

Application Ref:	14/01781/FUL
Proposal:	Extension to create 13 new flats
Site:	Guthrie House, Rightwell East, Bretton, Peterborough
Applicant:	Mr Andrew Winterton, Bretton Green Ltd
Agent:	Mr P Hand, Jefferon Sheard Architects
Referred by:	Bretton Parish Council
Reason:	Proposal is out of keeping with the surrounding area; lack of parking; inadequate pedestrian crossing; and increased traffic volumes in the area
Site visit:	25.11.2014
Case officer:	Miss Louise Lovegrove
Telephone No.	01733 454439
E-Mail:	louise.lovegrove@peterborough.gov.uk
Recommendation:	GRANT subject to the signing of a LEGAL AGREEMENT and relevant conditions

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

Site and Surroundings

The application site is located within the development known as Bretton Green. This was formerly a small cul-de-sac of 5 blocks of B1 office employment uses granted permission and built by the Peterborough Development Corporation. However under application references 13/00846/PRIOR and 13/01484/PRIOR, it was deemed that prior approval was not required for the change of use of the office buildings to C3 residential flats (under the provisions of Part 3 Class J of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended)). Accordingly, the existing blocks are currently undergoing conversion and renovation to residential flats.

The site is located within the identified Bretton District Centre, albeit outside the identified Primary Retail Area. The surrounding area is predominantly retail in character with the Cresset Theatre and television studios immediately opposite the site. To the south, is the A47 Trunk Road with an intervening shelter belt of mature trees. Vehicular access to the site is off Rightwell East and there is an adopted highway turning head within the north-eastern corner of the site.

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission to construct three new storeys above the existing building and a 4 storey extension to the front to create 13no. 1-bed residential apartments. The scheme also includes associated hard surfacing to create car parking and would result in the 'stopping-up' of a small section of adopted highway.

It should be noted that the proposal has been amended from the original submission by: reducing the height of the proposed extension to the front by one storey; reducing the size and number of residential units from 14no. 2-beds to 13no. 1-beds; and amendments to the proposed car parking layout.

This application is being considered in tandem with application reference 14/02078/FUL which seeks to alter the elevations of the original dwelling to tie in with this proposal.

2 **Planning History**

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
13/01484/PRIOR	Prior approval for change of use from B1a office to C3 residential	Prior Approval Permitted	21/11/2013
14/02078/FUL	Alterations to elevations of existing two storey block of flats and creation of lobby	Pending	
13/00846/PRIOR	Prior approval for change of use from Offices B1(a) to Residential C3	Not Required	22/07/2013
14/01987/FUL	Proposed new detached three storey building with six two bed flats	Refused	29/01/2015
14/01990/FUL	Proposed new three storey building with three two bed flats	Permitted	28/01/2015

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 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 11 - Natural and Local Environment

Should be enhanced through the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils; recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity. New and existing development should not contribute to or be put at unacceptable risk by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution and land instability.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside

The location/ scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Development in the countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

CS02 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

Provision will be made for an additional 25 500 dwellings from April 2009 to March 2026 in strategic areas/allocations.

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.

CS22 - Flood Risk

Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted if specific criteria are met. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

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.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010

Paragraphs 203-205 of the National Planning Policy Framework: Planning Conditions and Obligations:

Requests for planning obligations whether CIL is in place or not, are only lawful where they meet the following tests:-

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In addition obligations should be:

- (i) relevant to planning;
- (ii) reasonable in all other respects.

Planning permissions may not be bought or sold. Unacceptable development cannot be permitted because of benefits/inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Neither can obligations be used purely as a means of securing for the local community a share in the profits of development.

4 Consultations/Representations

Archaeological Officer (05.01.15)

No objections - The application site is not located within an area of known significant heritage assets. The archaeological potential of the site is therefore considered to be low and there is no need to secure a programme of archaeological work.

Building Control Manager

No comments received.

PCC Drainage Team (30.12.14)

No objections - No details regarding drainage have been submitted and as such, request a condition relating to surface water drainage to ensure that storm water can be managed on-site to minimise the impact of the development on local surface water flood risk.

Education & Childrens Dept - Planning & Development

No comments received.

PCC Pollution Team (12.01.15)

No objections.

PCC Transport & Engineering Services (08.01.15)

No objections – Request that parking bay no.1 be relocated to elsewhere within the site to ensure it does not impede visibility of the access to the parking area.

PCC Travel Choice

No comments received.

Waste Management (08.01.15)

Objection - Concerned that the site is not being looked at as a whole in terms of waste management. Underground units would be preferred for Guthrie House as they can potentially be used by some of the other blocks being redeveloped which do not have anything with regards to waste management.

PCC Tree Officer (26.01.15)

Objection - The loss of the trees is regretted as they are of group value to the visual amenity of the surrounding area. There is little or no opportunity for replacement planting.

PCC Senior Recreation Officer

No comments received.

PCC Strategic Housing

No comments received.

Section 106 Major Group

No comments received.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

No comments received.

Bretton Parish Council (28.01.15)

Objection - The building is out of character with other buildings in the area (the buildings are offices and not domestic dwellings). The building is 5 storeys high and of a different material to the other buildings. There will be a lack of parking spaces. There is a concern about the increase in volumes of traffic in the area. There is also concern that there is no pedestrian crossing on Rightwell East which would be a danger to pedestrians trying to get to Bretton Centre. Originally, the application for 4 flats was allowed and we believe in hindsight this was submitted in the event that once approved, it would be difficult to object to an application of the current kind.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (29.12.14)

No objections - There are some outstanding areas with regards to crime and community safety which require resolution however these could be addressed by condition.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 118

Total number of responses: 3

Total number of objections: 2 (one of which is from the Parish Council above)

Total number in support: 1

One **objection** has been received from a local resident on the following grounds:

- The development is out of scale and is going beyond the envelope of the existing building.
- The application refers to other buildings in the area but these are set back from the public highway. Those buildings of 4 storeys cannot be seen, masked by lower buildings in front.
- Trees would be removed thus reducing screening to the site.
- Being on the edge of the site, the building would be within a couple of metres of the cycleway/footway and close to the underpass. This would make the building seem intimidating.

- The closeness of the Cresset is an advantage but it requires crossing the road on a bend which is difficult at times as there is little warning of approaching cars.
- Has there been any assessment of traffic management, particularly when workers are arriving/leaving the nearby offices? Adding residents to this congestion would only compound the problem.

In addition, one letter of **support** has been received on the following grounds:

- The idea of an extension to create flats is very good because it is an opportunity to increase the population density in the area and help people, like me, who need a home.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Landscape implications
- Parking, access and highway implications
- Neighbour amenity
- Amenity provision for future occupants
- Developer contributions
- Environment Capital

a) Principle of development

As detailed in Section 1 above, the application site is located within the identified Bretton District Centre. The existing Bretton Green buildings are currently undergoing conversion and renovation to C3 residential flats under the 'permitted development' rights for conversion of B1a (offices) to C3.

The proposal seeks to extend Guthrie House to create 13 additional 1-bed flats above the permitted conversion of the existing building to 4no. 2-bed flats.

It is considered that, given the surrounding residential uses of the Blocks within Bretton Green, further residential accommodation is appropriate. The site is located within extremely close proximity to existing services, facilities and public transport routes which would well-serve the proposed occupants and is also within walking distance of the City Hospital, a major employer within the locality.

Furthermore, Policy CS2 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD states that *'in and adjacent to District centres and Local Centres, the Council will encourage schemes for residential intensification (including schemes which would exceed the District Centre dwelling figure above [this distributes approximately 1300 dwellings to District Centres], providing that the proposed development is otherwise suitable in the light of all other policies in the development plan'*. The proposal seeks to intensify the current conversion of Bretton Green to residential units and would therefore fully accord with the intention of the above policy and would provide significant public benefit through the provision of appropriately located residential development. It is considered that the provision of further residential units within the District Centre represents one of the most sustainable forms of development (given the access for residents to services, facilities and employment opportunities, as well as public transport links) and this would also contribute towards the continued vitality and viability of the District centre.

On this basis, it is considered that the principle of further residential accommodation within the District Centre is acceptable and the proposal is therefore in accordance with paragraph 23 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS2 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

b) Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area

It is acknowledged that the proposal represents significant extension to and remodelling of the host building. The proposal would result in a large building of varying 4 and 5 storeys in height, located in a prominent position within the streetscene, particularly when approaching from the main roundabout to the west. Both Bretton Parish Council and a local resident have expressed concerns with regards to the design, scale and mass of the proposal.

Within the locality, there is already a substantial amount of development to three and four storeys - particularly the Cresset which extends to a height of 4 storeys. The Cresset building is set almost hard up against the back edge of the highway and appears the most dominant structure within the locality. Whilst the proposal would exceed the height of the Cresset by one storey, the top floor of the proposal is set back from the facades of the main bulk of the building. This assists in reducing the overall height of the building and it is considered that it would not dominate the surrounding area. It should also be noted that the site itself and its surroundings are fairly isolated in terms of public views. Rightwell East is accessed predominantly by workers travelling to the nearby Royal Haskoning offices, Cresset building and to the overflow car park to the rear of Bretton Centre. Accordingly, it is considered that the site is not prominent and does not contribute significantly towards the overall visual amenity and form of the public area.

Furthermore, the proposed front extension has been reduced in height to 4 storeys to act as a bridge between the height of the proposal and the neighbouring units within Bretton Green. These neighbouring units are 3 storeys in height and therefore, a step-increase to the overall maximum height of 5 storeys would ensure that the proposed development ties in with its surroundings. It is therefore considered that this would not appear unduly dominant or out of keeping with the existing development.

In terms of the siting of the proposal, it is acknowledged that the existing building is set closer to the public highway and footway/cycleway than other buildings within Bretton Green. Furthermore, at present the site is partially screened by semi-mature trees and shrubbery albeit

the existing building it is clearly visible between a large gap in the tree cover. Whilst the proposal would remove this landscaping and significantly increase the height and scale of the building, it is not considered that it would appear incongruous or at odds within the streetscene. The proposed building (in combination with the tandem application to re-clad the original building) would result in a building of more modern appearance and act as a focal point upon entering Rightwell East. It is considered that the overall design of the proposal is of acceptable quality and that the mix of materials (facing brick, white render and cement weatherboarding) would enhance the overall appearance of the site.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not appear incongruous or at odds with the surrounding area and therefore would not result in any unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the locality. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

c) Landscape implications

As detailed above, the proposal would result in the loss of 16 mature trees which surround the existing building. These trees are of good quality (2no. Category A and 12 no. Category B) albeit there are others within the site to be lost which are poor quality (Category C or below). It should be noted that none of the trees are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. The City Council's Tree Officer has raised concern regarding their loss given that there will be limited opportunity for replacement.

These concerns are noted however within the locality, there is a considerable amount of tree cover, particularly from the backdrop of the shelter belt to the A47 which is situated to the rear of the site. In addition, there is already an established gap in the trees surrounding the site which leaves the present building open to the street. Whilst the loss of the trees surrounding the site is generally considered unfavourable, a neighbouring development which would have resulted in the complete loss of the frontage trees to Bretton Green was refused to ensure that some provision was retained. Overall, it is considered that an adequate level of tree cover would be maintained and that whilst some harm would result to the overall appearance of the site, this is significantly outweighed by the benefit arising from providing much-needed residential development within the District Centre.

A scheme for replacement low-level planting can be secured by condition to ensure that the hard landscaping and physical form of the building is softened.

d) Parking, access and highway implications

Parking provision

With regards to the existing building, this is currently undergoing conversion to 4no. 2-bed residential apartments which does not require the benefit of planning permission. Whilst there are only 7 car parking spaces present within the existing site to serve these units (which falls 1 below the requirement of adopted parking standards), Officers cannot require any additional parking for these units as they are not covered by the application. However, it is essential that these spaces are not lost as a result.

The application seeks to provide a total of 20 car parking spaces - 13no. for the application proposal whilst retaining 7no. for the existing building. This accords with adopted parking standards and as such, the Local Highway Authority is content that no undue pressure for parking on the adjacent highway shall result. It is acknowledged that no visitors parking bays are proposed however given the close proximity of public car parks, Officers consider it reasonable that visitors could use these facilities and that failure to provide spaces on-site is not a sufficient reason upon which to refuse the application and sustain it at appeal.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has requested that one of the parking spaces shown on the submitted layout drawing (space no.1) be removed and relocated elsewhere in the site owing to

conflict with the visibility splay onto the highway from the access to the parking area. This is noted however, owing to the arrangement of the bays and manoeuvrability within the area, vehicles will have to reverse into the bays and therefore will be exiting this access in a forward gear. Even if a car were to be parked in this space, given the speed that oncoming vehicles would reasonably be travelling at (far less than 30mph), there would still be adequate visibility to ensure that no conflict and danger resulted.

Access and highway implications

The proposed 4 storey front extension to the building would partially encroach upon a section of adopted public highway which forms part of the turning head to the Bretton Green development. The LHA considers that the loss of this section would not hinder the ability of refuse/service/emergency vehicles to use this turning head or access the site and, subject to the relocation of any services underneath, would not object to the stopping up and permanent removal of this section of the highway. This stopping up would be completed following any grant of planning permission through a separate application process to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

It is noted that concern has been raised by the Parish Council and an objector with regards to increased traffic volumes along Rightwell East and the nearby roundabout. These concerns are noted however consideration must be given to the previous use of the site and the wider Bretton Green development. As B1 offices, this would have generated a significant level of trips into and out of the site at peak times. Whilst these units are now residential, and other additional units have been approved on the site (3no. 2-bed apartments under application reference 14/01990/FUL), it is considered that the level of traffic generated by the site as a whole including the proposed units, would not be significantly more than previously. This is not a concern expressed by the Local Highway Authority and as such, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any undue impact upon the public highway network.

Finally, concern have also been raised regarding the lack of pedestrian crossing to Rightwell East which would pose a danger for occupants of the residential units wishing to access Bretton Centre. During the period that Bretton Green was occupied as offices, no pedestrian crossing existed and the number of people present within the site would be greater than as residential units. It is not considered that the application proposal would result in a significant increase in pedestrian crossings. Furthermore, there is safe crossing point further along Rightwell East (approximately 160 metres away from the building) which could be used by occupants wishing to cross the highway at a safe point.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that adequate parking can be provided within the site and that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to the safety of the public highway network. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

e) Neighbour amenity

Given that the neighbouring blocks to the east of the application site are presently being converted to residential units, due consideration must be given to the relationship between proposed primary habitable windows of both the neighbouring and proposed blocks. The nearest block to the application site is located to the east of the proposed building. On the side elevation which faces the application site, there are windows serving primary habitable rooms. These are situated no less than 20 metres from primary habitable windows of the proposed extension and this is considered a sufficient distance so as to prevent any unacceptable levels of overlooking. Furthermore, it is considered that the layout of the proposed extension in relation to this neighbouring block is such that the proposal would not appear unduly dominant or overbearing to neighbouring occupants.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants and is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

f) Amenity provision for future occupants

The proposal is sited in close proximity to the A47 Trunk Road, which runs to the south of the site separated from the boundary by a mature tree shelter belt. Given the proximity of this potential noise source, the application has been accompanied by a Noise Assessment. The City Council's Pollution Control Officer has reviewed this assessment and raised no objections to the proposal. It is considered that future occupants would not be subject to unacceptable levels of noise or disturbance. Further, the proposal would afford an acceptable level of space within rooms and with adequate privacy.

In terms of outdoor amenity space, no private area is proposed for occupants and only a limited outdoor area would be provided for occupants. This is not unusual for apartments and instead, the proposal would provide balconies and terraces for the individual units, offering a small private area of outdoor amenity space.

With regards to adequate bin provision, it is noted that the Waste Management Team has raised concerns regarding the provision shown on the submitted site layout plan for the entire site. Whilst this is noted, the current application can only deal with the impacts and provision arising from the current proposal, particularly given that the surrounding site is being converted through means which did not require planning permission. There is adequate space within the curtilage of the site to accommodate sufficient bin storage to meet standards and within acceptable distance of the proposed units. The Waste Management Team has also advised that they would prefer the use of underground bins. Whilst the final design of the bin storage is to be secured by condition, Officers will consult with the Waste Management Team to ensure that the most appropriate solution is provided.

The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has made a number of suggestions with regards to the window design and method of glazing in respect of the ground floor flats. To ensure that these units are not subject to an unacceptable crime risk, it is considered appropriate to append a condition relating to the glazing specification.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would afford occupants an acceptable level of amenity, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

g) Developer contributions

In accordance with Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), all new development is required to make a financial contribution towards the infrastructure demands it generates. The proposed 13no. 1-bed apartments are required to make a financial contribution of £39,000 in accordance with the Peterborough Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD (2010), plus a 2% monitoring fee of £840. The Applicant has agreed to enter into a legal agreement to secure this contribution and work is ongoing to finalise this.

h) Environment Capital

To accord with the provisions of Policy CS10 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), a condition is proposed to secure a 10% betterment on the target carbon emission rates of the building.

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 application site is located within the Bretton District Centre and the surrounding area of Bretton Green is currently undergoing conversion to residential units and accordingly. The

proposal would represent further residential development within the District Centre which is considered acceptable in principle, in accordance with paragraph 23 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS2 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);

- the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- it is considered that on balance, any harm resulting from the loss of trees and landscape features within the application site is outweighed by the benefit arising from additional residential units within the District Centre;
- there is adequate space within the curtilage of the site to provide sufficient parking to meet the needs of the development and no unacceptable impact to the public highway network shall result, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- on balance, the proposal would provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012); and
- a financial contribution can be secured to meet the infrastructure needs arising from the proposed development, in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and the Peterborough Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD (2010).

7 Recommendation

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the signing of a **LEGAL AGREEMENT** and the following conditions:

If the required Section 106 legal agreement is not completed within a reasonable period, then the Committee delegates the issuing of a notice of refusal to the Director of Growth and Regeneration on the grounds that the development has failed to adequately mitigate its impacts.

Should the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule come into force prior to the completion of the Section 106 legal agreement, the development may be wholly liable to the CIL or the S106 legal agreement may be amended to exclude those items that could be funded by the CIL. Items that could be funded by the CIL will be listed on the Council's Regulation 123 List in accordance with Regulation 123 of the CIL Regulations 2010.

A Regulation 123 List will be adopted by the Council on the same day as the Council's CIL Charging Schedule. Currently, a Draft Regulation 123 List can be viewed on the CIL pages of the Council's website.

- 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

- Proposed Site Layout (drawing number A_102 Revision B);
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan (drawing number A_2010G Revision A);
- Proposed First Floor Plan (drawing number A_2011G Revision A);
- Proposed Second Floor Plan (drawing number A_2012G Revision A);

- Proposed Third Floor Plan (drawing number A_2013G Revision A);
- Proposed Fourth Floor Plan (drawing number A_2014G Revision A);
- Proposed Roof Plan (drawing number A_2015G Revision A);
- Street Elevations (drawing number 3106 Revision B);
- Section A-A (drawing number A_4100G);
- Proposed Elevations (drawing number A_4200G Revision A); and
- Tree Protection Plan (drawing number 2626.TPP).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- C 3 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place until samples and details of the following materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Walling and roofing (samples);
- Windows and doors (details);
- Rainwater goods (details); and
- Vents and external flues (details).

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 Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

- Proposed finished ground and building slab levels;
- Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting;
- External lighting; and
- Surfacing materials of all areas of hardstanding.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The external lighting and hardstanding areas shall be completed prior to first occupation of the first unit and the soft landscaping shall be carried out no later than the first planting season following occupation of the last unit.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 5 Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme that die, are removed or become diseased within five years of the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the developers, or their successors in title with an equivalent size, number and species to those being replaced. Any replacement trees, shrubs or hedgerows dying within five years of planting shall themselves be replaced with an equivalent size, number and species.

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).

- C 6 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with Section 10 of the submitted 'Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement' (reference 2626.AIA.BrettonGreen.JSA dated 9th December 2014) and the tree protection details shown on drawing number 2626.TPP 'Tree Protection Plan'.

Reason: In order to protect trees approved for retention, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 7 Development shall not commence until fully operational wheel cleaning equipment has been installed within the site. All vehicles leaving the site shall pass through the wheel cleaning equipment which shall be sited to ensure that vehicles are able to leave the site and enter the public highway in a clean condition and free of debris which could fall onto the public highway. The wheel cleaning equipment shall be retained on site in full working order for the duration of the development.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 8 Prior to first occupation of the first unit, the parking, turning and manoeuvring areas shown on drawing number A_102 Revision B 'Proposed Site Layout' shall be surfaced, drained and marked out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, those areas shall be retained for the purposes of parking, turning and manoeuvring of vehicles in connection with the residential units.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 9 Prior to first use of the vehicular access serving the parking spaces shown on drawing number A_102 Revision B 'Proposed Site Layout' as spaces 1 to 6, a vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splay measuring 1.5 metres x 1.5 metres (measured from and along the back edge of the public highway) shall be provided to the eastern side of the access. Thereafter, that visibility splay shall be kept clear of any permanent obstruction above a height of 600mm in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 10 Notwithstanding the details shown on drawing number A_102 Revision B 'Proposed Site Layout' and prior to first occupation of the first unit, cycle parking details for 13 cycles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details, prior to first occupation of any unit and shall be retained for such purposes thereafter.

Reason: In order to encourage more sustainable methods of transport for future occupants, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 11 Notwithstanding the details shown on drawing number A_102 Revision B 'Proposed Site Layout' and prior to first occupation of the first unit, details of refuse storage areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The refuse storage areas shall be provided in accordance with the approved details, prior to first occupation of any unit and shall be retained for such purposes thereafter.

Reason: To provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 12 Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include full and up-to-date design details of the proposed drainage systems, including existing runoff rates and how the impact of the development can be mitigated. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and prior to first occupation of the first unit.

Reason: In order to prevent surface water flooding, in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

- C 13 The development hereby approved shall be constructed so that it achieves at least a 10% improvement on the Target Emission Rates 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).

This page is intentionally left blank