



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 14 MARCH 2017**

Members Present: Councillors Harper (Chairman), Serluca (Vice Chairman), Bull, Casey, Hiller, Stokes, Clark, Martin and Ash

Officers Present: Lee Collins, Development Management Manager
Chris Gordon, Planning and Highways Lawyer
Jane Webb, Senior Democratic Services Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Bond.

2. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

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

No Members' declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillors were received.

4. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 24 January 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2017 were approved as a correct record.

5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

5.1 17/00003//HHFUL – 2 Cowper Road, New England, Peterborough

The Committee was presented with an application for the construction of a detached outbuilding to the rear.

The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update report.

Gordon Smith, agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- This outbuilding covers a third of the garden and not half as reported.
- The report overstates the harm, the outbuilding looks good and neither obtrusive or dominant.
- Representation had been received from the neighbours living at Number 4 in support of the application.
- The applicant has a fall-back position should the committee enforce destruction of the building and that would be to remove the roof.

- The applicant had taken a risk building the outbuilding before acquiring permission but the Agent understood why he had taken this route.
- The building had been finished to a high standard and was located at the bottom of the garden with no more than normal impact on neighbours.

The Committee asked questions of the officer and received responses as follows:

- If Members were minded to go against officer recommendation then it would be advisable to impose a condition which prevented the outbuilding being used as a separate residential building and state that it could not be occupied and was to remain ancillary to the main residence. This would prevent the building from being rented separately as a self-contained unit and limit its use to that proposed as a gym/study or playroom.
- Confirmed that the building took up 42% of the garden, as opposed to 38% stated by the Agent and therefore was nearly half the garden. Permitted development allows 50% of a garden to be use but was subject to height conditions. Beyond 50% each case was judged on its own merit.

The Committee discussed the application and the fact that it was only the height of the building that was an issue with regard to permitted development and were in agreement that it did not overlook the neighbours and did not cause harm to the area. It was an urban area of reasonably high density with large gardens, the building was not prominent from the street and was built to a high standard.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that planning permission be approved, contrary to officer recommendation with the added condition regarding occupation of the building and the removal of permitted development rights. The motion was carried 6 voting in favour, 3 voting against and none abstaining.

RESOLVED: (6 voted in favour, 3 against and none abstained) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the two conditions previously stated and for the following reason.

Reasons for the decision:

The proposal was considered acceptable due to:

- There being no impact on the surrounding area,
- The building was well presented
- The building height was not onerous or overlooking the neighbourhood,
- The building was well presented
- Conditions added to remove permitted development rights and the installation of windows to the side of the property.

5.2 17/00228/HHFUL – 61 Taverners Road, Millfield, Peterborough

The Committee was presented with an application for external installation to the front elevation.

The Development Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

The Committee asked no questions of the officer.

The Committee were in agreement that the only reason the application had come to Committee was because the applicant was a Peterborough Councillor otherwise this would have been straightforward and therefore the Committee had no reservations in supporting the application.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that planning permission be approved, as per officer recommendation. The motion was unanimous.

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

Reasons for the decision:

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

- The proposals will not unacceptably harm the character of the area. In accordance with policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policies PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012.

5.3. 17/00229/HHFUL – 59 Taverners Road, Millfield, Peterborough

The Committee was presented with an application for external installation to the front elevation.

The Development Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report.

The Committee asked no questions of the officer.

The Committee were in agreement that the only reason the application had come to Committee was because the applicant was a Peterborough Councillor otherwise this would have been straightforward and therefore the Committee had no reservations in supporting the application.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that planning permission be approved, as per officer recommendation. The motion was unanimous.

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

Reasons for the decision:

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

- The proposals will not unacceptably harm the character of the area. In accordance with policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policies PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012.

7. Planning Compliance Quarterly Report on Performance December 2016 to February 2017

The Development Manager presented a report to the Committee, which outlined the Planning Service's planning compliance performance and identified if there were any lessons to be learnt from the actions taken.

The Committee discussed the report and commended the team on their performance

RESOLVED: that the Committee noted the past performance and outcomes.

Reasons for the decision:

To help inform future decisions of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee and potentially reduce costs.

Chairman
1.30pm – 2:20pm