Planning Committee if Officer recommendation is for approval. As the application is almost the same as last time and given Officers initially recommended refusal, I trust they will do the same.

3 .	13/00787/FUL	<b>229 Star Road, Eastgate, Peterborough, PE1 5ET</b> , Proposed demolition of existing factory and construction of two dwellings.
-----	--------------	--

**Environment and Pollution Control** – Due to the previous use of the site, there may be contaminated land issues. As such and on a precautionary basis, request that conditions be imposed requiring the Developer to assess the site for the presence of contamination and where necessary, submit an appropriate scheme for remediation.

4 .	13/00835/R4FUL	<b>The Peverels, 34 Pine Tree Close, Dogsthorpe, Peterborough</b> , Demolition of existing care home, and construction of 17 chalet bungalows and creation of 34 car parking spaces.
-----	----------------	--

A Construction Management Plan has been submitted and the highway section raises no objections. Condition 7 shall now be amended to a compliance condition.

**Councillor Miners** – I fully support the planning application....my comments were not contained within the Report.

**Councillor Ash** - Ward councillors have taken a close interest in this site for a very long time and our thanks go to the team involved at the pre application stage, for keeping us informed , and to Cross Keys for the consultation.

It is a pity however that once the application was formerly received the planners did not make any further contact.

Which is a pity, but we do hope and I am sure they have, that the planning team picked up our views and importantly those of the public who took the trouble to attend the consultation.

### **Design and Layout**

Generally speaking this is a well thought out and is suited to the area , however I feel that the design the appearance tends to look institutional and the dormer windows appear on the indicative drawing to look large and bulky, and sit uncomfortably with what are quite small buildings. Hopefully modifications to the design can be made to give the look of the complex a more softer human feel

### **Highways**

At the consultation it was suggested that extra parking provision would be considered for existing residents . At the consultation it was suggested by CKH that parking was not exclusive for the Peverels and that residents of Pinetree Close could use free space and that as part of the overall project CKH might consider providing additional off road spaces for existing residents . The comment from highways in the report seems to contradict that.

At this stage I am a little unclear of the implications of the comment from the LHA especially the mention of a stopping up order.

### **Community Consultation**

As mentioned in the report residents were very concerned that housing might be occupied by large families.

Given that the site was a care home and the housing in Pinetree Close is not occupied by families , this concern is justified.

Residents were happy to learn at the consultation that properties will be occupied by tenants who need a little extra help and care plus their careers if one is needed. However the report is not specific and simply states it is more likely that dwellings will be occupied by those with mobility problems and that occupation by large families is unlikely. As the design is not suited for families we seek assurances that there will be no conflict in that regard.

We would also ask that any demolition and construction works take into consideration the residential nature of the area and the demography of existing residents.

I have made the above comments in the hope that we can lift this scheme from being a good one that people can learn to live with to one that is of excellent design that desisting resident and new tenants can appreciate from day one and can become a showcase.

5 .	13/01159/R4FUL	<b>Spinney Adventure Play Centre, Hartwell Way, Peterborough, PE3 7LE</b> , Demolition of existing Spinney play centre and construction of replacement children's play centre with undercover external dining area.
-----	----------------	---

**Landscape Officer (Revised Comments)** – Following the submission of the requested foundation details the Landscape officer comments as follows: The site layout indicates that the proposed new build will be set back from the original building footprint. As such, this reduces the impact on the RPA of T3 & T7 to the point where there is less than 10% (BS5837:2012 recommends no more than 20%). Although a raft foundation is not ideal, I consider that this incursion should have little detrimental affect due the remainder of the RPA being untouched.

Following discussions with Enterprise Peterborough, the latest Tree Survey details have been updated to reflect the works needed to remove the existing sub-base within the RPA and as such, Section 6 of the Arboricultural Method Statement has been amended.

Enterprise Peterborough confirmed that an Arboriculturalist will be on site during construction to ensure that the necessary protection methods and works are carried out in line with the report.

I have no objections to the proposal.

**Councillor Murphy** - A representation from Councillor Murphy has raised a point that the site may have a Covenant protecting the site for Children's Play and that this should be retained. [Officer reply – Covenants are not a matter that can be lawfully be placed on a property as part of granting planning permission. This is a land transfer issue.]

**Councillor Nawaz** – The design and layout is a very sensible and practical replacement for the old building. I have received no complaints from any residents living close to the Spinney development.





ITEM 5.1 - LAND OFF THORNEY ROAD



This page is intentionally left blank