

Planning and EP Committee 21 October 2014

Application Ref: 14/01033/FUL

Proposal: Change of use of original building from office building to Elderly Care Home plus side and rear extensions to provide overall 56 No bedroom Elderly Care Home for the over 65s

Site: 270 Eastfield Road, Eastfield, Peterborough, PE1 4BE
Applicant: Mr Simon Kidner

Agent: Mr Michael Lavender
michael.lavender.architects

Referred by: **Cllr Shearman**

Reason: Impact on neighbours, possible future change of use, parking, over-development

Site visit: 27/8/14

Case officer: Ms L Lewis
Telephone No. 01733 454412
E-Mail: louise.lewis@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to conditions

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

The site was originally a residential plot, laid out in the mid-19th century, when Eastfield Road was comparatively lightly developed. The site frontage is to the east of the site and is about 50m wide, and the site extends back for about 80m. At a point about 45m back from the street the site extends to the north, behind the gardens of Nos 272-276 Eastfield Road.

The house is set about 28m back from the front boundary, approximately centrally on the plot. There is an access driveway at the north side of the frontage, which extends into the site, along the boundary to No 272, and leads to parking areas in front of the house and in the north-east part of the site.

For several decades, the house has not been in normal residential (class C3) use. It is understood that it was used as apprentice accommodation in the 1960s, and it was for some time used as part of the nearby College. Most recently the site was occupied by Family Care, a Diocesan organisation working with troubled families. To support these uses, various elements of extension have been added to the rear of the original house. These are wider than the original building, and are highly visible from the street.

The proposal is to remove the modern extensions to the building, and to construct substantial side and rear extensions to the building to create a 56-bedroom care home (including three double rooms for couples) for elderly persons, with the usual facilities in the way of living areas, gardens and vehicle parking. The retained house is two-storey, a Victorian house and therefore relatively high. The side extension to this, facing Eastfield Road, would be similarly scaled and also two storey in order that levels would follow through internally, and that the external manifestations of internal levels also followed through.

The extension to the rear would be approximately T-shaped, coming westwards off the rear of the original building then having wings to north and south as the site widens out at the rear. The rear part would be two-and half storey above ground, but with a basement to accommodate the kitchen, other service areas, and activity areas for residents such as a small pool, cinema room etc.

The existing access and driveway would be retained, with some parking to the front and some in the rear corner of the site.

The design of the front part has been influenced by the existing building, as the two elements will be seen together from Eastfield Road, in the context of the mostly inter-war development nearby. To the rear, the design would be modern.

2 Planning History

07/01413/FUL	Retention of mobile	PER	28.08.2007	07.11.2007
09/00630/FUL	Proposed part change of use from D1 (non residential education use) to part use as offices for family community and support services by Family Care and part retention of D1 use	PER	10.06.2009	28.07.2009
09/01213/FUL	Construction of new entrance gates and front boundary fence and lifting of the crowns of 7 Lime trees by 3m and removal of dead wood	PER	19.10.2009	09.12.2009
13/00660/FUL	Demolition of existing office building and erection of 2 blocks of student accommodation incorporating 8 flats and 31 studios	REF	03.06.2013	26.09.2013

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 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.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS08 - Meeting Housing Needs

Promotes a mix of housing the provision of 30% affordable on sites of 15 or more dwellings (70% social rented and 30% intermediate housing), 20% life time homes and 2% wheelchair housing.

CS10 - Environment Capital

Development should make a clear contribution towards the Council's aspiration to become

Environment Capital of the UK.

CS12 - Infrastructure

Permission will only be granted where there is, or will be via mitigation measures, sufficient infrastructure capacity to support the impacts of the development.

CS13 - Development Contributions to Infrastructure Provision

Contributions should be secured in accordance with the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD (POIS).

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.

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.

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.

PP04 - Amenity Provision in New Residential Development

Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

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.

PP13 - Parking Standards

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

PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

PP17 - Heritage Assets

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be

refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

4 Consultations/Representations

Victoria Park Residents Association

No comments received

Landscape Officer (29.09.14)

No objection.

A Tree Preservation Order protects Lime and Yew trees on the eastern boundary. The principle of the overflow car parking subject to no-dig construction and limited facilitation pruning is acceptable, however further information will be required under condition to ensure suitable protections and methods.

Conservation Officer (01.10.14)

No objection (to revised scheme).

The revised front extension is reduced in size and although it is still large it does not dominate the original building or views from Eastfield Road.

Adult Social Care

No comments received

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (02.07.14)

No objection.

Recommend a condition relating to site security overall.

Building Control Manager

No comments received

Drainage Team (14.07.14)

No objection.

Proposed use of SuDS is supported, although there are limited details. A condition requiring full details is recommended.

Waste Management

No comments received

Wildlife Officer (11.07.14)

No objections.

Conditions recommended relating to bird and bat boxes, nesting birds, landscaping and demolition method.

Archaeological Officer (15.07.14)

Based on the available evidence, the site appears to have low archaeological potential. Therefore, there is no need to secure a programme of archaeological work by condition.

Education & Childrens Dept - Planning & Development

No comments received

Pollution Team

No comments received

Transport & Engineering Services (26.09.14)

There is overspill parking shown for visitors however four of the spaces could not be used independently and therefore must be discounted. Another bay could be provided in the area of landscaping adjacent to the ambulance bay.

The access width is sufficient at the entrance, it will require widening to 4.5m where it passes the

building.

The LHA would wish to see a Construction Management Plan for this site given the limited space and constraints. It would be preferable for this to be submitted prior to determination however a condition would be acceptable.

Senior Recreation Officer

S106 request received

Section 106 Officer

Requests from individual service departments should be considered.

Travel Choice (30.06.14)

Travel Plan condition recommended

Strategic Housing (04.07.14)

A contribution to affordable housing may be required if there is any self-contained accommodation

Childcare Market Facilitation Manager (T Laws)

No comments received

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 52

Total number of responses: 18

Total number of objections: 15

Total number in support: 1

The following comments have been made in respect of the revised plans:

- How can “overflow” parking spaces be classified as such and not permanent? If they are permanent they will have an adverse effect on the appearance of the locally listed building.
- How would this be affected if a second phase is applied for [on adjoining land]? What would the effect be on traffic, noise pollution?

The following comments were made in respect of the initial submission

- In favour of elderly persons care home but would be concerned about a change of use to other C2 use such as hospital, residential school etc
- Site still appears to be overdeveloped with accommodation for 62 elderly people on site
- Parking is not adequate, people will park in College Park
- There should be stricter parking restrictions in College Park which are enforced by the Council.
- PCC parking standard is one space per full time member of staff and one visitor space for 3 beds, this standard is not met
- Very busy on Eastfield Road at peak times, there could be congestion problems
- Concept of visitors pre-booking a space is impractical
- Buildings would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties due to the new building extending very close to the boundaries of the site
- Rear extension will overlook our property [4 College Park]
- Overlooking from first floor bedrooms to 266 and 272 Eastfield Road
- Most parking spaces will lead to increased vehicular noise
- Security to [4 College Park] – doesn't look as though there is much of a fence
- Rear block will be approx. 11m from our back fence [5 College Park] and will cause unacceptable loss of light and daylight; also it will overlook
- Rear block has increased in length from the previous design
- Parking adjacent to our boundary [5 College Park] would cause noise and disturbance
- Could be noise and views into our property [262 Eastfield Road]

- Loss of view, privacy and light [2 College Park]
- Plans for trees [at the front of the site] are not clear
- The parking spaces will have an adverse effect on the established landscaping and wildlife
- Works for parking spaces [at the rear of site] may harm our Leylandii
- Scale of development is not in keeping with surrounding properties
- Overdevelopment – there will be virtually no separation between the extension and 266 Eastfield Road
- Proposal will dominate nearby residential buildings
- Surrounding plots are family homes and are less intensively developed
- Proposal is inappropriate and insensitive
- Density is higher than that of the local area
- Attention should be paid to detail to ensure a good outcome
- Concerns about possibly future change of use to flats
- Is this NHS funded or part-funded, it is not clear
- 62 beds was quoted by the applicant as being the minimum number needed to make the scheme viable, so we have a proposal based on economics not design considerations
- Only one of the seven reasons for refusal of the previous application has been addressed so how can this be accepted

One neighbour (at 266, to the immediate south) has written in support of the application, stating that the site has been neglected, become an eyesore, and presents a security risk.

Councillor Shearman has raised the following points:

- Overlooking and privacy to College Park, in particular No 2. An assessment of shading should be made, as on the first application.
- Concern that the use of the building could be changed without planning permission. Requests that a condition is imposed to restrict changes of use without planning permission
- Number of parking spaces is inadequate. Applicant has referred to a staff mini bus but I understand that this would be unenforceable. In view of the impact large numbers of staff using their own vehicles could have on nearby streets, I request that officers and the Planning Committee request a change in the plans in order to accommodate an increased number of staff vehicles.
- There is concern that the development constitutes over-development. The Planning Committee should be made aware of any guidelines/legislation relating to the optimum number of persons residing within a specified floor space.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

Principle of development

The application site is in an urban area, and is not allocated for any particular use. It is an established residential area, interspersed with various shops and other facilities, including the Regional College. Eastfield Road is a main route through the city leading from the Boongate Roundabout to Dogsthorpe, Newark, and on to Parnwell and the A47.

The last occupant on the site was an organisation called Family Care. The site was used partly as offices and partly as an education/resource centre. Use on Saturdays is understood to have been only occasional, and a planning condition prohibited use on Sundays and bank holidays. That consent was granted in 2009; previously the building was used by the College. The existing use is therefore a mixed B1 and D1 use, which could recommence subject to the restrictions imposed in 2009.

Industrial uses would not be supported on the site, as they would not be consistent with the residential character, and the site access could not accommodate significant numbers of larger

vehicle movements. Leisure or retail uses also would not be supported on the site, due to the residential surroundings and restricted parking.

As this is a residential area, residential use of the site would be supported. There are good facilities within easy reach, including the city centre which is slightly less than one mile away. A care home is a residential use, which falls into use class C2 and in principle would be acceptable.

Recent Site History

Most Members will be aware, and some might recall, that an application for demolition of the existing house and the construction of student accommodation blocks was refused by the Committee last year. The reasons for refusal were:

1. The existing house was proposed for demolition, but was added to the Local List during the application process. The applicant had not demonstrated that the loss of the existing building was necessary to enable a scheme to go ahead.
2. Insufficient car parking (spaces were proposed for student bedrooms – car ownership could have been restricted, and was in line with level required at other student sites)
3. Design
4. Overlooking
5. Overbearing impact
6. Disturbance to neighbours from use of the access road around the perimeter of the site (not a feature of this proposal)
7. Disturbance to neighbours from use of the bin store.

Design

The design of the front part of the new building has been informed by, and respects, the retained building. The horizontal lines of the Victorian house would be followed through on the new building and the new part set back from the front of the existing house by about 1.5m from the main wall, so that long views of the corner of the building and the bay would be retained. The link would be flat roofed and glazed to maximise the impression of separation.

The new building is shown with a square bay to the front, projecting about 0.8m, to break up the front elevation and pick up on the staggered front of the existing building although in a simpler form.

The parts of the building to the rear are more simply designed, and the floor levels would be slightly reduced from those to the front part. This allows for accommodation within the roofspaces without taking the roof height above that of the original building, and still allowing for good internal spaces.

The rear part of the new building would not be generally visible from the street. Some of it would be, if people looked along the driveway, but at a distance of nearly 50m so this would not affect views of the original building. The windows are shown of a plain design, being almost square with four lights. The cills would be low to allow views out for residents when seated, and the windows well sized to meet lighting and ventilation requirements. The size of the windows would also ensure that the elevations of the building are well balanced between masonry and window. The spacing of the windows is balanced and regular, and presents a pleasant appearance.

The design is considered appropriate for the site, location and use; and will fit with the strong character of the existing house. Details of materials and construction detailing will be required by condition.

Amenity for future residents

Levels of residential amenity for residents of care homes must be good, as residents are more likely to have restricted mobility and to spend most of their time at home. In this case, each bedroom would have a decent outlook. Although some rooms would be north facing and look out over the driveway, these rooms on the ground and first would also be closest to the large

communal lounges, which would have a southerly outlook over the resident's courtyard garden. The 8 rooms in the roofspaces would not have access to a lounge on the same level, but would benefit from longer views.

The outdoor amenity areas would be adequate for the nature of the occupation. They are proposed to the south and west of the site, bounding other gardens, and so would be quiet and should benefit from as much sunshine as possible. The plans show paths which should be suitable for persons of restricted mobility.

Access and Parking

The existing access would be re-used. This is set just under 5m from the back edge of the footway, which allows for small vehicles to pull completely clear of the footway outside the gates, and larger vehicles to pull partly clear of the footway. The gates would be electric-controlled. A condition is recommended requiring that they are fob-activated so that regular users of the site do not have to delay or get out of their cars to open the gates. An intercom system would be needed for visitors.

The driveway would be 5m wide for 15m into the site, narrowing as it passes the building. It is intended that only staff should have to drive further into the site than this. The LHA has recommended that the driveway is 4.5m as it passes the building, in the interests of the site operating efficiently internally although this is not a critical issue. Members should note that there would be bedroom windows along the ground floor, and a decent landscaping buffer should be retained outside these windows. The driveway would not be intensively used, and there would scope for drivers to wait while others come through the narrowest part. Currently the landscaping buffer is shown at just under 3m wide, and it is considered more important to retain this than to widen this section of the driveway.

Several neighbours have commented on the proposed parking provision. The adopted maximum standard is one space per full-time member of staff, and one visitor space for three bedrooms. The applicant has stated that there will be 18 full-time members of staff, but some of these are likely to be working shifts.

Parking is shown in two areas. There is an area indicated as "staff parking" at the rear, with 9 car spaces, one mini-bus space, and a 12-cycle store for staff. Visitor parking is shown to the front with eight tandem spaces (four x two) of which the "inner" spaces are under the trees and would be of grasscrete or similar, four other normal spaces, two disabled spaces, and four spaces under the trees, which would be grasscrete or similar and used only at the busiest times.

The nature of the "overflow" parking has been questioned. In this instance, they would be permanent spaces but not tarmacked, instead being spaces which are available for use but likely only to be used when all the other spaces are occupied. The softer surfacing would reduce the visual impact.

The applicant has advised that it is unlikely that all of the staff will drive to work. Care staff are not generally well paid, perhaps may not be able to afford to run a car, and the applicant explained that the offer of a mini-bus to and from work, which would usually pick up and drop off at a few central points, aids staff retention. Some neighbours have questioned whether this mini-bus service is realistic, but the applicant's explanation is reasonable. The site is easily accessible from many areas of the city by foot, bus and cycle, and there is no reason why all staff would be expected to drive to and from work. It is likely also that the four "inner" of the tandem spaces could be used by staff who would be there all day, with the four "outer" spaces left free for visitors to come and go during the day.

Taking away the "inner" spaces there would be 14 visitor parking spaces. The maximum standard for the proposed 56 bedrooms would be 18-19 spaces, so given that the site is well located for visitors to come by foot, cycle and bus, this is considered acceptable.

Initially, the proposal included only ten visitor parking spaces and the applicant was proposing that these be pre-booked. This would not have been a practical proposition and the applicant has increased the provision by 8 spaces, albeit four of these are inner tandem spaces that would have to be carefully managed. In addition, the number of bedrooms has reduced.

Given that the parking standards are maximums, it is not considered that lack of parking could be used to justify a refusal. It is for site management to arrange exactly how the parking is used – for example, a regular visitor such as a doctor might use the staff parking area. Officers do not anticipate parking problems, however if it becomes evident that there are parking problems then site management will have to find a way to deal with this.

Impact on Neighbours

266 Eastfield Road

This dwelling is to the south of the site. It is a detached house with windows on the north elevation, some to habitable rooms, less than 2m from the boundary with the application site. There is hedging along this boundary, about 1.8-2m for most of the boundary alongside the house, but lower adjacent to the windows.

It is proposed to place parking spaces just over 17m from the windows. A footpath would run across the site frontage at a distance of 7m from the boundary.

The parking spaces in question are the “overspill” spaces. These are so-called as it is likely that they would be required and used only at peak visiting times, and so impact on occupants from this parking would be slight and occasional. The path would be from a secondary, pedestrian/cyclist gate.

The new side wing was initially placed about 1.5m from the boundary, but has been reduced in width so that it is now proposed at about 5m from the boundary.

There would be windows about 11m from the neighbour’s windows. Initially these were to be bedroom windows, which would have given rise to unacceptable overlooking, but the plan has been amended so that these would now be to a staircase and would be obscure glazed without detrimental impact on the external appearance. The next-closest new windows would be about 17m away, at a steep angle.

The usual minimum window-to-window separation distance, for directly facing windows to habitable rooms, is 21m. This can be reduced if views are not direct, but there is no formula for deciding when the angle outweighs the closeness. 17m, at the angle proposed, is considered sufficient to ensure that there is no harmful overlooking.

The side wing, at 14m deep and 6m to eaves, is not a small element, but being set 5m from the boundary, and to the north of the garden/patio to 266, it is not considered that there would be any unacceptable shading or overbearing impact.

The occupant of this dwelling has written in supporting the proposal.

272 Eastfield Road

This dwelling is to the north of the site, and the south side wall of the dwelling runs along the site boundary. There are various trees along the boundary to the garden.

The occupant has objected on the grounds of facing windows overlooking their windows and the garden, and also regarding the location of the bin store (which is adjacent to the ends of gardens at 272-276 Eastfield Road).

In respect of overlooking, the rear of 272 has a first floor window facing west, and a ground floor window (which appears to be a patio door) also facing west off the back of a single storey rear

extension. The closest bedroom windows at first floor on the new building would be 24m from the first floor window, and 19m from the ground floor window. The windows would not directly face, and views would be oblique. This separation is considered acceptable.

There would be a closer window to the first floor hair salon, which would be 22m from the first floor window at 272 and about 18m from the ground floor window. This room is unlikely to be used continuously, and the separation is considered acceptable. The window could be obscure glazed.

This neighbour has also objected regarding overlooking to the garden. It is noted that the existing house has side windows, and there are windows in the existing post-war extensions, which could have given rise to overlooking for the last several decades. It has to be recognised that people living in a care home are likely to spend more time looking out of windows than would people using the building as an office, but even so it is considered that overlooking to rear gardens is common in urban environments and the proposal cannot be resisted on this ground. The area immediately to the rear of the house, usually considered to be the most private sitting-out area of a garden, is further away from the proposed bedroom windows.

Occupants have also objected on the grounds of disturbance from use of the bin store. This would be set in a corner of the site, just behind the boundary with the gardens to 274 and 276 Eastfield Road, and the refuse collection vehicle would collect from an area just within the site gates.

Given the nature of the proposed occupation, refuse would most likely be taken to the store by staff in an organised way, and probably during the day. There is no reason to suppose that this would lead to any more disturbance than that caused by any people putting rubbish in bins – less so, perhaps, as the store would be covered and enclosed. The bins would have to be moved down the drive on collection day, but this would take a few minutes only and should not cause any unusual or unacceptable disturbance.

Dwellings in College Park

College Park is the cul de sac which runs behind the site. It was built in the mid-1980s on land which formerly belonged to the college. There are five dwellings on College Park which have back gardens sharing a boundary with the site. Some residents have commented that the proposed building would block sunlight to their houses and gardens. Assessments have been carried out to establish the loss of day/sunlight to these dwellings.

An assessment has been carried out for 6 College Park, which is the dwelling potentially most significantly affected to the west of the site. Impact on direct sunlight would vary from some slight shading to gardens early in the morning at midsummer, to an increase in shading which would extend to the house wall on midwinter mornings. The relationship between the two buildings is very similar to that proposed last year, so the impact in this respect would be very similar.

Occupants of No 5 College Park have objected on loss of light and privacy, however the situation in respect of shading would be slightly better than for No 6, and the window-to-window separation distance meets the requirement.

One neighbour has commented that the parking area to the rear would cause noise and disturbance. There is already a parking area at the rear, and given that the area would be used for staff and mini-bus parking there is no reason to suppose that the number or noise of traffic movements should be significant or harmful. The size of the parking area would be significantly reduced from that already existing.

The assessment has also been carried out for No 2 College Park, which is the dwelling potentially most affected to the north of the site. There would be some shading to the back of the house in the middle of the day, which would occur for about three months around midwinter. For most of the year the sun will be high enough in the sky that shading would not affect this property. The proposed building would be slightly closer to this dwelling than was the previously refused student accommodation, and so the shading will reach slightly further up the back wall of the house.

During mornings and afternoons however the sun would be to one side of the new building, when viewed from No 2, and so there would be no shading.

Dwellings across the road

Immediately opposite the application site are 285 and 301 Eastfield Road. Given the front-to-front distance of at least 50m, and taking into account that Eastfield Road is a main route through the city, used by vehicles and pedestrians, it is not considered that there would be any significant impact on occupiers of dwellings across the road in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearing impact.

Other dwellings and potential impacts

Traffic noise has been mentioned. Residents might be aware of this, but any residential development on the site would be likely to use the same access point, as it is furthest from the bend in Eastfield Road, and the number of vehicles using the access is likely to be fairly low. Residents are accustomed to a site that is not in use at evenings and weekends and has been vacant for some years, but it is not realistic to expect this situation to continue.

Occupants of 274 commented last year, however it is understood that the house has been sold to new owners since then.

Occupants of 262 Eastfield Road have commented regarding overlooking and noise. This dwelling is over 25m from the site boundary so is unlikely to be affected by overlooking or noise, especially as the nature of the use is likely to be fairly quiet.

Neighbours have also mentioned the impact of having lights outside the building. Lighting could easily be agreed by condition, and external lights could be specified with hoods directing the light downwards, and shielding neighbours.

Comparison with 13/00660/FUL

Windows on the student accommodation proposals were small, and angled so that direct views towards neighbours were not possible. This would have resulted in a poor outlook for students, which Officers considered acceptable due to the temporary nature of occupation. That compromise would not be acceptable in a care home, which is a permanent home for the residents, and must therefore allow for a pleasant outlook from the bedrooms.

The current proposal results in two parts of the building, the new wing alongside the retained house and close to 266 Eastfield Road; and the rear wing closest to No 2 College Park, being several metres closer to neighbours than on the student proposal and therefore having a greater impact on shading.

Members were of the view that both overlooking and overbearing impact were unacceptable, although Officers had concluded that the proposal was acceptable in those respects.

Sustainability

The applicant has indicated a willingness to make a suitable contribution to the City Council's Environment Capital aspiration but has not fully detailed the contribution to be made. Solar panels are shown on the roof. A condition is therefore recommended to secure details prior to the commencement of construction.

Drainage

The applicant has proposed a SuDS system but no details have been provided. Details will be required by condition.

Impact on Locally Listed Building

The proposed development will bring the locally listed building back into beneficial use and secure its long term future. The design of the new building to the front respects the appearance and character of the original building. The new build to the rear would not be generally visible.

Landscaping and Ecology

There are protected trees to the front of the site, which have been considered as part of the application process. The development can be carried out without harm to these trees, although a detailed method statement and tree protection details would have to be provided by condition prior to any works being carried out.

Landscaping to the remainder of the site would be agreed by condition. New garden areas would be provided for residents, and it is expected that native planting would be specified in order to benefit wildlife. The Wildlife Officer has requested bird and bat boxes as well, which can easily be incorporated into the construction.

Large parts of the building are to be demolished, and it is possible that there might be bats living in the roofspaces. A specification for how demolition will be managed, to avoid harm to any bats, will be required as part of the Demolition and Construction Management Plan.

The neighbour at 5 College Park has commented that works to create the parking spaces at the rear of the site might harm his Leylandii. There is already a parking area in this corner of the site. It is not at this time known how the new parking area will be constructed, or whether the existing gravel surfacing will be partially retained. If works are to be done that might affect trees/hedging belonging to the neighbour then it is for the developer to ensure that they do not cause any harm. The plans show a buffer to the boundary, so construction should not need to go right up to the boundary.

The site owner has a common law right to remove roots or branches that are encroaching, and if any harm was caused the owner of the trees could take action against the developer.

As the developer has specified that Sustainable Drainage will be used, it would be possible for a permeable paving system to be used.

Section 106

A request has been received for a contribution to Bereavement Services, which the applicant has agreed to.

A request was also received from Recreation Services for a contribution to works at Central Park, but this cannot be directly linked to the development proposed and so will not be requested of the applicant.

Other matters

The following points have been raised by neighbours and are not addressed above:

- What would happen if adjoining land was developed?

Any application to extend the use/building/site would be considered on its own merits. Something that might happen in the future but does not affect the current application and proposal cannot be taken into account.

- Security to [4 College Park] – doesn't look as though there is much of a fence.

Boundary treatments and security will both be addressed by condition.

- Light pollution in all directions from such a large building.

Lighting will be agreed by condition. It is likely to form part of the Security condition.

- Density is higher than that of the local area.

Density alone is not usually a good indicator of whether a development is acceptable. It is not clear what the objector means by density. Density of occupation might not be the same as the local area, but the nature of occupation would be very different, so this is not necessarily a useful indicator and is not considered material in the circumstances. The proportion of the site that is built

on again might or might not be similar to other nearby sites, but these vary enormously among themselves. The dwellings in College Park typically have small gardens and a large amount of building footprint compared to overall plot size, the dwellings on Eastfield Road have larger gardens in proportion to dwelling size. What matters is the impact of the development, and whether any harm is caused.

- Is this NHS funded or part-funded, it is not clear.

This is not relevant to the assessment and determination of the application.

- There is concern that the development constitutes over-development. The Planning Committee should be made aware of any guidelines/legislation relating to the optimum number of persons residing within a specified floor space.

In order to operate as a care home, the development would have to meet the national standards. This is not a matter for the LPA, however it is understood that a minimum of 12 sq m per bedroom is required, which standard appears to be met or exceeded as rooms are of varying sizes and configurations. The inclusion of activity rooms and a cinema room, which are not usually included in care homes, suggest that the residents will have suitable spaces. Officers do not consider that the proposal constitutes overdevelopment.

- 62 beds was quoted by the applicant as being the minimum number needed to make the scheme viable, so we have a proposal based on economics not design considerations.

The proposal has now been reduced to 56 bedrooms, but in any case having a proposal based on economics does not make it unacceptable. The design is considered acceptable.

- Only one of the seven reasons for refusal of the previous application has been addressed so how can this be accepted.

Officers are of the view that there is no significant harm caused by the proposed scheme.

6 Conclusions

The site is in a residential area and is suitable for a residential use.

The development can be carried out without harm to the existing locally listed building.

The development will allow for the retention of protected trees.

Adequate access and parking can be provided.

The development will not lead to any unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbours.

7 Recommendation

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is GRANTED subject to the following conditions

C1 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).

C2 Development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Proposed basement 1001 Revision A
- Proposed ground floor 1002 Revision C
- Proposed first floor 1003 Revision C
- Proposed roofspace floor 1004 Revision A
- Proposed site plan 1005 Revision C
- Proposed roof plan 1006 Revision A
- Proposed elevations 1007 Revision C
- Proposed bike store, bin store and electricity sub station 1008
- Block Plan 1010 Revision B.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C3 Prior to the commencement of development, including the demolition of the parts to be removed, a Demolition and Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan.

The plan shall include the following:

- **Haul routes to and from the site, construction access and details of measures to ensure that all construction vehicles can enter the site immediately upon arrival**
- **Site storage and compound areas**
- **A scheme of measures for the temporary parking, turning, loading and unloading of construction vehicles clear of the highway**
- **A scheme of working hours for construction and deliveries to the site**
- **A scheme for the monitoring, reporting and control of construction noise and vibrations emanating from the site including scope for remedial measures should issues be identified**
- **A scheme for the control of dust arising from building works and site works**
- **A scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for construction vehicles and cleaning of affected public highways**
- **A contingency plan including, if necessary, the temporary cessation of all construction operations, to be implemented in the event that the approved vehicle cleansing scheme fails to be effective for any reason**
- **Details of how the partial demolition will be managed with respect to the possibility of bats using the space**
- **Details of the site enclosure, compound (including site huts) and parking for contractors and other employee vehicles**
- **A scheme for detailing with complaints**
- **Details of how the excavation of the basement and the disposal of spoil shall be managed.**

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C4 No work shall take place on the application site (including soil stripping, preconstruction delivery of equipment or materials, the creation of site accesses, positioning of site huts) until a Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to BS5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design demolition and construction – Recommendations* methodology has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority that identifies (not exclusively) the following:

- **Trees to be retained and those to be removed clearly identified. Tree removals must be commented on and justified on a tree by tree basis;**
- **Location and specification of protective tree measures in addition to appropriate ground protection (creating construction corridors where appropriate) within the Root Protection Areas of all retained trees within the application site;**
- **Details of all Root Protection Area infringement during the demolition, construction and landscaping phases with details on how the impact will be minimised. In addition an updated Method Statement will be required for all ‘no dig’ constructions cross referenced with other tree related operations and the phasing onsite;**
- **Details of facilitation pruning and comment on future growth in conjunction with likely future pruning works;**
- **Location of access, material storage, site office, mixing of cement, welfare facilities etc;**

- **Specification of landscaping prescriptions (including fencing/walls and changes in soil level) within the Root Protection Area of retained trees;**
- **Key timings/phasing of site visits is to be provided to ensure adequate arboricultural supervision throughout the project.**

The scheme shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the agreed details/plans. The tree protection shall be erected according to the specification and locations shown on the agreed Tree Protection Plan. Signs shall be placed on the tree protection emphasising that it is not to be moved, nor the area entered into, until the end of development without written permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP14 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C5 No work shall take place on the application site until a site meeting between the site agent/builder, the developers chosen arboriculturist and the Local Planning Authority's Tree Officer has been undertaken. Thereafter, the developers chosen arboriculturist will conduct site supervision as identified in the agreed Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan for the duration of the project to ensure that all protection measures (including tree fencing, ground protection and landscaping) are being implemented and maintained as per the agreed Tree Protection Plan. A log of visits shall be kept in the site office for inspection by the Local Planning Authority if required.**

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP14 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C6 No construction shall take place above ground until details of the following 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.**

- **Walling and roofing materials, including samples**
- **Details of cills, lintels, string courses and eaves to the front new wing**
- **Details of windows and doors**
- **Details of rainwater goods.**

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).

- C7 Prior to the commencement of development, details of any sustainable technologies and/or features to be incorporated into the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and therefore installed prior to first occupation. In the event that no such measures are to be included then the development hereby approved shall be constructed so that it achieves at least a 10% improvement on the Target Emission Rate set by the Building Regulations at the time of Building Regulations being approved for the development.**

Reason: To accord with Policy CS10 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

- C8 Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be submitted to the local planning authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans/specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme. The following also needs to be submitted as part of any approved works/scheme:**

- **Full and up to date design details of the proposed drainage systems for this development should be forwarded for approval.**

- **Overland flood flow routes in the event of exceedance or failure of the proposed drainage system**
- **Calculations showing the discharge rate and attenuation volumes required.**
- **Confirmation that infiltration to ground water has been investigated in the design process**
- **Where applicable, written confirmation of approval from Anglian Water to discharge surface water into their drainage systems.**

Reason: In the interests of flood prevention in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

- C9 Prior to any occupation of the development hereby permitted, measures to minimise the risk of crime to meet the specific security needs of the application site and the development shall be implemented in accordance with a security strategy scheme, previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In the interests of crime prevention and site security in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

- C10 Prior to any occupation of the development hereby permitted a scheme for the landscaping of the site shall be implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

The scheme shall include the following details

- **Proposed finished ground and building slab levels**
- **Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting**
- **Hard landscaping details including paths and surfacing, pergolas, benches and similar items**
- **Boxes/habitat for birds and bats**
- **Boundary treatments.**

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C11 Prior to any occupation of the development a revised Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall contain SMART targets and shall identify measures to achieve those targets and shall be implemented on occupation of the development.**

Reason: In the interests of promoting the use of non-car modes of travel to the site in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C12 Prior to occupation of the development the area shown on drawing 1005 Revision A for the parking, turning and loading/unloading of vehicles (including cycles) shall be provided and thereafter maintained for no other purposes than the parking, turning and loading/unloading of vehicles in connection with the approved use of the site.**

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C13 Prior to any occupation of the new building, the following windows shall be obscure glazed to at least level 3 and shall be retained as such thereafter**

- **East-facing staircase windows to the new wing adjacent to 266 Eastfield Road**
- **North-facing first-floor staircase window to the stairwell adjacent room 42.**

Reason: In the interests of protecting neighbour amenity in accordance with Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C14 Prior to any occupation of the development hereby permitted, the front vehicular gates shall be made electrically operated, and remotely controlled, and staff**

provided with remote controls. The gates shall be retained as remotely controlled thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety in accordance with Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C15 No external lighting shall be installed other than in accordance with details that have previously been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (For the avoidance of doubt: these details may be agreed under Condition NN, Security, and this condition need not be separately discharged).

Reason: In the interests of site security, and protecting neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C16 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order amending or revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), and the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order amending or revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the use of the development hereby approved shall be as residential accommodation and care for adults in need of full-time care and for no other use within the C2 or C2A use class.

Reason: The impact of the use, and the level of parking provision, has been assessed on the basis of this use. The Local Planning Authority wishes to retain the authority to assess any proposed change of use prior to it taking place to ensure that any alternative use complies with the requirements of Policies PP2 and PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

This page is intentionally left blank