

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 3 JULY 2018  
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** (Chairman) Harper, (Vice-Chair) Casey, Councillors, Brown, Joseph, Jamil, Hiller, Bond, Stokes and Serluca

**Officers Present:** Nick Harding, Head of Planning  
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor  
Simon Ireland, Head of PCC Highways  
Louise Simmonds, Principal Development Management Officer

**Others Present:**

**6. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Shaz Nawaz and Amjad Iqbal. Councillors Jamil and Joseph attended as substitutes.

**7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None were received.

**8. MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTENTION TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS AS WARD COUNCILLOR**

None were received.

**9. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 12 JUNE 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

The Chair proposed and it was accepted to move items 7.1 and 7.2 before items 5 and 6.

**10.1 18/00377/REM - LAND TO THE WEST UFFINGTON ROAD, BARNACK, STAMFORD**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to a Planning application seeking reserved matters consent relating to appearance, access, landscaping, layout and scale for 80 dwellings and associated parking, internal access roads and public open space pursuant to outline planning permission 15/01840/OUT which was allowed on appeal.

The Head of Planning introduced the report and update report. The Committee were also being asked to consider if they agreed in principal with a proposed pedestrian / cycle link to access the development via Bainton Road (this would have to subsequently come forward in the form of a planning application). A Management Company would be created to manage the drainage areas as well as the upkeep of the open spaces and roads. The houses were to be built using mock Collyweston slate on the roofs. The number of affordable housing units complied with the regulations and which had been set down in the planning application. The Committee were informed of any additional recommendation to delegate authority to the Head of Planning to receive revised drawings and a revised Landscape Management Plan to address the comments of the City Council's Wildlife Officer and amend any conditions which refer to drawing/document revisions which become superseded by this, ahead of issuing the decision.

Cllr David Over, Ward Councillor, and Parish Councillor Harry Brassey, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- This was a rural setting not a suburban environment. Little evidence to show that this development took into consideration that this was a rural setting.
- The play area was an important part of the development, rather than having area for 5-6 year olds this could potentially lead to an area for 15-16 year olds which could lead to issues in the future. A better solution would be the creation of a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) and this should be done in consultation with the Parish Council.
- The drainage area was a big concern and could in effect be quite dangerous as this was an issue in the area.
- There needed to be more visitor parking than what was currently suggested.
- There needed to be wider footpaths within the development, there were currently some footpaths in the village that were only 18 inches wide which was inadequate.
- It was important that issues such as mobile networks and broadband were looked at.
- Peterborough was earmarked as an environmental friendly city, there were no plans for solar panels, which would be of additional benefit.
- Disappointed that Linden homes drawn up plan with little thought to making it an attractive addition to the village.
- The Applicant had tried to squeeze in 80 homes as cheaply as possible with little regard to Peterborough Planning Policy DP2012, especially in relation to design quality which would not improve the character of the village. This development does not add positively to the local environment.
- The stone brickwork on the perimeter was welcomed however there needs to be a change to the type of slate work that was proposed.
- The number of affordable houses was welcomed and it was hoped that this would be enforced.
- There had been no opportunity yet to comment on the construction management plan and the drainage and flood alleviation plan, or the lighting plan.

- It was sought that conditions be imposed on the plans, namely that the residents of Paynes Field be consulted before any work was done to the boundary fence and that any damage made to the planting was made good. In addition lamp posts needed to be appropriate in style.
- It was anticipated that consultation would be sought from the Parish Council over the equipment to be used in the local play area.
- Dog waste and litter bins should be provided across the development to prevent any littering.
- The five visitor bays were not adequate for the size of the development, especially as this was a rural area with limited bus services.
- If an additional access way was created onto Bainton road the Parish Council would request that a gate be installed to stop children running onto the road. In addition cycling should be prohibited.
- It was important that the Committee took note of Peterborough Planning Policy DPD2012 PP03 and the impact of new developments. This made it clear that developments should be granted if there was an issue of loss of privacy as for example no 23 Paynes Field was to be overlooked by five new houses.

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

- Due to the lack of consultation the application should be delayed. The views in previous consultations had not been properly articulated. Linden homes had submitted what they wanted to hear.
- There had been limited advice from Planning Officer and response had not been forthcoming.
- There was a spacing issue as there was a close proximity of homes that would be overlooked, causing severe loss of privacy.
- It would be more in keeping with the village if all the houses built used stone instead of buff brick.

Michael Baumber, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Objection was linked to the comments made by the Parish Council around the need for consultation before the work was due to start.
- At present there was a post and wire fence and planting in the fence had grown on each side. Residents were seeking assurances that this would not be disturbed or damaged.

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

- Outline planning permission was granted in March last year for residential development of 80 dwellings. Of these 30% were earmarked for affordable homes.

- The applicants had met with the Parish council twice and had meetings with local residents.
- No objections had been raised by highways, wildlife, trees, ecological or strategic housing officers. Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England were also content with the development.
- An additional condition around extra screening was being dealt with.
- The applicants believed that the application fully complied with the relevant planning conditions and made provision for housing to meet the future needs of residents.
- The design was deemed sufficiently sympathetic to the site and the surrounding areas.
- The proposal provided the correct levels of parking for both visitors and residents.
- There was 1.7Ha of open space provided within the scheme and this more than complied with relevant policies.
- Approval was to secure around £650 000 of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and £27 500 towards mitigating the impact of development on the hills and holes.
- The applicant would be happy to meet with the Parish Council to look at options for the play area.
- The width of the footpath through the main spine of the scheme were to be 2m wide. The other area would be a shared surface area whereby no-one would have priority. Pedestrians were to have the same priority as vehicles.
- The applicant was willing to meet any local residents to discuss the condition of their planting and to ascertain their specific needs and would meet with residents on an individual basis.
- No buffer fencing was proposed as the development would go up to the legal boundary.

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

- In terms of planting it was a material consideration and could be included in the conditions, however there had to be an element of caution over enforcement.
- In terms of banning bikes as the roads and pathways were going to be private the planning team wouldn't have the ability to control how they were used.
- The shared surface design was endorsed by government policy and followed the advice given by the Highways Agency.
- The shared surface granted pedestrians and vehicles equal priority.
- The garage spaces provided complied with the minimal internal space measurements.
- The development layout was satisfactory and it was explained why the development was so close up against the eastern boundary.
- It was important that the residents on the Western boundary were consulted over their planting needs and treatments.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1 The Planning and Environment Protection Committee considered the addition of an additional access way to Bainton Road. A motion was proposed and seconded to

**AGREE to the principal of having a cycle / pedestrian link to Binton Road** (10 for, 1 abstain)

**RESOLVED:**

2. 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** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

**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 density of the development has previously been found acceptable and is therefore not a matter which can be re-considered at this time;
- the proposal would make adequate provision for a range of housing that would meet the future needs of residents and accords with the requirements of condition C18 of the parent outline planning permission. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CS8 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and emerging Policy LP08 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the layout and design of the development would not result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;
- the proposal would provide adequate parking to meet the needs of the development, and would ensure safe access for all users, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the level of public open space proposed is acceptable and accords with the provisions of condition C 17 of the parent outline permission. It would also afford future occupants with an acceptable level of amenity as well as achieving the required ecological mitigation/enhancements, in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP3, PP4 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policies LP17 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the proposal would not result in an unacceptable degree of harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;
- the proposed development would afford future occupants with an acceptable level of amenity, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD

(2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;

- additional planting to the western boundary would ensure that the setting of the Barnack Conservation Area was preserved, in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time; and adequate protection would be afforded to existing trees of amenity value to the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time.

## **10.2 18/00766/FUL - CORBAR FIRST DRIFT, WOTHORPE, STAMFORD**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to the approval for the erection of a one and a half storey detached 4 bed dwelling with integral double garage to be located at the far rear of the site. A new access would be created off First Drift.

The Head of Planning updated the Committee on the proposal.

Rena Russell, Parish Councillor addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Lived in Wothorpe for many years and had seen a number of changes. There had been strong support from the local community over the proposal. Believe it was testament to the environment that the application goes ahead. Previous applications had been approved for larger dwelling.
- The application would have a minimal impact on Wothorpe and the site in comparison to proposed application that was granted previously.
- The development conformed to all other requirements that had been imposed by planning legislation.
- Although this was back land development the impact was minimal to the surrounding area and enhanced the local area.

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

- Recent developments within applicant's private life led them to alter the proposed development. This application was non-intrusive, had ample amounts of light and space and did not affect any neighbours.
- Showed plans to neighbours and parish council of whom were all very supportive. The previous bungalow application was more detrimental to the street view and would spoil the character of wothorpe
- Residents were surprised at the refusal of permission, they were not against this development as it would not harm the character of Wothorpe.

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

- Although it was important to stop back land development, this application did not harm the area or the village of Wothorpe and it was noted that there were some long standing buildings nearby set nearly as deep back from the road frontage .
- It was encouraging that the owners were community orientated and that they had spoken to people to see if they would accept the application.
- The development proposed was better than what had been proposed previously. There had been no neighbour objections and the Parish Council were behind the application.
- The planning application would not be as damaging to the local street scene compared to the extant planning permission for a dwelling to the front and it was not reasonable to object to the application. Councillor Casey

**RESOLVED:**

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

**11. PETERBOROUGH STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to the Peterborough Statement of Community Involvement. The updated statement set out how the Council consulted the public in relation to planning documents. This updated the previous statement that was adopted in 2015. The statement of community involvement had to, by law, be updated every five years. The amendments to the updated document were primarily aimed at addressing the process of producing neighbourhood plans. The changes in the updated document were thought not to be overly onerous, but maintain the high standards as set out in the previous iteration.

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

- The document was robust and easy to understand. It was about the communities that members represent. This was a responsible document for the City Council to adopt.
- The changes laid out were straightforward and well written. This was a clear improvement on the existing document. This in turn enabled members of the public to understand more fully the document.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Planning and Environment Protection Committee endorse the statement of community involvement to Cabinet for approval.

**12. APPROVAL OF DRAFT UPDATED REG 123 LIST AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY SUPPORTING POLICY**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Regulation 123 list. This provided greater clarity for what infrastructure the Council may seek to fund through CIL and what infrastructure will be delivered through other planning obligations. The process of amending the CIL charging schedule was lengthy. The amount that could be charged would be adjusted in line with the uplift in inflation.

The local planning authority could include as much or as little on list, there were changes proposed to remove outdated information and make it easier to read.

The net effect of changes, may result in more contributions for certain pieces of infrastructure that were being planned.

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

- The updated regulation 123 list showed the types of infrastructure that the city required.
- It was only in exceptional circumstances that relief could be obtained and could allow for specific constraints where viability would be difficult to achieve.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee endorse the draft set of Community Infrastructure Levy Supporting Policies Document including a revised Reg 123 List and recommends that Cabinet adopts them.

### **13. ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE SHARED PLANNING SERVICE WITH FENLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to the shared agreement with Fenland District Council. This had already been presented to scrutiny at Fenland. The agreement had been in operation since 2015, it was important to note that this was not a full shared service, but a more light touch approach.

There was now a full complement of staff in the Technical Administration Team and so performance was improving.. Applications received in PCC had climbed over the past year. The fee income target had just been missed.

Lot of income came from just a few large scale developments. Performance had been maintained consistent across the teams. There had been a slight drop in the number of appeals.

The enforcement case closure rate had fallen off during the course of the year, this was mainly due to the fact that two people had been off long term sick.

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

- The service had been running well over the past two and a half years. The department were now back on track following recruitment.
- The scrutiny committee at Fenland had also acknowledged and agreed that the service had been running well.
- It was hoped that the service would continue to grow and expand.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Planning and Environment Protection Committee noted the report.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 3.26pm

This page is intentionally left blank