

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 7 JANUARY 2014 AT 1.30PM

	Page No:
1. Procedure for Speaking	1
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak	2
3. Briefing Update	4
ITEM 5.1 – Email from Mr Adrian Woolley	8

**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 – 7 JANUARY 2014 AT 1.30PM
LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK

Agenda Item No.	Page No	Application	Name	Objector/Applicant/Agent/ Supporters/Parish Council/Town Council/Neighbourhood Representatives
5.1	29	13/00927/FUL – PHASE 4, LAND AT MANOR DRIVE, GUNTHORPE, PETERBOROUGH	Mr Julian Foster (Cross Keys Homes)	Applicant
5.2	49	13/00928/FUL – PHASE 6, LAND AT MANOR DRIVE, GUNTHORPE, PETERBOROUGH	Mr Julian Foster (Cross Keys Homes)	Applicant
5.3	69	13/01539/FUL – 15-17 HIGH STREET, GLINTON, PETERBOROUGH, PE6 7LS	Councillor John Holdich Councillor Diane Lamb Mr Johnson Mr Oldrich Hoppe (Local Resident) Mr David Turnock (David Turnock Architects) Mr Keshwara	Ward Councillor Ward Councillor Glinton Parish Councillor Objector Agent Applicant
5.4	85	13/00951/OUT – LAND TO THE SOUTH OF WOBURN DRIVE, THORNEY, PETERBOROUGH	Mr Bartlett Mr Jake Nugent (Bidwells)	Thorney Parish Councillor Agent
5.5	105	13/01485/HHFUL – 11 BARNARD WAY, BRETTON, PETERBOROUGH, PE3 9YZ	Mr Greg Homer-Ward	Applicant

5.6	111	13/01585/WCPP – BATTLEFIELD LIVE, FRENCH DROVE, THORNEY, PETERBOROUGH	<p>Mr Bartlett</p> <p>Ms Helen Godber (Local Resident)</p> <p>Mr Andrew Turner and Mrs Julie Turner (Local Residents)</p> <p>Mr Graham Simons (Partner)</p>	<p>Thorney Parish Councillor</p> <p>Objector</p> <p>Objectors</p> <p>Applicant</p>
-----	-----	---	---	--

BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 7 January 2014

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	13/00927/FUL	Land At Manor Drive, Gunthorpe, Peterborough , Construction of 46 dwellings and associated works - Phase 4.

1 further letter of objection has been received from a local resident, raising the following concerns:-

- This site, in addition to the other site planning reference 13/00928/FUL, should still have its own play area. The 30m green buffer is not sufficient.

2.	13/00928/FUL	Land At Manor Drive, Gunthorpe, Peterborough , Construction of 25 dwellings and associated works - Phase 6.
----	--------------	--

2 further letters of objection have been received from local residents, raising the following concerns:-

- Feels that the houses proposed adjacent to the bottom of their garden in Brickenden Road will be positioned too close. This will reduce light into the garden and new rear patio area, and overlook their site. The 2 closest houses should be deleted.
- This site was originally for a shop, why do we need more houses than originally planned, there are no facilities on this development. The green space to the North of Manor Drive is also being lost to allow for more houses
- The collapsible bollards should be deleted, with no vehicle access, in an emergency vehicles would be quicker using the existing longer access use than stopping to open the collapsible bollards.
- The junction is still a major concern, and the safety of cars manoeuvring into and out of the proposed car parking spaces within 5m off it.
- The provision of the play area is much improved. Hardy play equipment is required and then who will maintain this equipment?

S106 Obligation

The final figure to be sought has not yet been agreed in view of the revised viability of the scheme following the reduction of 2 dwellings and the provision of an area of on-site open space, and the ongoing maintenance costs. Therefore if Members are minded to approve the application Officers ask that Recommendation is altered, to provide delegated Authority for Officers to negotiate the final S106 Obligation figure to be sought.

3.	13/01539/FUL	15 - 17 High Street, Glinton, Peterborough, PE6 7LS , Change of use from retail and residential to retail only including extension and internal rearrangement of existing post office and convenience store.
----	--------------	---

Glinton Parish Council:

There were a number of objections from residents, but the vast majority of attendees approved of the application.

The Parish Council were unanimous in their support of the application, however they also welcomed the Highways Department recommendation that in the interest of highway safety and cyclists visibility that if the officer is minded to approve this application that the following condition is appended to any approval:

- a) A design for the formalisation of the accesses and parking court should be submitted and approved which includes a one way system, boundary treatment between the two accesses, white lining and signage and the marking out of parking spaces.

The Parish Council also supports the proposed recommended conditions for the condensing units relating to noise limits and positioning of the units, but would ask the officer to be mindful when setting these limits that they will be sited in a rural area. It is also suggested that consideration be given to housing the units in an acoustic enclosure to further reduce noise pollution.

The Parish Council would also wish to ensure that a limestone colouring is applied to the rendered brickwork

Glinton Friendship Group:

Unanimous support for the expansion of the village shop and post office. It will provide for a greater range of products and also strengthen the case for the PO to survive.

At the recent Parish Council meeting many of the residents of the village, including representatives of the Women's Institute, wholeheartedly supported this planned development.

Additional Representations

1. Letters of support have been received detailing:

We need to keep a functioning competitive shop in the village.

If lost where would that leave our older generation who do not drive and need our local amenities

The loss of the residential accommodation should be supported as it's a small cramped inconvenient family residence.

Groups have objected on traffic and parking grounds, but I would suggest that there are bigger problems with all the parking from the zebra crossing to the village hall and the constant traffic outside schools at school hours.

There is already a 20 mile an hour speed limit in place, which if adhered to should prevent accidents. It could reduce traffic by keeping people in the village saving fuel, traffic keeping us greener.

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.

A larger modern shop will deal with customers quicker and potentially reduce adjacent parking. The implementation of the plan is essential to secure the future of what is a very important asset to the local area.

Wider range of facilities and selection within walking distance results in fewer car journeys and less CO₂.

1. Letter of Objection:

As the owner of the adjacent property of 13 High St Glinton (Grade II listed) I have only 4 concerns to raise that with due consideration and compromise can be overcome so that planning can be approved for the shop/post office.

A) I would like to be assured that should the alarm be triggered out of hours there is a key holder within no more than 10 mins from the property to attend to the alarm.

B) I would like due consideration to be taken into the impact on the view from the back of my property onto the new extension. As a listed building it is important to maintain all aspects of the property including the views afforded. I would like to be assured that the extension will not have an adverse impact on the views from my house or the patio/garden that faces the shop/post office.

C) I would like to be assured that acoustic protection is provided to reduce the impact of the 3 proposed coolers - the noise of these especially at night I believe could impact my house in general as well as the garden and patio area at the rear of my property which is used for entertaining.

D) The traffic increase to the shop is a concern however I understand that to enable the continued viability of the shop this is an inevitable consequence. I would only ask that full attention is paid to the rights of adjacent property accesses, pedestrians, cyclists and motorists in this application and sufficient restrictions/rights are created, maintained and enforced for the safety of everyone concerned.

1. Letter of objection

Insufficient parking on the site now but with the threefold increase in retail area the overflow of cars from the increased visitor numbers would go from an inconvenience that we tolerate, to being a danger to us when leaving our house in vehicles, which will become also importantly dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians who are using the footpath.

The loss of the private dwelling on site will be the cause of more burglary attempts, disruption and continued alarm noise pollution at night.

The large automatic glass doors which are 3 times as big as the existing doorway could easily be accommodated in half that size, so instead of a glass opening of three meters surely 1.5mtrs would suffice for every use including wheelchairs.

We do want a village shop and post office but not a mini supermarket squeezed into such a small site.

4.	13/00951/OUT	Land To The South Of Woburn Drive, Thorney, Peterborough, Outline application for up to 80 dwellings with all matters reserved apart from access.
----	--------------	--

Anglian Water have made the following comments:

Wastewater Treatment - The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Thorney STW that at present has available capacity for these flows.

Foul Sewerage Network - The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows.

Surface Water Disposal - The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application is not relevant to Anglian Water and therefore this is outside our jurisdiction for comment and the Planning Authority will need to consider which is the appropriate body to comment. We request that the agreed strategy is conditioned in the planning approval.

When assessing sites we look and see if there are any issues associated with the sewers. But our response is based purely on capacity. If there are any blockages and issues this will be dealt with by our operational department and if there are any serious issues that need addressing the applicant will need to arrange to maintain and carry out the work required. There have been no **reported** instances of blockages in the area requested for several years.

I have therefore given a positive response as following our procedures I can see no reason why capacity doesn't exist.

5.	13/01485/HHFUL	11 Barnard Way, Bretton, Peterborough, PE3 9YZ, Erection of a cat enclosure in rear garden – retrospective.
----	----------------	--

No Further Comments

6.	13/01585/WCPP	Battlefield Live, French Drove, Thorney, Peterborough, Removal of condition C1 (temporary permission for two years) of planning permission 11/00950/FUL - Proposed change of use from agricultural to Battlefield Live Outdoor Activity.
----	---------------	---

The applicant has requested that the maximum number of participants be increased so that an occasional larger group of people could be accommodated and proposes 10 special event days during any calendar year where over 30 participants could take part.

It is considered however that this would be impossible to monitor and it would be more appropriate to consider increasing the number of participants at a later stage which could be dealt with under a variation of condition application.

Comments have been received by a neighbour regarding the use of a barn, which lies outside of the application site, which it is alleged is being used for induction purposes and for parties. The applicant has been advised that the barn is not part of the application and a separate application would need to be submitted to include the barn. The applicant has advised that a portacabin would be used for induction purposes, as approved under the original consent. A drawing has now been submitted. No further consultation has been undertaken as this was approved under the original consent.

Further representations received since the dispatch of the committee report as follows:

Neighbouring occupier:

The above application is to be considered at the Planning Committee on Tuesday 7th January.

I have read the Planning Committee Report for this meeting and am concerned about some errors and omissions regarding this application.

On page 116 there is a list of 4 complaints made during the two years the activity has been operating.

First of all although permission was granted in October 2011 it did not begin operating until April/May 2012 so has only been operating for 18 months. Secondly I have made other complaints that are not listed. I have forwarded below an email dated 8 May 2013 that I sent regarding the noise. I was told nothing could be done until the temporary 2 year condition was ended and I am also aware that one of my neighbours was given a log sheet to record the noise so had also complained. As a result of the information provided below we assumed there was no point in continuing to complain about the noise and we also passed this on to other neighbours.

I have also complained and sent photographic evidence of pyrotechnics being used in December. As this is quite recent I wondered whether this is also to be added to the report.

On page 122 of the report the planning officer has said "occupiers of properties along Bell Drove whilst in their rear gardens would to some degree be screened by the dwelling". This is untrue as both properties on Bell Drove have their main gardens at the side of their properties and not behind them. Both gardens run along the side of Bell Drove itself and do not have additional screening from the dwellings.

I spoke to Mrs MacLennan in a telephone call after her visit and she said she could hear the noise but that the numbers attending were low so it wasn't too bad. The applicant claims there were 24 participants but this cannot be proved and I believe was actually a much lower number.

On page 114 the report also states that each session lasts 90 minutes which is also untrue as it is at least 2 hours for each session.

On page 123 it says "The structures are positioned within the site at least 170m from French Drove and 280m from Bell Drove and are not directly visible form the public highway. The structures are seen against the backdrop of the farm buildings and converted barns and do not detract from the character and appearance of the rural setting."

The structures are visible along Bell Drove and some of French Drove. We have sent photographs to show this with our objection letter and with photographs of the use of pyrotechnics which hasn't been mentioned. I have attached 2 photographs I have just taken from the gate of my property on Bell Drove and the site is clearly visible.

Comments from user of the facility: We recently organised a fund raising ball for great Ormond street and battlefields kindly donated us a prize it become very apparent to us how few decent outdoor activities there are in the Peterborough area and I feel this is of great value to the area it is relatively inexpensive an can be enjoyed by all ages I would like to offer this application my full support.

7.	Article 4 Direction	270 Eastfield Road
----	---------------------	---------------------------

Councillor Shearman - The Planning Committee is well aware of the strength of feeling of residents in the area, as well as the views of the MP and local councillors, over the possible demolition of the property, and their collective view that any proposal for demolition should be subject to planning permission being granted.

ITEM 5.1

Dear Miss George,

Thank you for your letter (12/12/13) references the following plans (13/00927/FUL).

I like many of the residents of Manor Drive and the surrounding areas are concerned about the plans for development above.

My concerns are as stated in previous correspondences along with knowing who is now set to build the planned house directly opposite to where we live.

If you ask any of the residents who were unfortunate enough to have their house built by Linden Homes there is again likely to be a poor quality of build.

As you will be aware one of the main issues is the complete lack of amenities on our development, two dog mess bins is the total sum at the moment. Not very good I'm sure you will agree?

The area that is intended to be built on often has standing water and I would be seriously concerned that this will be made much worse when housing foundations interrupt the natural drain away that is there.

The build that Cross Keys managed at Hamptons, Four Chimneys Crescent was to be similar in types of houses and a resident that is planned for Manor Drive and that has become a little ghetto. The houses that are not owned or part owned are very obvious from the state of the gardens, repair and general lack of TLC and are quite frankly in a disgusting state for houses that are so new and apparently managed!

Another one of my concerns is that having paid an awful lot of money for my house, the planned amount of social/affordable housing will seriously devalue my home and investment.

I would urge the committee meeting tomorrow to again throw these plans out as not suitable for among other issues the ones I have stated above.

Kind Regards

Adrian Woolley

48 Manor Drive
PE4 7AT

The Fane Clinic
The Old Farmhouse
Paston Ridings
Peterborough
PE4 7XB

This page is intentionally left blank