

Application Ref: 13/01539/FUL

Proposal: Change of use from retail and residential to retail only including extension and internal rearrangement of existing post office and convenience store

Site: 15 - 17 High Street, Glinton, Peterborough, PE6 7LS

Applicant: Keshco Ltd

Agent: David Turnock Architects

Referred by: Director of Growth & Regeneration

Reason: Level of objections to the application

Site visit: 06.11.2013

Case officer: Mr S Falco
Telephone No. 01733 454408
E-Mail: sam.falco@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

Site Description:

The site is host to a detached chalet bungalow that is currently in joint residential and Post Office cum Village Shop use. At first floor there is a bedroom and en-suite. The property was constructed circa 1960's with dual pitch gabled roofs covered with interlocking concrete tiles, light brown brick elevations, white upvc windows and doors. To the front of the shop is a forecourt with two dropped kerbs which typically creates an in/out informal parking area.

Proposal:

The proposal under this application is for change of use from joint retail and residential use to retail use only.). The existing first floor level will be used as a store accessed by way of a loft ladder. The proposal also includes:

- A rear flat roof single storey extension is proposed (2.4m eaves height). This will increase the gross internal floor area from 169 sq m to 249 sq. m (an increase of 80 sq. m
- the blocking up of windows to the east elevation
- relocating the front entrance to the front facing gable with 4 No. security bollards to the front
- extending the shop front window to incorporate the space that is the current front entrance to the shop/ post office
- rendering part of the front elevation and sides and rear of the shop
- The installation of 3no. Condenser units to the rear for air-conditioning and refrigeration.

There is space on the forecourt for 6 cars to park. Daily deliveries by 1 No 26 tonne rigid truck will take place with other deliveries being by van.

The above represents a summary of the scheme as revised from what was originally submitted which then had 5 condenser units, an ATM, full height shop front windows and 13 security bollards to the forecourt amongst other things.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
P0492/78	Extension to shop/bungalow	Application Permitted	13/07/1978
P0225/88/C	Change of use of part of existing bungalow to form an extension to existing shop and alterations to existing glazed extension	Application Permitted	06/05/1988
05/01376/FUL	Loft conversion with 2 dormers to front	Application Permitted	04/11/2005

3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 1 - Economic Growth

Planning should encourage sustainable growth and significant weight should be given to supporting economic development.

Section 3 - Rural Economic Growth

Should be encouraged through sustainable growth and the expansion of business/ enterprise including sustainable rural tourism/leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside, via the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings. The retention and development of local services and community facilities should be promoted.

Section 4 - Assessment of Transport Implications

Development which generates a significant amount of traffic should be supported by a Transport Statement/Transport Assessment. It should be located to minimise the need to travel/to maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel and be supported by a Travel Plan. Large scale developments should include a mix of uses. A safe and suitable access should be provided and the transport network improved to mitigate the impact of the development.

Section 7 - Good Design

Development should add to the overall quality of the area; establish a strong sense of place; optimise the site potential; create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses; support local facilities and transport networks; respond to local character and history while not discouraging appropriate innovation; create safe and accessible environments which are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Planning permission should be refused for development of poor design.

Section 8 - Safe and Accessible Environments

Development should aim to promote mixed use developments, the creation of strong neighbouring centres and active frontages; provide safe and accessible environments with clear and legible pedestrian routes and high quality public space.

Section 11 - Noise

New development giving rise to unacceptable adverse noise impacts should be resisted; development should mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising. Development often creates some noise and existing businesses wanting to expand should not be unreasonably restricted because of changes in nearby land uses.

Section 11 - Light Pollution

Lighting should be designed to limit pollution on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and

areas of nature conservation.

Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

Section 13 - Economic Benefit

Great weight to the benefits of the mineral extraction, including to the economy. Non energy minerals should be provided for outside of Scheduled Monuments and Conservation Areas where practicable.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

CS17 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non-scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

CS14 - Transport

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

PP02 - Design Quality

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

PP03 - Impacts of New Development

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

PP13 - Parking Standards

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

4 **Consultations/Representations**

PCC Conservation

The rear extension will not have an adverse impact on the Glinton Conservation Area or nearby listed building. The use of render to part of the building is accepted, and the trough render finish can be agreed via condition. Similarly infilling of existing openness in mitring brick is accepted.

There were concerns with regard to the proposed alteration to the existing shop front and the provision of a high number of bollards on the forecourt windows, the provision of an external ATM to form 6 bay floor-to-ceiling mock glazing appearance is not supported. However, these have been addressed in the revised proposals for the scheme.

These comments are given further to the e-mail and revised plans received from the agent on 14th November.

- The omission of the ATM machine from the front elevation is supported.
- The retention of the existing stall riser height and new windows, including to the existing door opening, is supported.
- Render finish to this side of the front elevation is supported and the finish can be agreed via condition.
- The use of 4 bollards in place of the proposed 13 is supported and is in line with the comments made by the Police Architectural Liaison Officer
- The community notice board as the only external display board is noted and supported
- The retention of the 4 door entrance is noted. I would prefer to have a two door entrance as advised in my earlier comments. I note the applicant's comments made in favour of the 4 door entrance for higher level of accessibility, notwithstanding the increase in internal floor space the present door is single and this would double in width which would provide a more balanced ratio of solid to glazing in the gable, then the 4 as proposed.

Recommendation: From a heritage consideration the proposed revised external works can be supported. I would still encourage the reduction from 4 entrance doors to 2. Various details mentioned above can be secured by condition.

PCC Transport & Engineering Services

Due to numerous concerns raised directly with me by residents, I have visited this site on 3 occasions to ensure we have a full idea of the current situation, particularly at school times.

Transport Assessment - The Gross Floor Area triggers the need for a Transport Statement, which I understand has not been provided. Due to the location of this site, the local schools and the intensive use of the route in front of this site during school start/finish times, these are the periods that we have focused on. No information has been provided on expected traffic generation, but it is assumed it will increase as a direct result of the expansion, but this is difficult to quantify. It is assumed that the increase will be throughout the opening hours, rather than a significant increase at the school peak times although it is expected that there will be some increase then. The following comments includes the area's that should have also been addressed under the Transport Statement.

Parking - Based on the gross floor area we have calculated that a maximum provision of 19 on-site parking spaces would be allowed. No information has been provided about the existing or proposed layout including the access/es, parking or loading/unloading area. There are no detailed plans for the accesses and forecourt area, but documentation included within the application states that they believe they can accommodate 6 parking spaces. This provision has not been

demonstrated on a plan. From my site visits I have observed up to 5 vehicles parked within the site at any one time in a very informal manner including partly on the footway in front of the site. The lack of detailed plans or any formalisation of the area makes it difficult to assess what can actually be achieved. That said, it is evident that there is no further area that can be set aside for parking due to the constraints of the site. The parking provision is under the “maximum” provision set out in our policy.

Site Observations - I have visited the site 3 times, to establish what currently happens, in particular during peak periods associated with the schools. The speed limit is 20mph within the vicinity of the site and whilst most drivers appeared to adhere to the restriction, there were some that did not. There is a footway running along the frontage of the site, which is indicated and used as a cycleway too. There were many occasions of conflict between vehicles accessing the shop forecourt and pedestrians and cyclists passing the site, although at no time did either have to stop suddenly. Both seemed to be aware of the potential for conflict and walked/rode/drove accordingly. It should be noted that under highway law the pedestrians/cyclists have the right of way at a dropped crossing such as these and any vehicle must give way. It has not been demonstrated on the plans if vehicle to pedestrian or vehicle to cyclist splays can be achieved, however the one I remain concerned about is the vehicle to cyclist splay to the west of the western access point. Pupils were also observed cycling on road as well as within the footway. Some vehicles, including a delivery vehicle on one occasion parked half on the footway and half on the road or the application site. These obstructions are a concern given that this is a classified road and a primary route for school children. There were also some vehicles parked fully with the carriageway in front of the shop, primarily as the forecourt appeared full. These vehicles resulted in forcing eastbound vehicles in to the oncoming lane of traffic, a short distance from a bend in High Street. Observations were made also of vehicles parked further east where the same situation occurred. But at no time did I observe any near misses or any vehicle having to break hard. Whilst most parents in vehicles picked up away from this site, it was noted that some children did walk up to the shop to be picked up although the amount was very minimal. The majority of the traffic passing the site were associated with parents picking up their children.

Accident data - I have also reviewed the number of accidents in the last 5 years and have found only 2 recorded accidents, neither of which can be associated with the school peak times or school children.

Cycle Parking - A minimum of one cycle parking stand (2 spaces) will be required. This can be conditioned.

Site Boundary It would appear that the site edged red on the application has in error included an area of public highway land. Please ensure this is corrected before any planning permission is issued.

Loading and Unloading - No information has been provided on - deliveries, i.e. timings, location of and type of delivery vehicle, so this is difficult to assess. It can only be assumed that similar delivery vehicles to that which already occur will continue post development, although I appreciate that there may not be sufficient space within the parking court, similar to the current situation.

Summary

It is clear that this development will increase the number of visitors to the shop but it is likely that this will be spread throughout the day rather than at any specific peak time. There are a number of highway related concerns with this proposal as stated above although the impact is hard to quantify with the information provided. One of the main concerns is the conflict between pedestrians/cyclists and vehicles along the site frontage, which I believe can be improved significantly with some boundary treatment, signing and lining to formalise the accesses and parking arrangements. In addition, due to concerns about the lack of vehicle to cyclist visibility splays, I would recommend that a “one-way” system is introduced making the most eastern access the exit thereby allowing adequate visibility. If the Local Planning Authority are minded to approve

this application, then I would recommend that the following conditions are appended to any approval:-

1. Submission of details for demarcation of the forecourt area in respect of in / out and car parking bays and signage
2. Submission of cycle parking details

Informatives re penalties for mud on the highway are also requested.

PCC Pollution Team

No objection. I performed a calculation with all 3 models and used the screen as the barrier. I haven't included the fence into the barrier calculation. It would appear that the appropriate noise limit can be met by careful selection, siting and installation of the units. I would therefore be willing to recommend a noise limit to the planning officer on submission of documentation, although the reliance upon complying with any limit can only be presumed upon the developer and his representatives.

The appropriate noise limit is as follows:

The rating level of noise emitted from the site shall not exceed 35 dB LAeq, 1 hour. The noise levels should be determined at the nearest noise sensitive premises. The measurements and assessment should be made according to BS:4142:1997.

PCC Environmental Health (Food)

No objection

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (13.11.13)

I am also aware that Glinton is a conservation area and the Local Conservation Officer would prefer a reduction in the number of bollards proposed. A suggestion by the Conservation Officer has been made, to raise the ground height of the windows by installing a 600mm brick stall riser, therefore eliminating the need for security bollards in front of this glazed section. The height of 600mm is the very minimum height which may provide some protection. In my opinion increasing the brick stall riser to only 600mm is in itself, not a sufficient deterrent to address the future crime risk to this property. In light of this assessment, I would ask the conservation officer to re-consider his views in respect to the reduction in number of suitable bollards. I would strongly advise that Bollards are definitely required to protect the main front door fully glazed unit. Such bollards should be installed with a maximum of 1.2m between bollards.

The final decision is obviously down to the conservation officer and yourself, however I am minded to advise that if such a modern glazed shop frontage on an unremarkable building is acceptable to the LPA in this conservation area, then the addition of matching, modern style of bollards, are in my opinion, not an unreasonable request, having taken into consideration the above crime risk. It could be argued that such bollards may have less impact on the aesthetics of the area than the alternatives proposed above.

In addition, I understand that the applicant is intending to install external CCTV. I consider this is definitely required in the area of the ATM to act as a deterrent to Fraud and assist any future criminal investigation. If necessary a Condition in relation to the provision and future maintenance of CCTV and appropriate external Lighting may be advisable.

Welland & Deeping Internal Drainage Board

No comments received

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 7

Total number of responses: 17

Total number of objections: 15

Total number in support: 2

2 letters of support have been received:-

- Stating they fully support the development to ensure that the village retains a functional shop/PO.
- A larger shop with longer hours will prevent travel to Werrington or other shops, potentially reducing through traffic and serve the ever growing elderly population.
- The current shop is small/cluttered and more than 2 customers create a queue and blockage in the aisle(s). A larger modern shop will deal with customers quicker and potentially reduce adjacent parking.
- In my view the potential increase in Anti-Social Behaviour and Parking/Traffic problems are not significant and more problems of this nature are caused by the village's two schools.
- There is nothing to suggest the frontage will become a gathering area for youths and if it did, the issue should be dealt with by the owners, local residents, customers and other bodies as necessary.
- Wider range of facilities and selection within walking distance of my house resulting in fewer car journeys .and less co2 will help the environment.

15 letters of objection have been received, including one from the North Peterborough Villages Association, raising the following concerns:-

- The increased vehicle movements could be 3 or 4 times greater than they are at present, and this will be problematic at busy times.
- Insufficient car parking provision, and no employee parking shown
- On street parking in the vicinity of the shop causes highway safety issues, due to the proximity of the bend
- Much larger delivery vehicles will service the site than presently, this will cause disruption on the site frontage
- The increased frequency of deliveries will cause further noise and disturbance to residents
- Traffic and parking problems will increase significantly from the existing situation and persist throughout each day
- A transport assessment of increased vehicle movements and parking requirements required to support the application
- The delivery times should be restricted to between 10am and 12noon and at no other times unless in very exceptional circumstances, waste collection should be done at the same time, or in line within the existing village collection times.
- The loss of a pavement/cycleway, will result in pedestrians having to cross the busy road
- The building's design is not in keeping with the surrounding properties, and is inappropriate for this conservation village setting
- Additional light Pollution, particularly from the proposed glazed front door
- Detrimental impact on the amenity of surrounding residents
- The store size is too large, and exceeds the needs of the community
- The residential accommodation on site should be retained, particularly for security
- - The condenser units will cause nuisance to close neighbours. They should be soundproofed.
- The opening hours in a rural village should be restricted to say 6am to 8pm Mon –Sat, and 8am-4pm on Sun.
- The opening hours should be no earlier than 7.00 a.m. and remaining open no later than 8.00pm on weekdays and Saturdays, and 1.00pm on Sundays.
- The development will reduce the light to my property and change my current view.
- Detrimental impact on the setting of listed buildings
- The signage lighting of the shop should not be left on when the shop is closed.
- The alcohol should not be positioned so close to the entrance as it may attract school children or

undesirable customers

- Residents already have trouble getting their cars out of their drives, this will make things worse
- The ATM will attract more customers to the site than presently. There will be noise and light pollution from the ATM.
- There is no application for the change of use of the existing residential accommodation into retail use.
- There is no provision for a toilet, washing facilities, drinking water etc., as required for employees by the HSE
- The proposed bollards are not in keeping with the surrounding Conservation Area
- The proposed security gates will be unsightly
- The extra food waste generated will attract pests.
- the shop is on a major Arthur Mellows Village College (AMVC) and Primary School travel to school route where cyclists (lots - mainly unsupervised secondary level), pedestrians (AMVC and Primary - with younger siblings), car and bus traffic all converge - not to mention extra and larger delivery vehicles.
- It is a shame windows and doors are to be removed and in-filled and rendered
- There is no reference to fire exits in the plans.
- Potential to increase anti-social behaviour
- The Glinton Conservation Area Appraisal Report and Management Plan suggests "the planting of a single specimen tree at the back edge of the pavement in front of the shop at a central point in the forecourt. What is proposed does not achieve this.

Peterborough Civic Society

The existing building contributes little to the Glinton Conservation Area. However as it is an important village facility the increased floorspace to enhance viability is not opposed. However the redevelopment of the building should provide an opportunity to readdress the negative aspects of the buildings appearance in the Conservation Area.

- 1) We agree with the Conservation Officer's comments about the adverse effect on the street scene of mock windows with advertising and would wish to see clear glazing with stall-risers, albeit with an appropriate level of added security.
- 2) We agree with the Conservation Officer's comments regarding the signage.
- 3) Additionally we are concerned that the proposal is only to tarmac the existing front forecourt. At present it is unsightly and runs the full width of the site. Cars at busy times (e.g. school pick-up and collection) park haphazardly over it. We do not agree with the applicant that the arrangement works well and should not be altered. The forecourt can be more precisely designed and delineated to break up its unsightly mass using a range of surfacing materials, indicating more efficiently where cars are expected to park, and giving design attention to those parts not required for parking and manoeuvring.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

Background Context:

The Shop/Post Office is located in the centre of Glinton Village. The premises shares it's A1 (shop/Post Office) use with C3 residential accommodation to the rear and first floor. The Shop/Post Office as it exists is small with limited space for either service run from the site. When the Case Officer visited the site it was apparent that when a customer line forms for the Post Office this conflicts with the free flow of the shop as shoppers are unable to access the items for sale nearest the Post Office Counter. The shop offers a limited number products with papers, sweets and snacks making up the main consumables offered. There is certainly limited stock of food and household items, for which it would appear that the residents of Glinton have to travel to the nearest district centre of Werrington to purchase these types of item. In many villages around the Peterborough area, especially the size of Glinton there is a general store that offers a proportionate selection of foods, drinks and household goods to serve the community and reduce the need to travel to larger shopping areas.

Sustainable Development:

The development as proposed is deemed to be sustainable as it will enable local villagers to purchase a wider range of goods that have not been available in the village previously. It is also considered that the proposed alterations will provide a larger turnover for the shopkeepers which will reduce the risk of yet another village losing its primary services. For many who do not drive or unable to travel, a shop with a good range of everyday items inclusive of a post office is deemed to be a huge benefit. Thus improving the economic, environmental and social conditions in the Village. The proposal is deemed to accord with Policy PP01 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012 which ensures that development is sustainable economically and environmentally for now and the future.

Character and Appearance:

Change of Use:

The removal of the residential element of the premises to A1 retail only, is not deemed to have any significant implications on the character and appearance of the area. The frontage of the shop currently has no notable features which would lead anyone to assume that there is a residential element to the premises.

Shop front and exterior alterations:

The original proposals for the shop front were deemed by the LPA and many neighbouring residents to be unacceptable by way of the installation of floor to ceiling windows across the frontage. This was relayed to the applicant who was willing to make the necessary changes to retain the front windows as it exists, which is deemed to be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority. The entrance door is to be moved from its current location to the wall of the front facing gable. The entrance is proposed to be a double opener with two similarly sized non opening glazed panels either side. This has raised objection from neighbouring residents on the grounds that it resembles a supermarket, is not in keeping with the Village Conservation Area and will cause additional light spillage from the shop. The Case Officer along with the Conservation Officer consider that a double door solution (less the glazed sides) would be preferable but that the proposed design is not so harmful as to justify refusal of the application. The removal of the existing door and the replacement of the existing window for a door is not deemed to result in significant amounts of additional glazing that would increase light pollution levels into the street.

The rear, sides and part of the front elevation are proposed to be rendered as part of the works. The existing elevations in places have blemishes, especially the right hand side of the front elevation. The render will hide this as well as the windows that are proposed to be blocked up to the side and rear elevations. It was not deemed appropriate to render the front facing gable, in order to retain an element of the original building character and provide contrast between the two differing materials. The render is a welcome improvement and a condition has been appended to ensure a suitable through render that will harmonise with the colour palette of the surrounding area. The blocking up of the windows to the side and rear elevations are not deemed to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area as they are not principle elevations and the old openings will be rendered reducing the risk of poorly matching brickwork.

The original submission proposed 13no. Bollards to protect the shop from ram-raid. It was considered that the sheer number of bollards would create an appearance that was incongruous with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. A number of objections were received on this basis, which has resulted in the withdrawal of the proposed floor to ceiling glazing to the shop front allowing the number of bollards to be reduced significantly from 13no. to 4no. (Set 600mm from the front face of the dwelling and spaced 1200mm apart to provide access for all) The 4 proposed bollards will be confined to the relocated entrance within the front facing gable. A condition has been appended requiring details of the bollards to be submitted and approved by the LPA .

Rear extension:

The rear extension is proposed to be 8.8m (projection) x 9.1m (width), with a flat roof standing 2.6m in height. The extension will provide mainly storage to the shop, with a small proportion being allocated for additional retail floor space. Glimpses of the extension are likely to be possible from

the street scene, but by virtue of it being to the rear of the property, will only be visible above the hedges and fences that exist. The proposed extension to the shop is not deemed to be prominent or incongruous within the public realm of the Glington Conservation Area.

Signage The signage proposed at the site has been dealt with under a separate application (ref:13/01540/ADV) and the amended plans have brought a significant improvement from what exists and also the original proposal.

The applicant has agreed to almost all of the suggested changes and the amended proposals are not deemed to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property or that of the Glington Village Conservation Area in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP02 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

Area Amenity:

Change of Use:

The loss of the residential element of the shop is not deemed to be unduly detrimental to the amenity of the area. Objections have been submitted regarding the loss of residential accommodation on the basis of security. The fact that nobody will reside on the site would obviously put the shop at an increased risk of burglary where nobody would be around to tackle intruders. However, the fact of the matter is that the majority of business premises do not have the benefit of owners residing on site. Objections have been raised that the fact that nobody is residing on site would put the neighbouring properties at risk from crime. The LPA doesn't consider this to be the case and could not justify refusal of planning permission on this basis.

Rear Extension:

As referred to above, the dimensions of the rear extension are 8.8m (projection) x 9.1m (width), with a flat roof standing at a height of 2.6m in height. At its closest point the extension is 5.5m from the rear of no.13 High Street Glington, extending to approximately 12m as the extension projects north. No.13 is located west of the proposal and it is deemed by the LPA that the flat roof height of approximately 2.6m is unlikely to result in significant overbearing or overshadowing on adjoining neighbours as it is set back from the boundary, at an oblique angle and would not project significantly above the fence height.

The Conservation Officer is content that the proposed extension would not detract from the setting of any adjoining listed property.

Condenser Units:

Please refer to the Environmental Health and Pollution Comments below.

The proposals have been assessed on the basis of their likely impact on the amenity of the area in light of the fact that the surrounding area is largely residential. The proposals are not deemed to significantly increase the impact on the amenity of the area from its current situation in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP03 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

Highways and Transport Implications:

The forecourt parking arrangement is not proposed to change in terms of capacity as a result of this application. Much of the objection to the proposal has centred on the assumption that the shop is increasing substantially and that the number of customers is likely to increase significantly resulting in delivery and parking and highway safety implications.

Whilst the shop is increasing significantly in size, the objections on the grounds that the shop is increasing three fold and therefore three times as many customers are going to attend is not considered strictly correct by the LPA. The site is host to a long established Village Shop and Post Office. There is only a certain catchment area that a village shop is going to attract, which is likely to be Glington residents and those residing in close villages without their own facilities. It is deemed that the catchment will not change substantially. It is the opinion of the LPA that this shop will in no

way be competing with larger supermarkets across the district for example those in Werrington and Market Deeping. The likely scenario is that the existing customers will continue to use the Shop and Post Office, but with the increased range of goods for sale would presumably be more attractive as a place to shop and provide for more goods to be purchased more items. Obviously there is likely to be some level of increased trade, but there is the potential for much of this to be from Glington Residents that are in walking / cycling distance of the shop.

The adjacent highway is the High Street and whilst there is a bend in the road that does reduce overall visibility, it also must be considered that there is a permanent 20mph speed restriction. The area is at its busiest at the times of school drop off / collection times and parents /careers have been observed calling at the shop / post office at the same time. Both uses are established and the LPA do not consider that a larger shop is likely to exacerbate this issue by a significant proportion.

Highway officers have identified that through marking out the forecourt area and providing signage the forecourt area and the existing and hence future potential for conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and manoeuvring vehicles can be better managed.

Environmental Health and Pollution:

There are 3no. Condenser units to be located to the north elevation of the proposed rear extension to the store. The applicant has stated that they are proposed to be located here are they will not be visible from the street scene. The original proposal was for 5no. But this has since been revised down to 3no. The Environmental Health and Pollution Officer has considered the noise implications of the units to be installed and some basic calculations have resulted in the belief that the proposed condensers could be acceptable subject to correct placement and installation. As such the Environmental Health Team have suggested a condition be appended to the proposal, stating: The rating level of noise emitted from the site shall not exceed 35 dB Lea, 1 hour. The noise levels should be determined at the nearest noise sensitive premises. The measurements and assessment should be made according to BS:4142:1997. This therefore safeguards neighbouring residents from undue noise issues and places the responsibility of conforming to this in the hands of the applicant. If complaints arise as a result of their installation on the grounds of noise and disturbance, it is also the responsibility the applicant to rectify the issue under the enforcement of the Environmental Health and Pollution Team. In light of the above, the LPA are content that the installation of the condensers to the north elevation of the extension will not give rise to undue disturbance from noise emanating from the condensers in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP03 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012

Miscellaneous:

- Use of a loft ladder to the upstairs storage area would be unsafe – this is not a planning matter
- The hours of opening should be reviewed – this is not possible as the existing shop / post office has no opening hours limitations under its existing permission and it would be unreasonable to now limit them
- Light pollution – The brightness of the shop adverts is controlled by virtue of the advert consent that has been granted. As the shop exists at present it is not possible to now control the provision of lighting unless the lighting erected is of a character that needs planning permission.
- Size / frequency of delivery vehicles would impact on amenity of residents – there are no controls over such matters with regard to the existing shop and so it would be unreasonable to now control such matters. Also such a condition would mostly likely to be unenforceable.
- Will increase the likelihood of antisocial behaviour / which might arise from alcohol sales – There is no evidence to suggest that the increased floor space will result in this. There are no planning controls preventing the sale of alcohol at the existing shop and so it would be unreasonable to restrict such sales.
- The lack of an on-site residence will increase the risk of crime including for nearby residents – Whilst an on-site presence would act as a deterrent to shop break ins, it

would not be reasonable for the application to be refused on such grounds. In any event it was not a requirement on the original permission for the shop / post office that the dwelling MUST be occupied.

- A dwelling will be lost – The loss of one dwelling would not justify the refusal of planning permission
- The gates to the side of the building are unattractive – As the gates are less than 2m in height they do not require planning permission

6 Conclusions

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The proposal is deemed to accord with Policy PP01 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012 which ensures that development is sustainable for now and the future.
- The amended proposals are not deemed to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property or that of the Glinton Village Conservation Area or nearby Listed Buildings in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP02 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.
- The proposals are not deemed to significantly increase the impact on the amenity by way of noise, loss of light / overshadowing or by way of being overbearing in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011 and PP03 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012
- The proposal will not result in a level of additional vehicle traffic which would significantly be detrimental to highway safety in accordance with Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)
- The proposal is unlikely to result in an increase in the risk of crime and disorder in accordance with Policy CS16 Of the Peterborough City Council Core Strategy 2011.

7 Recommendation

The case officer recommends that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

- C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 2 The works hereby permitted shall be in strict accordance with the approved plans and supporting information.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance and to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 3 No development shall take place until details of all materials to be used in the external surfaces for the alterations to the building and the rear extension, including the bollards to be located in front of the entrance, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted for approval shall include the name of the

manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 4 No external fixed plant shall be installed unless in accordance with details (including siting) to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The rating level of noise emitted from the fixed plant shall not exceed 35 dB LAeq, 1 hour. The noise levels should be determined at the nearest noise sensitive premises. The measurements and assessment should be made according to BS:4142:1997.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 5 Prior to commencement of development a design for the formalisation of the accesses and parking court is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved plans. The design must include a "one-way" system, boundary treatment between the two accesses, white lining and signage and the marking out of parking spaces.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policies CS14 of the core strategy and PP12 and PP13 of Planning Policies DPD.

- C 6 Prior to commencement of development a plan showing the location of one cycle-stand shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Plan Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policies CS14 of the core strategy and PP12 and PP13 of Planning Policies DPD.

Informatives

INF53 S148 Penalty for depositing on highway

Highways Act 1980 - Section 148, Sub-Section C

It is an offence to deposit anything including building materials or debris on a highway which may cause interruption to any user of the highway (including footways). In the event that a person is found guilty of this offence, a penalty may be imposed in the form of a fine. It is the responsibility of the developer and contractor(s) to ensure that no building materials or debris are placed on or remain within the highway during or after the construction period.

INF54 S149 Penalty for depositing on highway

Highways Act 1980 - Section 149

If anything is so deposited on a highway as to constitute a nuisance, the local authority may by notice require the person who deposited it there to remove it forthwith and if he fails to comply the Local Authority may make a complaint to a Magistrates Court for a Removal and Disposal Order under this Section. In the event that the deposit is considered to constitute a danger, the Local Authority may remove the deposit forthwith and recover reasonable expenses from the person who made the deposit. It is the responsibility of the developer and contractor(s) to ensure that no building materials or debris are placed on or remain within the highway during or after the construction period.

Copies to Cllrs J Holdich, D Lamb

This page is intentionally left blank