

**Application Ref:** 15/02209/FUL

**Proposal:** Single storey extension to create 4 additional bedrooms with associated lounges, storage and meeting room, and two storey extension to create additional educational wing, music studio and storage

**Site:** 8 Lincoln Road, Glinton, Peterborough, PE6 7AW  
**Applicant:** Mr Steve McFaden

**Agent:** Mr Jamie Alston  
 Hoopers Architects Ltd

**Referred by:** Glinton Parish Council

**Reason:** The extension would be outside the village settlement boundary

**Site visit:** 03.03.2016

**Case officer:** Mrs J MacLennan. The report has been drafted by South Kesteven District Council for independent review of the proposal and conformity to planning policy

**Telephone No.** 01733 454438  
**E-Mail:** janet.maclennan@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

### Site and surroundings

The application site is approximately 1.1ha and located to the far south and within the village settlement boundary of Glinton. The site contains a two storey building, which has been previously extended, which is used as a secure unit for young women. The site is accessed via an independent free-standing access off Lincoln Road to the west of the site. This access was approved in 2010 (ref. 10/00071/FUL). A former access off Welmore Road has now been closed with the opening of the new access. The site is enclosed by an extensive tree belt to the western and southern boundary. The character of the adjoining area to the north and east comprises residential properties and to the west and south open countryside. The building is very effectively screened by a dense tree belt to the west and south of the site.

### Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of the following extensions

- a) a Single storey extension to provide 4 additional bedrooms including 2 lounges to be located on the western side of the existing building attached to the gym. The extension would have a footprint of approximately 6.2m in width x 33.2m in depth. The unit would have a dual pitched roof with a maximum height of 6.3m and an eave height of 4.7m; and
- b) Two storey extension to provide 2 classrooms on the ground floor and storage/education space at first floor. This would be located at the east side of the existing building and would have a footprint of approximately 7.7m in width x 14.6m in depth. The height of the extension would align with that of the existing building.

The capacity of the secure unit would be increased from 16 residents to 20.

## 2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
P1053/81	Erection of 4 metre high security fencing	Permitted	16/02/1982
94/P0914	Extension to provide 16 bed children's secure unit with education and service facilities, including demolition of some existing buildings as amended by revised plans received 24.4.95, numbered: 94-11398/DLP1/E, 11883AS0101, AK0063, 64, 65, 66A, 67A, 69	Permitted	19/06/1995
07/00482/FUL	Extension to fitness centre, extension to sleeping accommodation and new garage, extension to lift and entrance, demolition and rebuilding of classroom and administration block and alterations and extension to car park	Permitted	23/07/2007
07/01620/FUL	Creation of temporary car park	Permitted	26/11/2007
10/00071/FUL	Construction of external drive to form vehicular access onto B1443 from Clare Lodge	Permitted	02/03/2010
10/00808/R3FUL	Construction of two single storey lounge extensions and one two-storey teaching and office extension	Permitted	20/08/2010
10/00810/DISCHG	Discharge of conditions C4 (parking) and C9 (vehicle cleaning) of planning permission 10/00071/FUL - Construction of external drive to form vehicular access on to B1443 from Clare Lodge	Determined	06/08/2010
12/01255/NONMAT	Non-material amendment to planning permission 10/00808/R3FUL dated 20/08/10 (Construction of two single storey lounge extensions and one two-storey teaching and office extension) - re-location of external doors to single storey lounges from side elevations to rear gable elevations	Determined	30/08/2012

## 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 8 - School Development**

Paragraph 72 emphasises that the Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools.

## **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.

### **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 Site Allocations DPD (2012)**

### **SA04 - Village Envelopes**

These are identified on the proposals map. Land outside of the village envelop is defined as open countryside.

## **Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)**

### **PP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**

Applications which accord with policies in the Local Plan and other Development Plan Documents will be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where there are no relevant policies, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **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.

### **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.

### **Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)**

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document ran from 15 January to 25 February 2016.

At this preliminary stage the policies cannot be afforded any weight with the exception of the calculation relating to the five year land supply as this is based upon the updated Housing Needs Assessment and sites which have planning permission or which are subject to a current application. Individual policies are not therefore referred to further in this report.

### **Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD**

#### **SPD Policy – Glington**

Glin 14: All new developments on the edge of the village should conserve or enhance the soft landscape edge by provision of appropriate tree and hedgerow planting. Hard edges, such as high fencing, walls or other similar style structures should be avoided.

#### **4 Consultations/Representations**

**PCC Tree Officer** - No objection - the arboricultural survey submitted appears to be accurate. During a site visit it was noted that a row of conifers would require removal as they are too close to the existing boundary fence for reasons of security. The loss of these trees is internal and is unlikely to be noticed from the outside of the site. The groups of trees to the south (A001) is a mixture of predominately Poplar and Field Maple. Historically, a section of bund was partially removed for previous construction access. The bund was then replaced and replanted. The majority of these trees have failed to grow significantly. This section of bund is planned to be removed again for access to the site. In principle, there is no objection with the creation of this access so long as the adjacent trees that are required to undertake this task are replaced. A group of trees to the south will be removed completely. They are of reasonable quality but cannot be seen from outside the site. Their loss will have no impact on the amenity of the area. A more site specific description of the methodology for tree protection is required. This can be secured by condition.

**PCC Wildlife Officer**– No objection – The officer is satisfied that none of the existing mature deciduous trees in the south-western corner of the site will be impacted on by the proposed scheme. However it is recommended that the proposed access routes and compound storage areas are carefully positioned to minimise the need to remove existing vegetation. It is recommended that the western boundary is replanted and strengthened using a range of native tree and shrub species, the details of which may be provided via a suitably worded condition. In the officer's opinion the proposal would result in no net loss to biodiversity.

**Lead Local Drainage Authority**– No objection - The applicant suggests using a soakaway to manage the surface water onsite. These details would be required to be submitted and secured by condition.

**Archaeological Officer**– No objection - Within a 250m radius, investigations carried out to the west and south of the proposed development site have produced evidence for intense Roman occupation. Aerial photographs show remnants of medieval ridge and furrow associated with the open fields of the historic village of Glington. The available evidence indicates that there is high potential for the existence of Roman remains associated with settlement and land management. Medieval ridge and furrow are also likely to be present. However, groundwork operations associated with the construction of the centre, including service trenches for the utilities and landscaping, are likely to have obliterated potential buried remains, thus reducing the archaeological potential of the site. On the basis of the available evidence, a programme of archaeological work would not be justified.

**PCC Conservation Officer**– No objection - The site is not located within the Ginton Conservation Area. It is not within close proximity to the conservation area or any designated or non-designated heritage assets and therefore the proposal is considered unlikely to result detriment to the character and appearance of it. The site is currently very well screened by way of a perimeter fence with adjacent earth bunds and planting. The single storey extension is adjacent to a taller gymnasium and the two storey extension is no taller than its attached buildings. With the benefit of a site visit to view the setting, it is not considered that the new structures would result in any significant impact on the character or appearance of the wider locality. The loss of some of the boundary planting could be mitigated by re-planting to aid screening of the site. The buildings have been designed to be constructed of matching scale and materials to those already in existence. From a heritage consideration the proposed works can be supported.

**PCC Transport & Engineering Services** – No objection - The addition of 4 bedrooms shall not result in a significant increase in traffic flows to and from the site and as there is adequate on-site parking and turning facilities the LHA raised no objections subject to conditions. It was noted that for the proposed temporary access, no turning is provided, therefore any turning would have to be carried out within the private access road.

**PCC Pollution Control Officer** – No objection – The following comments have been made:

Noise – Music Room - The proposed Music Studio is approximately 75m from the nearest residential property on Ashburn Close, and approximately 60m to the nearest residential property on Welmore Road. If the practice of music was to take place in this premises with the window open at a volume usually played for the provision of dance then the estimated noise levels at the nearest residential property would be in the region of LAeq 45dB(t). Noise reports completed for other developments to the south-west of this development indicate that a daytime background noise level of LA90 42dB(t) can be expected. Peterborough City Council generally prefer noise levels to be 10dB below the background noise levels. Although with good management excessive noise levels from the music room are unlikely the officer suggests the appending of a condition to ensure noise is controlled.

Noise – Mechanical Plant – Concerns have been raised regarding noise from the chiller plant. This is not an issue Pollution Control are aware of, nor is it one that is covered in any detail in the planning submission. Nevertheless with the siting of new mechanical plant it may be necessary to consider a compliance condition to ensure sound levels are suitably controlled. The officer suggests the appending of a condition to ensure noise from plant equipment is suitably controlled.

Light - Pollution Control are not aware of any complaints relating to lighting at this development, and given the nature of its use it is unlikely that light nuisance would be an issue. However the Officer suggested that lighting should accord with The Institution of Lighting Engineers “Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution (Revised)”. This Institution strongly recommends that planning authorities adopt obtrusive light limitations for exterior lighting installations. The Officer suggests the appending of a compliance condition.

Construction Works - There is no specific legislative control for the hours of work on construction sites. There is a code of practice for control of noise from construction sites which advises that work should be programmed such that HGV’s do not come on site between 7pm and 7am. Although not directly relevant it gives a guide of likely acceptable hours for noisy activities. The Officer suggests the appending of a condition advising that construction traffic should not use the site entrance off Welmore Road and HGV’s should not come on site between 7pm and 7am.

**Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO)** – No objection - No comments to make on the application.

**Sport England** – No objection - The nature of this specific proposal is such that Sport England does not consider that this development would fall under any requirement to consult Sport England as a statutory (Statutory Instrument 2015/595) or non-statutory consultee (Planning Practice Guidance 'Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities, Public Rights of Way and Local Green Space, Paragraph 003).

**Glington Parish Council**– Objection – The Parish council were unanimous in their objections to this application on a number of grounds. A substantial part of the proposed extension is outside the village envelope in contravention of planning policy CS1. The proposed extension could be accommodated elsewhere on the site within the Clare Lodge boundary. The applicant was well aware that the proposal was outside the village envelope as they had previously consulted parish council on the plans and had been advised to adjust their plans. That advice had been ignored.

Concern was expressed about the proposal to remove screening hedge to the western boundary of the site. This should be retained to help disguise the security fencing. Policy Glin 14 states that development on the edge of the village should conserve or enhance the soft landscape edge by provision of appropriate tree and hedgerow planting. Councillors question the accuracy of the site boundary shown on their plans, particularly on the western boundary. Google Earth overlay clearly suggest that the site boundary shown on the plans is in the wrong position giving the impression that Clare Lodge site is larger than it actually is in reality. Therefore development, if permitted, would have a greater impact on neighbours' amenity than intimated by the plans. Parish council are of the opinion that the existing boundary should be confirmed by independent onsite measurements. Furthermore existing boundaries should remain unchanged.

Those Councillors present at a city council budget presentation had been informed that the City council budget strategy took into account additional revenue of £250k arising from the extension of Clare Lodge. Recognising that this increased the pressure on the City Council planning department to approve the application, parish council are of the opinion that this application should be subjected to independent scrutiny possibly by a planning department outside of Cambridgeshire.

### **Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 17

Total number of responses: 2 (including Parish Council – comments above)

Total number of objections: 2

Total number in support: 0

- I represent local residents on a Communication Group with Clare Lodge. On several occasions concerns have been raised on the noise emitting from plant rooms on the site with no successful outcome.
- The site is a large educational/care facility on the edge of a residential development; therefore I assume there are some technical limits and restrictions. Please verify the status of this site in planning terms and assure me that all the necessary technical details have been applied and described in the application. *Officer response: The proposed extension is considered to be relatively modest. Sufficient information has been submitted to allow for full consideration of the proposal.*
- Should there not be a full Design and Access statement or does the Planning Statement suffice? *Officer response: This is not a major development and therefore a Design and Access Statement is not required.*
- Change of infrastructure and plant to support extra accommodation is a material factor within the profile of the application. Please advise how and where this will be described in the application. *Officer response: These details shall be secured by condition.*
- Please advise what is the normal population of the development and how it may increase in total. *Officer response: The number of residents would increase from 16 to 20*
- I would like to remind you that the facility is in the outer zone of the PADHI restrictions of the gas compressor station at 1650 Lincoln Road Glington, and I understand it counts as a level 4 sensitivity development. *Officer response: The site lies outside the consultation zone*

- I also note there is a music room planned for the first floor, please describe the expected noise levels external to the building.

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

### **a) Background**

The application is subsequent to a pre-application enquiry to the Local Planning Authority for an identical scheme seeking an in principle view on the proposal. It was officers' opinion that the proposal, if submitted, could be supported in principle subject to the details of the scheme meeting the requirements of other planning policy and material planning considerations.

The Parish Council refer to the additional revenue of £250k arising from the extension of Clare Lodge and consider that this has put pressure on the planning department to approve the application. The Parish Council are of the opinion that this application should be subjected to independent scrutiny possibly by a planning department outside of Cambridgeshire.

The proposal is for an extension to an existing secure unit and whilst recent changes, introduced via the Housing and Planning Act, have emphasised that the financial implications of development are material planning considerations this proposal has been assessed purely on its planning merits and in terms of its accordance with relevant national and local planning policy.

For the Committee's information, as requested by the Parish Council and in order to ensure the integrity of the planning process, the Council's approach and assessment of the planning merits of this particular case has also been subject to appropriate independent scrutiny by South Kesteven District Council for independent review of the proposal and conformity to planning policy.

### **b) The Principle of Development**

It is noted that a small section of the development would encroach outside of the current village settlement boundary. The Officer is mindful that the Parish Council has raised objection to this encroachment stating that the proposal would be contrary to policy CS1 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD. The extension would project approximately 13m beyond the current line of the built form which forms the village settlement boundary to the west edge of the site although it should be noted that all of the proposed extensions would still be contained within the physical boundaries and particularly the established landscaping framework and visual parameters of the application site.

The Parish Council has suggested that the extension be positioned elsewhere within the site.

It is considered, however, that the proposed development could not practically be positioned in any other location within the application site without inappropriately compromising on parking provision and outdoor amenity space. Furthermore the proposed positioning of the extensions to the western/southern side of the site would effectively safeguard adjoining residential properties by ensuring that they would not have any impact on existing neighbouring properties to the north and east.

The site is an established secure unit with a number and variety of buildings on site. The proposed extensions are all considered to be within the boundary of the site. The extensions are also not considered to result in significant intensification of the approved use. The principle of the proposed extensions is therefore capable of being supported as they would not contravene the principles of policy CS1 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy Glin14 of the Village Design Statement.

c) Design and Visual Amenity

The site is situated some 170m from Lincoln Road to the west and 110m from the A15 to the east and is well screened by way of an earth bund and planting. The single storey extension is adjacent to a taller gymnasium and the proposed two storey extension would also be appropriately subsidiary as it would be no taller than its attached buildings. It should be noted that the proposed two storey element was previously approved in 2010 however that permission was not implemented and it was not constructed. Due to the extensive established planting the building is not directly visible from outside of the site and therefore it is considered that the extensions would not in any way be visually intrusive, intrude into open countryside nor have any notable impact on the character or appearance of the wider locality.

The buildings have been thoughtfully designed so as to be constructed of matching scale and materials to those already in existence. The single storey extensions will match in terms of height, scale, design and materials, the features of the existing single storey elements of the building. The two storey extension abuts and existing two storey element of the building and would match the height, scale and design of the existing building.

It is therefore considered that the proposed extensions would respect the form and character of the existing building and would not be harmful to the visual amenity of the area. Hence the proposal accords with policy PP2 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy Glin14 of the Village Design Statement.

d) Neighbouring Amenity

The site has been occupied and in use as a secure unit for a number of years. Therefore it has to be acknowledged that these limited proposed extensions and the relative related increase of only 4 no. bedrooms would not either change the existing character or the use of the site. It is also important to note that the proposed extensions would be positioned on parts of the site furthest from the adjoining village of Glinton and well away from any of the neighbouring dwellings.

It is not therefore considered that the proposed extensions would result in significant increases in noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers. It is unlikely that the increase in the number of bedrooms would result in any material increase in the flow of traffic to and from the site and in any event it is considered that this would not impact on neighbours as the site now has its own independent dedicated access from Lincoln Road.

A letter of representation has been received from a neighbouring occupier raising concerns about the noise implications resulting from plant and the proposed 'Music Studio' The applicant has responded to this concern by stating that the old chiller plant would now be removed and also that the external condenser units are to be relocated to within the existing plant room. The applicant considers that this intended approach will help to eliminate any previous noise issues experienced by the neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed Music Studio element would be positioned 80m from the neighbouring properties in Ashburn Close and 50m from neighbouring properties in Welmore Road. The two storey extension within which the Music Studio is proposed aligns with the existing building. It is therefore not considered that noise emanating from this room/activity would be at a level that would significantly impact on the amenity of the occupiers of these dwellings.

Furthermore it should be noted that whilst the Council as the applicant could effectively manage the use of the premises the Local Planning Authority would not have any control over the reconfiguration of the internal areas.

Therefore having thoroughly considered the issues relating to neighbouring amenity it is contended that the proposal would not impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and accords with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and Policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.



Conditions would be appended to the decision notice restricting the level of noise emitted from the music room at the site which should not exceed 32dB  $L_{Aeq, 1 \text{ hour}}$  between 07:00hrs and 23:00hrs Monday to Friday and 24dB  $L_{Aeq, 15 \text{ minutes}}$  at any other time; and a general noise condition for the whole site requiring the level of noise emitted from the site should not exceed 32 dB  $L_{Aeq, 1 \text{ hour}}$  between 07:00hrs and 23:00hrs Monday to Friday and 24dB  $L_{Aeq, 15 \text{ minutes}}$  at any other time in order to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

e) Landscape Implications

The arboricultural report has been submitted in support of the application and the Tree Officer considers the submitted information to be acceptable. The report outlines the partial removal of trees to the west of the site and a section to the south of the site.

The Tree Officer advises that the submitted supporting plan is misleading as it identifies a significant amount of trees, mainly Pine, to be removed on the western boundary. However, this is not the case. The Tree Officer has visited the site as the applicant considers that it will be necessary to remove a row conifers as they are too close to the existing boundary fence for reasons of security. The tree officer considers that the loss of these trees is internal and is unlikely to be noticed from the outside of the site.

The tree group to the south is a mixture of Poplar and Field Maple. Historically, a section of bund was partially removed for previous construction access. The bund was then replaced and replanted – the majority of these trees have failed to grow significantly. This section of bund is planned to be removed again for access to the site. There are no objections to the loss of these trees provided that they are replaced.

There are another group of Field Maple trees to the south of the site which are of reasonable quality and are to be removed, however, they cannot be seen from outside the site and their loss will have no impact on the wider amenity of the area.

Details of tree protection and replacement planting will be secured by condition.

It is not considered that the proposal would actually be contrary to policy Glin14 of the Peterborough Design in Selected Villages DPD as the existing tree belt would be enhanced.

It is not considered that the loss of trees would adversely impact on the visual amenity of the area and replacement tree planting would enhance the tree belt and the biodiversity within the site. Hence the proposal accords with policy PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

f) Highway Implications

There are 50 parking spaces within the site and the site benefits by an independent access from Lincoln Road. There are currently 103 employees and this would not change as a result of the development. The Local Highways Authority (LHA) considers that the increase in the number of bedrooms would not result in a significant increase in traffic flow and there is adequate on-site parking provision.

A temporary construction access would be formed to the south and would utilise a construction access point previously used for recent lounge extensions at the site. Construction traffic for the duration of the project will use the existing access with easy access to the A15. No construction traffic will use the former site access off Welmore Road. Contractor parking and storage has yet to be finalised but it is proposed that contractors will park within the bounds of the site or adjacent to the Access Road.

The LHA raises no objections to the proposal subject to conditions being appended to the decision notice regarding the retention of parking and the details of a construction management plan to be agreed.

The proposal would not unduly impact upon the adjacent highway and therefore accords with policies PP12 and PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS14 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

## **6 Conclusions**

In coming to a conclusion regarding the potential acceptability of these proposals it is important for the Committee to consider the essential planning balance in terms of both assessing and evaluating the exact nature of the proposals and, having regard to the applicable presumption in favour of acceptable sustainable development, determining what harm if any would actually be caused.

In this instance whilst there would be a very limited element of conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS1, in terms of the potential impact of the location of part of the proposed extension, that impact has to be considered in light of the relative weight that needs to be attributed to other relevant policies and the nature and extent of any actual harm that might be caused by the proposed development. In this instance NPPF offers explicit direct support for proposals that help meet the educational needs of communities. As Members will be aware there is a clear acknowledged and increasing need for Local Authorities to provide such specialised accommodation and as such, in accordance with the express requirements of the relevant national planning policy, that factor should and needs to be given great weight in determining this application.

Notwithstanding the weight that must be given to national policy in this instance it is also important to consider the nature of the localised impacts. In essence all of the relevant sections of this report have concluded that, due to the careful siting and thoughtful design of these proposals, there would not actually be any discernable material harm to either the visual or residential amenity of the area.

Therefore, subject to the imposition of the attached appropriate conditions, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in planning terms, having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant national policies and the policies of the development plan and specifically because:

- The proposal is for well thought out extensions to an existing building which would all lie within the established operational boundary to the site;
- the height, scale, proportions and design of the extensions will be in keeping with the existing building and will not result in any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity;
- due to the extensive tree belt to the site boundary the extensions will not result in any adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area; and
- the proposal will not result in any highway implications.

Hence it is considered that whilst there is some minor conflict with Policy CS1 on balance the proposal accords with policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP12, PP13 and PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, policies CS14, CS16 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and the NPPF.

## 7 Recommendation

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

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

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

- C 2 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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 3 No development shall take place on the site until a finalised arboricultural protection scheme has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The finalised arboricultural protection scheme shall include:

1. A site meeting between the site agent/architect/builder, the developers chosen arboriculturist and the Local Planning Authority's Tree Officer which shall inform the;
2. Submission of a site specific Method Statement and/or Tree Protection Plan to BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design demolition and construction - Recommendations methodology. The Method Statement/Tree Protection Plan shall identify (not necessarily exclusively) the following:
  - Clear identification of all trees to be removed and those to be retained;
  - Location and specification of protective tree measures in addition to appropriate ground protection within the Root Protection Areas of all retained trees within the site;
  - Details of all Root Protection Area infringement during the construction and landscaping phases with details on how the impact will be minimised. This includes the location and specification of 'no dig' constructions (where applicable);
  - Details of facilitation pruning;
  - Location for 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;
  - Details of signage to be erected within the tree protection areas

The approved scheme shall be implemented in full, strictly in accordance with the agreed details/plans and shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the demolition/construction of the development.

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 PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition as the tree protection measures shall need to be provided prior to any works commencing on site.

- C 4 A replacement tree or trees of a size and species to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority shall be planted in the first planting season (December to February inclusive for deciduous trees and October to March for evergreen trees) following removal of the tree(s) the subject of this application. The western boundary shall be replanted and strengthened using a range of native tree and shrub species.

Reason: To ensure continuity of tree cover in the interest of visual amenity, in accordance with the Policy 39 Peterborough Tree and Woodlands Strategy 2012.

- C 5 Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme (except those contained in enclosed rear gardens to individual dwellings) 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 parking spaces shown on drawing no. 3659/6/03 Rev A for vehicles to park and turn clear of the public highway shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose than the parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the use of the children's home.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C 7 Prior to the commencement of development details of the temporary facilities that shall be provided clear of the public highway for material storage and for the parking/turning/loading/unloading of all vehicles visiting the site during the period of construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy PP12 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition as the details will need to be agreed before any works commence on site.

- C8 All construction vehicles shall enter and leave the site from Lincoln Road and no construction vehicles shall enter or leave the site from Welmore Road. No HGV's shall come on site between 7pm and 7am.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and in accordance with policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C9 Prior to the commencement of development details of the proposed surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to manage surface water run-off and in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition because the details to be approved are required to be carried out at the on-set of any groundworks/building works.

C10 Prior to installation, the details and siting of any new plant equipment such as A/C units including noise data shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The equipment shall only be provided in accordance with the approved details.

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

C11 The level of noise emitted from the music room at the site should not exceed 32dB  $L_{Aeq, 1 \text{ hour}}$  between 07:00hrs and 23:00hrs Monday to Friday and 24dB  $L_{Aeq, 15 \text{ minutes}}$  at any other time. The noise levels should be determined at the nearest noise sensitive premises. The measurements and assessment should be made according to BS:4142:2014.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and in accordance with policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C12 The rating level of noise emitted from the site should not exceed 32 dB  $L_{Aeq, 1 \text{ hour}}$  between 07:00hrs and 23:00hrs Monday to Friday and 24dB  $L_{Aeq, 15 \text{ minutes}}$  at any other time. The noise levels should be determined at the nearest noise sensitive premises. The measurements and assessment should be made according to BS:4142:2014.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and in accordance with policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C13 No additional lighting shall be installed at the site without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and in accordance with policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C14 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- \* 3659/6/T/04 rev A
- \* 3659/6/02 rev A
- \* 3659/6/03 rev A
- \* 3659/6/04 rev A
- \* 3659/6/B/02 rev A
- \* 3659/6/T/02 Opt 2A
- \* 3659/6/T/03 Opt 2A

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

This page is intentionally left blank