



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 28 JULY 2015**

**Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Chair), Hiller, Stokes, Martin, Harrington, Okonkowski, Lane and Casey

**Officers Present:** Nick Harding, Head of Development and Construction  
Alan Jones, Senior Officer Minerals and Waste (Items 4.1 and 4.2)  
Vicky Hurrell, Principal Development Management Officer (Item 4.6)  
Jim Daley, Principal Built Environment Officer (Archaeology and Building Conservation) (Item 4.6)  
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer (Highway Control)  
Hannah Vincent, Planning and Highways Lawyer  
Pippa Turvey, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Paulina Ford, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors North, Serluca and Sylvester. Councillor Casey was in attendance as substitute.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations for interest were received.

**3. Members' Declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor**

No Member declarations of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor were received.

**4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

**4.1 14/01307/MMFUL – Eyebury Quarry, Eyebury Road, Eye, Peterborough**

The planning application was for the provision of an in-vessel composting facility at Eyebury Quarry, Eyebury Road and the retention and extension of the existing recycling facility.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The Senior Officer Minerals and Waste provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update sheet.

The Committee were pleased with the officer's clear and understandable presentation. Following a question from a Committee Member, it was clarified that all food and organic waste would undergo several stages of sanitisation before being safely composted.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

### **Reasons for the decision**

The NPPF stated that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development - in terms of decision taking this meant approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.

The proposal represented appropriate waste management development outside an allocated area, which would contribute to moving waste up the waste hierarchy and was therefore supported by both the NPPF and local planning policy. The principle of development was in accordance with the waste spatial strategy, as set out in policies CS2, CS14, CS15 and CS18 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core strategy in relation to the provision of in-vessel composting, and recycling, capacity.

An Environmental Statement accompanied the application which was considered comprehensive and met the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011. Detailed topic areas had been assessed/considered.

#### **4.2 15/00229/MMFUL – Cooks Hole, Leicester Road, Thornhaugh, Peterborough, and 15/00230/MMFUL – Thornhaugh Landfill Site, Leicester Road, Thornhaugh, Peterborough**

Two planning applications were presented to Committee. 15/00229/MMFUL sought the restoration of part of the quarry at Cooks Hole, Leicester Road, Thornhaugh, to the original ground levels using inert materials and consequential amendments to the restoration scheme. 15/00230/MMFUL sought the continuation of landfilling in phases 1 and 2 at the Thornhaugh Landfill Site, Leicester Road, Thornhaugh. This included consequential amendments to the phasing scheme, relocation of the site roads and infrastructure, including the landfill gas flare, minor amendments to the final restoration contours, continued periodic use of the crushing and processing plant and the deferment of the dates of the cessation of landfilling, and final restoration by 6 years.

It was officer's recommendation that both planning permissions be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The Senior Officer Minerals and Waste provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the reports.

Gean Wilson addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Dr Wilson advised that the officer report was accurate.
- It was clarified that the restoration of the site was progressing and that Councillors were more than welcome to visit the site if they wished.
- The material intended to infill the hole on the site was to be mineral material, which was already present. The surrounding area would be filled with a mixture of low degradable material, with little odour.
- There would be no toxic ash at the site.

The Committee were content with the established nature of the site and were pleased that conditions had been proposed to address dust and noise issues. It was considered that the applicant was to be praised for decontaminating the land fully.

15/00229/MMFUL

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Reasons for the decision**

The NPPF stated that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development - in terms of decision making this meant approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay. The principle of development was clearly in accordance with policy SSP W2 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD which allocated the site for inert landfill, and contributed to the provision of inert landfill capacity as required by Core Strategy policy CS20.

The proposals also enabled the provision of Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste (SNRHW) and non-hazardous wastes at the neighbouring Thornhaugh I landfill, contributing to the aims of Core Strategy policies CS19 and CS21. The proposals also complied with Core Strategy policies CS14 and CS15 in respect of the need and location of waste management facilities.

An Environmental Statement accompanied the application which was comprehensive and met the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. Detailed topic areas had been assessed/considered.

The comments of consultees had been taken into account and suitable conditions would be attached to mitigate any of the issues raised. The comments of neighbours had been taken into account, but given that the site was allocated for waste development and in all other respects the proposal was acceptable, there was no reason not to approve the application in line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compensation Act.

15/00230/MMFUL

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Reasons for the decision**

The NPPF stated that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development - in terms of decision taking this means approving development proposals that accorded with the development plan without delay. The principle of development was clearly in accordance with policy SSP W4 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific DPD (Site Specific DPD) which allocated the site for SNRHW and complementary non-hazardous land fill. The proposal also sought to provide an appropriate long term solution to the potential pollution risks of over tipping phases 1 and 2 through their excavation and re-engineering into a modern contained landfill design and is in accordance with policy CS46.

The proposal also included recycling of inert waste (from within the site and imported)

for use on the site or for sale off site. The site was not allocated for inert waste recycling but the proposal complies with policies CS14 and CS15 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (the Core Strategy) with regards to the need and location of waste management facilities. The additional component parts of the application, namely the retention of the gas flare and time extension to the completion of landfilling operations were considered acceptable in light of the requirements to secure the long term pollution prevention measures at the site as represented by the re-engineering of phases 1 and 2.

An Environmental Statement accompanied the application which was considered comprehensive and met the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. Detailed topic areas had been assessed/considered.

Comments of consultees had been taken into account and suitable conditions would be attached which address any issues raised. The comments of neighbours had been taken into account, but given that the site was allocated for waste development and in all other respects the proposal was acceptable, there was no reason not to approve the application in line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compensation Act.

#### **4.3 15/00653/OUT - 1 Grove Street, Woodston, Peterborough, PE3 9AG**

The planning application was for 6 one-bedroom flats at 1 Grove Street, Woodston, with associated parking and amenity space.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be refused, for the reasons set out in the report. The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update sheet.

Councillor Faustino, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The current use of the site was industrial and residential was considered to be preferable to this.
- From an historical point of view the surrounding area of the Fletton Towers was better suited to residential development.
- At the current time the design of the site had windows facing the neighbouring properties. The proposal did not have any windows on that side, so would allow residents greater privacy.
- It was not considered that overshadowing would be an issue, as the location of the site allowed for a good amount of sunlight.
- Two of the flats outlined would be set aside for disabled residents and single bedroom flats would not attract families. This was considered to be a good feature for the residential amenity of the area.

Councillor Thacker and Peter Slinger, Architect, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The applicant had retired and wished to convert his business buildings into residential dwellings.
- Previously a high number of vehicles had utilised the site, this would be reduced within the proposals.
- The applicant had taken into consideration officer comments and had reduced the development from its 7 x 2 bedroom flat design.

- There was sufficient space on the site for parking, refuse and gardens.
- No objections had been received from residents, and response had been positive.
- It was not considered sensible that the current building was acceptable in terms of amenity, while the proposed dwellings would not be so.
- The specific design of the development was a topic for a reserved matters application.

The Committee noted that there was potential for overdevelopment on the site, however considered that the proposal was reasonable in size and more appropriate than the current building.

A Member of the Committee expressed concern that the two storey nature of part of the proposal would have an impact on neighbouring residence's outlooks.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, contrary to officer recommendation, and the Corporate Director of Growth and Regeneration be granted authority to attached appropriate conditions. This was because the proposal was not considered to impact residential amenity and did not constitute overdevelopment. The motion was carried seven voting in favour, one voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (seven voted in favour and one voted against) that planning permission is **GRANTED** and the Corporate Director of Growth and Regeneration be granted authority to attach appropriate conditions.

#### **Reasons for the decision**

The Committee did not believe that the development proposal would have a negative impact on residential amenity and it was not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.

#### **4.4 15/00662/R3FUL – Caretakers House, 9 The Pentlands, Gunthorpe, Peterborough**

The planning application was for the change of use of Caretakers House, 9 The Pentlands, Gunthorpe from a caretakers dwelling to a building for the use of a before and after school care centre and holiday play scheme centre. The application included a single storey side extension.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be refused, for the reasons set out in the report. The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

Sharon Bishop, Capital Projects and Assets Officer, addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Peterborough City Council was required, under statutory guidance, to provide child places for out of hour's services as far as reasonably possible.
- The proposal would cater for children up to the age of 17, however the average age was expected to be between 6 and 8 years old.
- The current take up within Peterborough of such schemes was high, with increased demand.
- The scheme would support local parents in maintaining work, which, in turn, would support the city's economic development.
- The facility would run before school, after school and during school holidays.

- The parking arrangements would be similar to those currently in place. It was considered that as the peak hours for traffic in relation to the proposal were different from those of the current school, the impact would not be significantly worse.
- The proposal could cater for up to 44 children, though in practice this number would be less.
- The applicants understood the concerns of residents, however it was commented that the current sound of the school would carry to those areas.

Linda Parrish-Smith addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- As a resident of one of the properties that backed onto the application site, the area was currently quiet, regardless of the nearby school. The additional noise the proposal would create would be a disadvantage.
- The proposed change of use had the potential to house up to 44 children. That amount of children playing would be disruptive.
- The traffic that would result from the development would increase existing problems with parking and residents being blocked into their driveways.
- The hours of operation were beyond normal school times, which was unfair on residents who lived immediately next to the site.
- It was agreed that the facilities were needed, however there were other sites that would be more appropriate nearer current school amenities. The proposed site was too small and too near residences.

The Committee sympathised with the concerns of local residents. It was considered that the noise created from the proposal would be significantly greater than background noise and would be unacceptable. It was suggested that, although the provision of out of school hour's child places was important, this did not outweigh the importance of residential amenity.

While the Committee were not accepting of the change of use, the physical design of the application was considered to be acceptable.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be refused, for reason 2 as set out in the report. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

#### **Reasons for the decision**

The building would change from a single dwelling to a building that would cater for a large number of children not connected with Gunthorpe Primary school, and would operate outside of core school hours. It would result in harmful levels of noise and disruption over and above the existing situation exacerbated through the coming and going of traffic. This unacceptable impact would be exacerbated as children would likely play immediately outside the building, thereby having a harmful impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours and was contrary to Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

#### **4.5 15/00671/HHFUL – 80 Ledbury Road, Netherton, Peterborough, PE3 9PJ**

The planning application was for a two storey and a single storey rear extensions to 80 Ledbury Road, Netherton and a new 2 metre high boundary wall.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be refused, for the reasons set out in the report. The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update sheet.

Councillor Fitzgerald, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The planning history of this development was set out in the report and had been ongoing for a significant length of time.
- Councillor Fitzgerald was speaking on behalf of Stewart Jackson and fellow Ward Councillor, Councillor Maqbool, who had all received complaints in relation to the development.
- It was considered that the proposals reflected an overdevelopment of the site and were not acceptable.
- The applicant had housed a large amount of rubble on the front of the sight, which continued to sour relations with neighbours.
- The Councillor fully supported the reasons given by officers in the report for the refusal of planning permission.
- There was concern that the applicant would continue with work regardless of the success of the application.
- The extension of the boundary fence infringed on land owned by the City Council. The applicant had not originally served notice on the Council, though had done so now.
- It was considered that the expansion was to cater for a driveway, which the Councillor would object to.

Phil Branston, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The increased footprint of the ground floor was going through the prior approvals process.
- The two storey element of the proposal would not impinge upon neighbours and fitted within the scheme of the building. As such, there would be no additional visual impact.
- The extension of the boundary fence would still leave a wide space beyond. It was accepted that the applicant did not own this land and progress on this aspect would be investigated.
- The applicant intended to live in the development with his family. As a developer it was felt more economical to tailor the dwelling to his requirements.
- It was believed that the extension of the boundary was in order to gain access down the side of the property.

The Planning and Highways Lawyer advised Committee that Members were not permitted to speculate on the applicant's future actions and that the ownership of land was not relevant to the application. This was addressed through private law and was not for Committee to consider.

The Committee agreed with the officer recommendations, considering that the application would have a detrimental impact on neighbours and that the extension was bulky and incongruous.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be refused, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposal was unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given in the report.

#### **4.6 15/00692/FUL – Memorial Wing, Peterborough District Hospital, Thorpe Road, Peterborough**

The planning application was for the construction of a new community primary school at the Memorial Wing, Peterborough District Hospital, Thorpe Road. The application included the retention of the Midland Road façade of the Memorial Hall building, and all associated landscaping, car parking and boundaries.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The Principle Development Management Officer provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update sheet.

Councillor Fitzgerald, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- When the outline proposals were first granted, it was intended to retain as much of the heritage asset on site as possible. The fabric of the building, however, was in poor condition.
- The application was a matter of balance and the proposals were considered appropriate.
- The Council's Heritage Team recognised the proposal as the best option.
- In relation to the traffic measures proposed, concerns had been addressed and solutions proposed. It was not expected that traffic would increase a significant amount.
- The memorial plaques were to be reinstated within the new building.

John Dadge, on behalf of Hunt and Coombs Solicitors, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Reservations had been held in relation to the highways issues, however this issues had been addressed by the applicant and an acceptable scheme was reached. As such, previous objections had been withdrawn.
- The Thorpe Road / Thorpe Lea Road still needed designing. The applicant should be mindful that provision should be made to accommodate a right turn, with hatching or a 'keep clear' section.
- It was suggested that if the right turn was extended, this would also be able to serve the Register Office.

Councillor Murphy and Dan Windwood addressed the Committee in objection to the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Councillor Murphy suggested that to rely on the issue of structural integrity in case of a vehicle collision, when the building was set so far back from the road, was not relevant.
- It was thought that, considering the air quality of the area, Thorpe Road was not



- the right place for a school.
- It was believed that providing space for children to play was more important than car parking provision on the site.
- The crossing points outlined in the report were mentioned and it was subsequently questioned where the proposed playing fields for the school would be located.
- It was suggested that the proposal should be reworked and funding be used instead to increase the size of the playing fields.
- Councillor Murphy believed that traffic would increase.
- Dan Windwood raised concerns following those set out by the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Society. It was suggested that public benefit would be achieved by the retention and strengthening of the Memorial Wing.
- It was considered that a war memorial should not be treated in such a wasteful manner. Mr Windwood believed that the retention of the whole structure was important to keep a tribute to a working building and not just a façade.

The Committee accepted that decision relating to historic buildings would always be difficult, however the proposed school required a workable, safe building. It was considered that the proposals would keep the sentiment and historic memory of the building, while maintaining its use.

The Principal Engineer (Highway Control) commented that hatched yellow grids were limited to use within junctions, but that a ‘keep clear’ area could be investigated. A right turn to serve the Register Officer was not possible, as there was insufficient highway land width to this area. It was further noted that, on page 6 of the report, “a crossing point on Midland Road,” should read, “a crossing point on Thorpe Road”. It was further explained that reducing the occurrence of illegal manoeuvres at the Midland / Thorpe Road junction was part of the proposed alterations.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

### **Reasons for the decision**

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

- The principle of locating a school on this site was established by the granting of outline planning permission. The development would help meet the existing demand for school places and also the demand which would be created when the hospital site was redeveloped. The proposal therefore accorded with the National Planning Policy Framework and policy CS13 of the adopted Core Strategy.
- Notwithstanding the concerns which have been raised the traffic impacts of the development were considered to be acceptable given the context of the previous use of the site as a hospital. The changes to the Midland Road junction would help prevent illegal manoeuvres into and out of the road and the inclusion of a pedestrian crossing as part of the signalisation of the Thorpe Road/ Thorpe Lea Road junction would ensure a safe route to the Thorpe Meadows where the school’s playing fields would be located in the future. On-site parking would be

provided for staff, the level of which was considered to be acceptable. In addition, new parking bays would be created on Midland Road which could be used for drop off and pick up. As such the proposal was considered to accord with policy PP12 and PP13 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD. The development would also be subject to a Travel Plan and Parking Management Plan in accordance with policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy.

- Notwithstanding the objection received the impact of the development upon the non-designated heritage asset was on balance considered to be acceptable given the benefits to the scheme which the proposal approach would bring. The design of the new build was also considered to achieve a satisfactory relationship with the locally listed building. The proposal was therefore considered to accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS16 of the adopted Core Strategy and policies PP2 and PP17 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.
- Subject to noise attenuation measures an appropriate environment would be provided for the children. It was also not considered that there would be any adverse impact upon neighbouring residents. The proposal therefore accorded with policies PP3 and PP4 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.
- The application sought to retain the key protected trees within the site and there would not be any adverse ecological issues. Subject to conditions the proposal was therefore considered to accord with policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.
- The site could be adequately drained and the detailed proposal would include measures to promote sustainability. The proposal therefore complied with policies CS10 and CS22 of the adopted Core Strategy.

#### **4.7 15/00740/FUL – 126 Lincoln Road, Peterborough PE1 2NT**

The planning application was for the change of use of part of the ground floor of 126 Lincoln Road, to A1 (retail). The application was retrospective in part.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be refused, for the reasons set out in the report. The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

Councillor Nadeem, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Councillor supported the application, which was made under an exceptional set of circumstances.
- The applicant was a widow and her daughter hoped to support the family through a home sari-making business.
- The business would take up a single room within the family home and would be small in scale compared to the commercial premises opposite.
- It was not considered that the proposal would detract from the street scene and no highways access was proposed.
- It was suggested that the application was a reasonable solution to a delicate situation.

Rob Gooding, Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal would maintain the character of the area and would exist in a small scale only.
- The applicant's daughter had limited options and required planning permission for a change of use to set up her business.

- The commercial buildings on either side of the application site fell outside of local commercial centres, therefore the proposal was not uncharacteristic.
- Though the option to use the current front door as a front door for the business was available, the applicant wished to maintain their privacy. The alteration proposed was not a significant one.

The Committee discussed the application and whether a permission could be identified as for the lifetime of the current owners, not subsequent owners. It was noted that although the proposal was small, the fact that it fell outside of any retail area was a problem.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be refused, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposal was unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reason set out in the report.

#### **4.8 15/00768/HHFUL and 15/00769/HHFUL – 21 Grange Road, West Town, Peterborough, PE3 9DR**

Both planning applications were for a proposed two storey side extension at 21 Grange Road, West Town, and a ground floor rear extension. The applications also included a veranda and loft conversion including a dormer window, increasing in roof height. Application 15/00768/HHFUL proposed a 9.15 metre ridge height for the main house and an 8.85m ridge height for the side extension, and application 15/00769/HHFUL proposed a ridge height of 8.85 metres for both the main house and the side extension.

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission 15/00768/HHFUL be refused, for the reasons set out in the report, and that planning permission 15/00769/HHFUL be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report. The Head of Development and Construction provided an overview of the applications and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update sheet.

Councillor Murphy, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Councillor Murphy believed a decision needed to be made on this, as building work had currently stopped.
- There had been no material objections and residents were not concerned about the proposals.
- The split roof height proposal was favoured as a flat, terraced design was not the nature of the street.

Phil Branston, Agent, and Yasir Qureshi, Applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the applications and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Mr Branston advised that the applicant would like to retain an increased roof height, to keep the development in keeping with the rest of the street.
- Mr Qureshi drew the Committee's attention to examples of staggered roof

- heights within single dwellings in the surrounding area.
- He wanted the proposal to impact positively on the area.
  - There was a dwelling, 45 Grange Road, which had a roof height the same as that proposed in 15/00758/HHFUL.
  - As the dwelling was situated with a gap between it and the neighbouring property, the effect of the proposal was not as significant.
  - The extension minimised the massing affect.
  - Mr Qureshi explained that part way through the build he had realised there was not sufficient room in the loft. After discussing his options with planning officers, he decided to take a calculated risk and raise the roof height. He appreciated that this risk was a mistake. His builders increased the roof to a greater degree than requested. As such, new builders were now being used.

The Committee discussed the applications and considered that the varied roof height, although high was not unacceptable. It was suggested that a completely flat roof would look out of place within the street and that a varied roof would add to the area.

#### 15/00768/HHFUL

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, contrary to officer recommendation, and the Corporate Director of Growth and Regeneration be granted authority to attached appropriate conditions. This was because the application was not considered to be unacceptable, but would add to the street scene. The motion was seven voting in favour, and one voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (seven voted in favour, one voted against) that panning permission is **GRANTED** and the Corporate Director of Growth and Regeneration be granted authority to attached appropriate conditions.

#### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposal was not considered to be unacceptable and it was believed that it would add to the character of the street scene.

#### 15/00769/HHFUL

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

#### **Reasons for the decision**

Having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan that the planning permission for the application was considered acceptable.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 4:54pm