



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 13 JUNE 2017**

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

Officers Present: Nick Harding, Head of Planning
Simon Ireland, PCC Highways
Louise Humphreys, Planning and Highways Lawyer
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Before the commencement of the meeting the Chair welcomed Councillors Seaton and Clark and Ms Carol Pilson from Fenland District Council with regards to item 7 of the agenda.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Sylvester and Serluca.

Councillor Iqbal attended as substitute for Councillor Sylvester

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Bull advised that although she was Ward Councillor Orton Longueville, she had not been involved in any discussion in relation to item 5.1 '17/00521/FUL – Nene Park Academy, Oundle Road, Peterborough'.

Councillor Stokes advised that although she was Ward Councillor Orton Longueville, she had not been involved in any discussion in relation to item 5.1 '17/00521/FUL – Nene Park Academy, Oundle Road, Peterborough'.

Councillor Casey advised that although he was Ward Councillor Orton Longueville, he had not been involved in any discussion in relation to item 5.1 '17/00521/FUL – Nene Park Academy, Oundle Road, Peterborough'.

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 25 April 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 April 2017 were approved as a correct record save for the following alteration to Councillor Ash's comments on item 5.1:

It was important that the existing displaced foxes were not threatened if moved.

5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

5.1 17/00521/R3FUL – Nene Park Academy, Oundle Road, Orton Longueville, Peterborough

The Committee was presented with an application seeking permission for extensions to the existing school building. The extensions are required as part of an expansion of the existing Academy by two forms of entry, resulting in an increase of 300 pupils, plus additional sixth form capacity. Furthermore, there would be additional 30 full time staff, taking the total to 211.

The proposed extensions would comprise a new 3 storey wing at the rear of the academy, to be located on a site occupying a single storey building. This extension was to link into the existing two storey building located to the rear of the Academy. In addition the extension to the existing sports hall was to provide changing rooms, storage facilities and specialist teaching accommodation.

The vehicle drop of area at the north of the site near Oundle Road was to be reconfigured to provide an additional 36 car drop-off/pick-up facilities.

The Head of Planning 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 Engineer, Highway Control stated that:

- The travel plan survey produced by the applicant highlighted that 43% of students walked to school, 21% cycled, 23% were dropped off by car and 7% used the bus. With regards to staff 81% drove to work, 7% cycled and 1% used public transport.
- Although there were no precise numbers of those students who used the rear entrance to the school, it was observed that a high number of students used this access point.
- With regards to Peterborough United Football Club players and coaches arrived after the start of school at both the Primary and Secondary school.

The Committee discussed the application and commented that this extension was much needed to deal with the oversubscribed school places. The Committee welcomed a six monthly review of travel plans to ensure any transport issues could be dealt with.

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 and update 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 make efficient use of an existing school site and would enable the expansion to deliver much needed school places;

- the proposal would preserve the setting of the Grade II listed Orton Hall and also the character and appearance of the Orton Longueville Conservation Area;
- the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the adjoining highway network;
- the site would provide safe and convenient access and is accessible by a choice of modes of transport and the use of non-car modes of travel will be encouraged through the School Travel Plan;
- the layout, scale, proportions and design of the extensions would be in keeping with the existing Academy building and would not detract from the existing character of the site or that of the surrounding area;
- the siting of the building provides an adequate separation distance to existing neighbouring residential properties and the proposal would not result in any adverse effects on the amenity of the occupiers of these properties; and
- the proposal would provide replacement planting and features to enhance the biodiversity within the site.

Hence the proposal accords with Policies CS14, CS16, CS21 and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP12, PP13 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and sections 8 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

5.2. 17/00520/R3FUL – Ormiston Bushfield Academy, Bushfield, Orton Goldhay, Peterborough

The Committee was presented with an application seeking planning permission for the erection of a two storey extension to accommodate 300 pupils, revised pedestrian access to the west, repositioning of an existing boundary hedge, the relocation of secure parking and expansion of the existing car park to include a further 29 spaces.

The Head of Planning 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 Head of Planning confirmed that:

- The Conservation Officer had looked at the impacts on the local ponds and had deemed there to be no significant impact. Furthermore the applicant was to provide an additional pond, which they were not obliged to do.
- If members agreed a condition could be inserted to enforce that a new cycle storage facility be erected, instead of refurbishing the existing structure.

The Committee discussed the application and again welcomed regular reviews into potential traffic and transport issues that may arise. In addition the Committee agreed that this development was much needed to reduce the strain on the number of school places within the authority.

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 and update 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 proposed extension and associated works would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character or appearance of the host building or area, it would maintain good levels of sports provision for members of the public and an improved level of sporting provision for the school, as such the proposal would accord with Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP2 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012);
- The extension and associated works would not have an unacceptable harmful impact to neighbouring amenity and would therefore accord with Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012);
- There are no Highway safety concerns and satisfactory parking can be accommodated on site, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012); and
- The proposal would preserve and enhance the biodiversity value of the site, and would therefore accord with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

6. Planning Compliance Quarterly Report on Activity & Performance January to March 2017

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

The Committee were also presented with key figures and headlines for the financial year 2016/17. This included the team dealing with 601 cases in the year of which 97% were closed. Of those 49% were closed with no breach found, 27% remedied by addressing the breach without recourse, and a further 15% were closed as further action was unjustifiable. Of 29 notices served, 13 had been complied with, the remaining 16 were still to be closed off.

In response to questions from the Committee the Head of Planning stated:

- A further email would be circulated to members outlining the circumstances around the one case that was upheld at appeal.
- It was hoped that the appeal decision relating to Land South East of Nine Bridges Glinton, would be received in the next 1-2 months.
- Officers were keen to learn lessons from the experience at Glinton, including improving relationships with the traveller liaison officer.

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.

7. Review of the Performance of the Shared Planning Service with Fenland District Council

The Head of Planning presented a report to committee outlining the performance of the shared service arrangements with Fenland District Council. The Committee were informed that the shared service arrangement had been in place since January 2016 and a requirement was made that performance and outcomes were to be reported back to each authority. Both authorities had bought and sold services where technical knowledge and expertise were needed. The shared service was identified as having a target savings of £175k per annum, the perspective savings for 2016/17 was £150k.

The Committee were informed that both organisations had suffered a temporary dip in performance due to a period of vacancies and an officer having an extended leave of absence, however this was now being addressed.

In terms of speed of decision making, both PCC and Fenland exceeded government targets and both authorities use extension of time in order to be able to issue planning permissions rather than refusals.

In response to questions from Members the Head of Planning confirmed:

- The anomalies in relation to fee income was due to the fact that PCC had updated their fee structure, however Fenland were in the process of updating their system.
- Officers worked on both PCC and Fenland planning applications, depending on their workload.
- Working across both authorities allowed expertise in certain areas to be shared and enhanced the quality of work across both organisations.

Councillor Sutton (Fenland) addressed the Committee and stated that the robust advice received allowed their committee to make better decisions and therefore the number of appeals that had been successful were reduced. In addition he commented that the relationship between PCC and Fenland had been working well and looked forward to its continued success.

Resolved:

That the Committee notes past performance and outcomes.

Chairman
1.30pm – 3.04pm

This page is intentionally left blank