

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 19 DECEMBER 2017
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: (Chairman) Harper, (Vice-Chair) Casey, Councillors Bull, Stokes, Clark, Martin A Iqbal, Saltmarsh and Hiller

Officers Present: Lee Collins, Development Management Manager
Amanda McSherry, Principal Development Management Officer
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer, Highway Control
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Stephen Turnbull, Planning Solicitor

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ash, Serluca and Bond

Councillor Saltmarsh substituted for Councillor Ash

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bull declared a personal interest in item 5.1 by virtue of knowing the Chairman of the Sutton Parish Council through the local community group.

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

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

4. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2017 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

5.1 17/01765/FUL - LAND TO THE EAST OF MANOR FARM NENE WAY, SUTTON, PETERBOROUGH.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to seeking planning permission for the 'demolition of farm buildings and erection of single dwelling with associated parking and amenity space'.

The proposed dwelling would be sited 50m from Nene Way site frontage and would utilise both existing vehicle access points creating an in and out access arrangement. The dwelling would stand at three and two storeys in height. The main dwelling would have a floor area of 16.9m x 16.9m and proposes to stand at 7.4m to eaves and 9.5m

to ridge. The two storey element would have a floor area of 7m x 16.9m proposing to stand at 4.75m to eaves and 6.6m to ridge.

A detached one and a half storey triple garage with accommodation above is also proposed to the side of the property, with a floor area of 7.3m x 16m and proposes to stand at 2.7m to eaves and 5.5m to ridge.

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced the report and update report. The proposal would dominate the area and would erode the current manor house and the agricultural heritage of the village. Proximity to the conservation area would exacerbate the harm to the local area.

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

- The applicants were born in local area and had been involved with a number of local businesses. The applicants had a strong desire to return to the village and enhance its appeal.
- The applicants were aware of previous planning history, however their wish to build one house instead of two was not overbearing.
- There had been numerous meetings and discussions with the planning department and alterations had been made where requested.
- The design and build of the property would be in keeping with other buildings in the village.
- The application would enhance the local area with the removal of the current outbuildings.
- The results of the consultation had shown that they have taken all aspects into account.

Peter Lee, Chairman of Sutton Parish Council, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Parish Council supported the application. At present the eastern approach is spoilt by modern farm buildings and this application sought to bring character back to the village.
- Although substantial it was well set back on the site, therefore opening up a far more attractive view of the village.
- The views as people approached the village would be better and more appealing..
- The Parish Council welcomed the creation of the meadow/pasture area.
- The reasons for refusal were not clear. This application would architecturally improve the conservation area.
- The proposed house was set back from the front of the plot and would not damage the character of the manor house opposite.
- Severed farm land had very little use for modern day times. Natural transition changed when this land was split up and now no longer influences planning decisions.
- This was an entirely appropriate development for the scale and size of the plot of land.

- Parish council normally defend no further developments, however the scheme was carefully designed. As the site needed improvement, small breach should be allowed.
- There were many other cases of other villages outside the village envelope being developed upon.
- Not a new form of development, Northborough manor is a similar development.
- There will be other buildings between development and the village as you approach it.

John Dadge the Agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Neighbours lived at Manor Farm, objected to previous applications. Never consulted by previous owners of the land. New owners have consulted and worked closely with their neighbours.
- The residents at Manor Farm needed to protect their own house, to which the applicants had taken into account.
- Driving into village from nene way the development would enhance the views.
- The original plan to create two large houses would've been damaging to the village.
- Area of land outside village boundary, half of the existing barn was already outside the village envelope.
- Completely fresh proposal, high standards of insulation. Tall breeze block wall replaced by stone wall.

The Planning Committee and Environmental Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members were struggling to agree with the officers. Most members had seen this site, what was currently there was very grim. Can't see how this development was a step back from previous applications.
- The application would sit extremely well on the plot. Property was to be set well back and not diminish the view of Manor Farm. Previous application for two houses was approved, however this was an even better proposal. Application would provide a lovely view of the old manor house from approach to the village.
- Garden area that building was proposed for was a better use of the lan than the current outbuildings.
- Owners of the Manor House had shown their support.
- Proposed building is very large, but was a good distance from listed building and was of good design.
- Application had been considerably well thought out and consulted on by the owners.
- Parish councils support carried a lot of weight.
- There had been no objections made to this development and had the support of the village in total.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **APPROVE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations.

The application was not overbearing on the village envelope. The proposed developments size, mass, scale and proximity to the adjacent Sutton Conservation Area would preserve and enhance the setting of that Conservation Area.

5.2 17/01432/FUL - THORNEY GOLF CLUB, ENGLISH DRIVE, THORNEY, PETERBOROUGH

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to planning permission to change the use of the site to leisure land to allow the siting of 17no. holiday lodges and caravans. The use of land for the siting of such units would fall within Class C3 (residential dwellings) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) albeit the lodges/caravans are intended for holiday/leisure use and it is on this basis that the proposal has been considered (i.e. not unrestricted residential use).

The proposal also includes associated hardstanding, internal roads and the widening of the existing vehicular access onto English Drove.

The Development Management Manager introduced the report and update report. Policy PP18 had been applied to be consistent with the rural location which it would be in. Issues of archaeology and drainage were addressed through use of lodges. Although the proposal complied with PP18. The flood risk was in zone 3 which was the highest level of flooding. The applicant had demonstrated part of the sequential test, however the wider community benefits outweighing the flood risks, had not been demonstrated adequately.

John Bartlett, Parish Councillor for Thorney the Applicant addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- On two occasions the Parish Council had submitted comments, based on the comments in the report, it was agreed that the Parish Council endorsed the council's refusal of the application.
- If the application was successful the Parish Council would consider taking legal action.

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

- It was believed that the proposed lodges would be used for permanent use as the applicant's website had been offering them for sale 365 days a year.
- The website had been advertising the lodges since March 2017.
- There was a 60 mph speed limit on the road approaching the proposed development. In addition there had recently been a fatality near the site.
- Lodge residents would be unaware of the danger of not knowing the road and there was a higher likelihood of there being an accident.
- A previous, similar, application for a museum was refused.

- Support the golf course remaining, however there was no support for the sale of lodges.
- New website launched didn't offer explanation that the course was under new ownership.
- The applicant needed to explain how rental income was to subsidise the running of the golf course.
- Need to demonstrate long term future for golf. New plan should be submitted.

Neil Morgan, the applicant, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Officers had been presented with research from local lodges which were part of golf clubs.
- Other golf courses were able to charge reasonable rates and make an income from their lodges.
- Although other lodges were unable to provide detailed financial spreadsheets they had during discussions outlined the financial gain of having lodges at their golf clubs..
- The problem with Thorney Golf Club was that there were no finite figures, any figures given would be speculative and would only be based on how consumers would view the site.
- There were numerous factors that were not able to be predicted.
- Planning Officers had been given as much detail as possible.
- They were the experts in this field, although there was no formal business plan the figures provided would be enough for banks to grant business loans.
- There were a number of economic benefits, it was predicted that if the lodges sell the golf club would receive a £600k injection into the business from this sale.
- Had given accurate position to best of ability. Increased revenue to restaurant and shop.
- Need lodges to sustain golf course, not long term viable without supplementary income. Currently running at a loss.
- Flooding and soakaway, there is no flood risk and environmental agency has agreed that there is no flood risk.
- Only one incident of flooding in history in 1947, but this was only 2 inches. Flooding agency had said in writing that there is no flood risk.
- There was a proven business model so know there was a demand for this.
- Was a failing golf course and people would buy the lodges as an investment and this would impact positively on the local community.
- Thorney had been running at a substantial loss over the past year.
- 17 lodges would provide income and capital at the level that it needs to run at.
- There was a lot interest in the lodges being bought and the local course with a similar scheme were sold out.
- All figures given were in the planning statement, only amendment was the projected income, which had now increased to £475 p/w.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Robust business plan was the sticking point From what had been provided there was enough information to show the projected income raised by the sale of the lodges.
- It was deemed acceptable that it was reasonable to assume from the information provided that a business model was in place for the development.

- The purpose was to build a holiday letting plan and give a financial boost to the golf course.
- It was acceptable that the relevant information from the plan and from questioning that there was enough information and data provided to see how the proposal would work.
- Through the use of conditions there can be put in place ways to monitor the situation on site to ensure that people were not living in the lodges all year round.
- The applicants had provided everything that was needed to determine the viability of the project.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **APPROVE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 in favour, 1 against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions being delegated to officers.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations.

The application adequately demonstrates that the development proposed will support and sustain the existing and well-established Thorney Golf Club. Accordingly, it has been demonstrated that the proposal would result in an overriding wider sustainability benefit to the community that would outweigh the flood risks and the proposal meets the requirements of the exceptions test. On this basis, the proposal is satisfied in terms of Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and paragraphs 102 and 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

5.3 17/01833/FUL - 22 TOPHAM CRESCENT, THORNEY, PETERBOROUGH.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to seeking approval for the erection of a two bedroom bungalow with independent access and parking provision for at least 2 vehicles.

The red outline of the application site has increased since the initial submission and the garage has been deleted. Re-consultation had been undertaken.

The Principal Development Management Officer introduced the report and update report.

Jim and Patricia Caudle, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The bungalow had a generous frontage, a small garden to the rear on the left and a large side garden to the right. The large side garden had always been screened from view by a brick wall between the bungalow and the right hand boundary with No 24 until it was cut through the wall and demolished the left part of it this year in order to gain access to clear the land behind.
- There had been evidence that the area had been infested by vermin. It then took many weeks of work to clear the outbuildings.

- There had been no objections raised by the highways department to the proposals
- There had been no objections from any neighbours.
- The property was now locked with too much land that will be very difficult to sell.
- The applicant wished to build another high quality small bungalow and provide a much needed home for another retired couple which would be in line with government policy.
- Almost all the buildings nearby are bungalows occupied mostly by retired couples.
- The bungalow itself was in a very poor state having had virtually no work done since it was built.
- Welcomed any further suggestions from planning officers, especially in relation to the fences at the front of the property.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Difficult with the house was that it overlooked properties to the front and side. In order to overcome boundary fence, if lowered the fence it would be in keeping with the street scene, however the property would then overlook neighbouring properties.
- Appreciate traffic concerns, however they are looking to build a detached house, in quiet residential road of bungalows.
- Wouldn't be out of keeping with the local area.
- The wall at the front would be better in keeping with the local area by having a smaller wall.

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **APPROVE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions being delegated to officers.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations. In addition the Lower boundary treatment/wall to frontage is to be secured by condition.

The positioning of the dwelling with its close relationship with the host dwelling at number 22 Topham Crescent and to the neighbouring property at no. 24 Topham Crescent, including the erection of a 1.8m high fence, would not result in a contrived development within this location. Hence the proposal would be conform to policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

5.4 17/01785/FUL - LAZYACRE WERRINGTON BRIDGE ROAD, MILKING NOOK, PETERBOROUGH.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to The application is a revised scheme following two former refusals for a day room ref. 16/00348/FUL (also dismissed at appeal) and ref. 15/00971/FUL (refused by members of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee on 27.10.2015).

The application under consideration is as follows:

- Addition of 4 pitches/caravans (8 in total)
- Erection of a day room. The building would have a square footprint 9.6m x 9.9m with a hipped roof to a maximum height of 4m

The proposal is for an increase in the number of caravans for one extended family to cater for the family's children and grandchildren and comprises an increase in the overall site area.

The Development Management Manager introduced the report and update report.

Barry Nicholls, the agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Worked with planning officers to work towards a solution for the family on this site.
- Used inspector's comments to justify the dayroom and reduce impact on the local area.
- Family are known and a part of the community and the local community are very supportive of the family and this development.
- Want the utility room to remain and not be demolished. However would accept officers recommendation to demolish the utility room.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- In officers view not acceptable to have both, previous decisions refusing the keeping of the additional dwelling.
- Officers had taken a pragmatic view to this application and not keeping the old utility block.
- The residents would use their caravans primarily instead of any additional day unit
- Local Parish Councils objections seem vague and haven't come to explain objections.

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimous) to **GRANT** planning permission.

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:

- This is an existing Gypsy and Traveller site and therefore the principle of development is already established;
- The increase in number of pitches/caravans from 4 to 8 would not materially change the character of the site;
- The consent would be personal to the applicant due to the need of additional caravans for his extended family;

- The dayroom would not have an independent residential use;
- The site is substantially enclosed by hedgerow and boundary fencing and therefore it would be satisfactorily screened from views outside of the site;
- The proposed day room would be visible above the boundary, however, such views would not unduly impact on the character and appearance of the open countryside.
- The proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact on the adjacent highway; and
- The site would not adversely impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

Hence the proposal accords with policies CS9 and CS20 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policies PP2, PP3 and PP12 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Chairman
1.30pm – 4.18pm

This page is intentionally left blank