



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 16 MAY 2017**

Members Present: Councillors Harper (Chairman), Serluca (Vice Chairman), Bull, Casey, Hiller, Stokes and Sylvester.

Officers Present: Lee Collins, Development Management Manager
Vicky Hurrell, Principal Development Management Officer
Simon Ireland, PCC Highways
Chris Gordon, Planning and Highways Lawyer
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Martin.

2. Declarations of Interest

None were received.

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

Councillor Serluca advised that, with reference to item 5.1, upon legal advice, she would be withdrawing from the Committee for that item and making representation as a Ward Councillor.

4. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 14 March 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2017 were approved as a correct record.

5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

5.1 17/00604/HHFUL – 63 Peake Close, Woodston, Peterborough

The Committee was presented with a revised application seeking the erection of a two storey extension to the dwelling. The extension was to have a pitched roof, a ridge height, a gable and a depth that would match those of the existing dwelling.

The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update report. In addition the Committee were informed that the planning department had accepted Councillor Serluca's assertions that the area between the side elevation of the dwelling and the east flank boundary was, in fact, situated to the South East. Furthermore planning officers agreed that the shared rear boundary with No.2 Prospero Road was 2m and not 1.5m and that the shared rear boundary with No.1 Prospero Road was 1.84m and not 2m.

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

- The applicants wanted to create a family home for themselves and upgrade the property from its current derelict state.
- Committee needed to look at the application subjectively. This would improve the public realm and address vulnerability to crime.
- This application would make a positive contribution to the built and natural environment and not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.
- Both neighbours at No1 and No2 Prospero Road were supportive of the application and welcomed the upgrading of the property.
- This would not have a negative impact on neighbour's amenities.

The Committee discussed the application and commented that it was rare for the Committee to go against officer recommendations, however it was felt that this application would enhance the local area. In addition the Committee noted that the neighbours had both written letters of support for the extension.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that planning permission be approved, contrary to officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (unanimously) that planning permission is **GRANTED**

Reasons for the decision:

- The application would not result in an adversely overbearing impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of no.1 and no.2 Prospero Close.

5.2. 16/02328/ADV – 85 Mayors Walk, West Town, Peterborough

The Committee was presented with an application seeking advertisement consent for two externally illuminated advertisements. The first sign was to be 2.5m high from the ground and measuring 3.6m in width. The second sign was to be 2.5m high from the ground and measuring 3.2m in width.

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

In response to questions from the Committee the Principal Development Management Officer confirmed that this application was solely for the consent to erect advertisements. The applicants for each shop would still need to get planning permission approved for their individual units.

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

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 is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The proposal would not unacceptably harm the appearance of the application site or 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).
- The surrounding highways would retain their current levels of safety, in accordance with Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

5.3 17/00405/HHFUL – 333 Thorpe Road, Peterborough

The Committee was informed that this application would be read in conjunction with item 5.4 of the agenda as it related to the same property.

The application sought the planning permission for a new 3 light dormer to the garage and the conversion of the loft of the early 19th century element to the south of the tower. This would provide accommodation by raising the ceiling and inserting a new internal staircase. In addition three roof lights were proposed to the west facing roof.

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

The Committee welcomed the report and 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 relevant conditions and authority being delegated to Officers to review the bat survey, agree appropriate mitigation measures including any additional conditions and any necessary design changes along with any associated changes to the wording of the conditions set out at the end of this report.

Reasons for the decision:

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

- The proposal would protect and preserve the setting of this grade 1 listed building subject to the imposition of conditions. The proposal therefore complies with section 66 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP17 of the adopted Planning Policy Framework.
- Subject to conditions, the works will preserve the character and appearance of the Longthorpe Conservation Area in accordance with Section 72(1), of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act

1990 (as amended), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP17 of the adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- Bats have been identified on the site. However it is considered that subject to further surveys and agreement of appropriate mitigation measures that the impact can be acceptably mitigated in accordance with policy CS21 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.
- The proposal would not have any adverse impact upon existing trees in accordance with policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.
- The proposal would not have any adverse impact upon neighbour amenity and therefore accords with policy PP3 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

5.4 17/00406/LBC – 333 Thorpe Road, Peterborough

This application was taken in conjunction with item 5.3 above.

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 relevant conditions with authority being delegated to Officers to agree any design changes along with any changes to/ further conditions as maybe required to ensure suitable mitigation for bats.

Reasons for the decision:

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

- The proposal would protect and preserve the setting of this grade 1 listed building subject to the imposition of conditions. The proposal therefore complies with section 66 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CS17 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP17 of the adopted Planning Policy Framework.

5.5 17/00629/HHFUL – 11 Pembroke Grove, Glington, Peterborough

The Committee was presented with an application seeking planning permission for a ground floor extension. The external materials of the extension would match the existing dwelling. Three roof lights are proposed and a large window and patio door on the rear elevation.

The Principal Development Management Officer provided an overview of the application and highlighted a number of key issues within the report and update report. Members were informed that Glington Parish Council were due to discuss the application on the same day as the Committee, however no objections from local residents had been received.

The Committee discussed the application and agreed that as no objections had been received that the recommendation should delete any reference from Glinton Parish Council as Peterborough City Council were the deciding authority for planning applications and were satisfied with this application.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that planning permission be approved, as per officer recommendation, with the removal of the reference to Glinton Parish Council.

RESOLVED: (8 voted in favour, none against and 1 abstained) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to relevant conditions.

Reasons for the decision:

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 proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact to 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).
- The proposal would not result in unacceptable impact upon 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).

5.6 17/00338/HHFUL – 11 Broadway Gardens, Peterborough

The Committee was presented with an application for a single storey flat roof extension to the rear linking to the part conversion of the existing garage. The single storey extension was to span the whole width of the rear elevation of the dwelling.

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

The Committee welcomed the report and were in agreement that the only reason the application had come to Committee was because the applicant was a Peterborough City Council member of staff, 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 relevant conditions.

Reasons for the decision:

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 conversion of part of the existing garage and the rear extension to the dwelling would not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the conservation area in accordance with policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD
- The part conversion of the garage to a habitable room and the rear extension would not impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of the two adjoining dwellings in accordance with policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Chairman
1.30pm – 2:23pm