

Application Ref: 18/00491/R3FUL

Proposal: Conversion of B1 office block (excluding ground and first floor of Public House) to 43 residential flats, including roof top extension; and alterations to existing elevations through insertion/amendment of windows and cladding

Site: Bretton Court, Rightwell East, Bretton, Peterborough

Applicant: Mr Gary Clarke
Medesham Homes

Agent: Mr Leonardo Mattioli
Capital PCC

Referred by: Head of Planning Services

Reason: This is a City Council application

Site visit: 10.07.2018

Case officer: Nick Harding

Telephone No.: 01733 454441

E-Mail: nicholas.harding@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

Site and surroundings

The application site is located on Flaxland, within the Bretton District Centre and lies to the east of the Bretton Shopping Centre car park. Bretton court is a part 4 storey and part 3 storey building with commercial occupiers at ground floor and office on the upper floors. The upper floors are now vacant. The building was constructed in the early/mid 1970's. At the south corner of the building there is a Public House, (The Roundhead), which occupies 2 floors, ground and first floor, which has been vacant for at least the last 8 years. Elsewhere the ground floor of the building is currently leased out as shops and offices and the roof, on the third floor, also has a number of leases for mobile phone and telecommunication equipment on it. This development intends to retain the commercial units on the ground floor and the telecommunications equipment on the roof.

To the rear of the site is a Health Centre, to the north is the Aldi supermarket and to the south is Stirling House, an office building. The immediate surrounding character is predominantly commercial.

Proposal

The application seeks approval for the conversion of the upper floors from offices (B1) to residential (C3) and the addition of a 3rd floor above the southern element of the building which currently has 2 upper floors resulting in the entire building being 4 storeys.

The Council owns all the (predominantly) hard landscaped area at the rear of the block, which would be used for future refuse collection points and cycle stores serving this conversion. Some external works are required including the removal of a wall and re-surfacing to allow for the manoeuvring of refuse vehicles.

The proposal would provide 43 no. apartments comprising 30 no. 1-bed, 11 no. 2-bed and 2 no. 3 bed however may initially be used for temporary accommodation for homeless people.

2 Planning History

No relevant planning history

3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

Section 12 Achieving well-designed places

Decisions should ensure that development will function well and add to the overall quality of the area over the life time of the development, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout, appropriate and effective landscaping, are sympathetic to the local character and history, establish or maintain a strong sense of place, optimise the potential of the site, create places which are safe, inclusive and accessible.

Para. 130 Poor Design

Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an areas and the way it functions. Conversely where the design accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision marker as a valid reason to object to development. Local Authorities should seek to ensure that the quality of the development approved is not materially diminished between permission and completion.

Section 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Para 180 Pollution. New development should be appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment. In doing so they should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life, identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and limit the impact of light pollution from artificial lighting on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside

The location/ scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Development in the countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

CS02 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

Provision will be made for an additional 25 500 dwellings from April 2009 to March 2026 in strategic areas/allocations.

CS08 - Meeting Housing Needs

Promotes a mix of housing the provision of 30% affordable on sites of 15 or more dwellings (70% social rented and 30% intermediate housing), 20% life time homes and 2% wheelchair housing.

CS14 - Transport

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

CS22 - Flood Risk

Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted if specific criteria are met. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

PP02 - Design Quality

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

PP03 - Impacts of New Development

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

PP04 - Amenity Provision in New Residential Development

Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

PP13 - Parking Standards

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Examination Stage)

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan took place in January and February 2018. The Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 26 March 2018 and is now at examination stage.

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in an emerging plan according to:-

- the stage of the Plan (the more advanced the plan, the more weight which can be given)
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the policies
- the degree of consistency between emerging policies and the framework.

The policies can be used alongside adopted policies in the decision making process, especially where the plan contains new policies. The amount of weight to be given to the emerging plan policies is a matter for the decision maker. At this final stage the weight to be given to the emerging plan is more substantial than at the earlier stages although the 'starting point' for decision making remains the adopted Local Plan.

LP01 - Sustainable Development and Creation of the UK's Environment Capital

The council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework. It will seek to approve development wherever possible and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area and in turn helps Peterborough create the UK's Environment Capital.

LP02 - The Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside

The location/scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Proposals within village envelopes will be supported in principle, subject to them being of an appropriate scale. Development in the open countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

LP03 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

Provision will be made for an additional 21,315 dwellings from April 2016 to March 2036 in the urban area, strategic areas/allocations.

LP08 - Meeting Housing Needs

LP8a) Housing Mix/Affordable Housing - Promotes a mix of housing, the provision of 30% affordable on sites of 15 or more dwellings, housing for older people, the provision of housing to meet the needs of the most vulnerable, and dwellings with higher access standards

LP13 - Transport

LP13a) New development should ensure that appropriate provision is made for the transport needs that it will create including reducing the need to travel by car, prioritisation of bus use, improved walking and cycling routes and facilities.

LP13b) The Transport Implications of Development- Permission will only be granted where appropriate provision has been made for safe access for all user groups and subject to appropriate mitigation.

LP13c) Parking Standards- permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Development proposals would contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area. They should make effective and efficient use of land and buildings, be durable and flexible, use appropriate high quality materials, maximise pedestrian permeability and legibility, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, and be accessible to all.

LP17 - Amenity Provision

LP17a) Part A Amenity of Existing Occupiers- Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

LP17b) Part B Amenity of Future Occupiers- Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Peterborough Highways Services – Objects. To accord with PCC DPD PP13 for a C3 dwelling, 56 allocated off highway parking spaces are required with 10 unallocated visitor parking spaces. The LHA is minded that nearby private parking is available however we would comment that this is time limited, which maybe suitable to apportion some of the visitor parking requirement to. The applicant is not proposing any allocated parking for the residential dwellings.

The applicant has indicated 2 external areas for the parking of cycles but has not specified how many spaces they are to provide. To accord with PCC DPD PP13 which requires 1 space per bedroom, 56 spaces should be provided in a secure covered shelter.

The applicant has indicated that a secure area is proposed to be formed to the rear of Stair A for the storage of residential waste and cycle storage, however within this area is a rear customer access to a retail unit (BetFred) so it could not be a secure area if it was accessible by the general public.

The applicant has not explained how the existing retail users on the Ground Floor of the building will continue to gain access for their servicing vehicles and refuse collection points, as some existing service doors access into the secure residential areas (Flaxland to the front of the building is a Bus Only way)

Recommends refusal as the development would not provide adequate parking facilities within the curtilage of the site for the parking of cars and cycles; the proposal is therefore contrary to policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Lead Local Drainage Authority – No objections. As it stands, we have no objections to the proposed development. However we would require details of the proposed bin store drainage, which can be provided now or by way of condition.

PCC Pollution Team – No objections - The conclusions of the noise impact assessment are acceptable to this section. Construction work should not begin until a scheme for protecting the proposed noise sensitive development from noise has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority; all works which form part of the scheme should be completed before any part of the noise sensitive development is occupied.

Waste Management - No concern in connection with waste services and provision. Will require confirmation of access by a waste collection vehicle which will need to access over third party land.

PCC Tree Officer – No objection. There are two Rowan which have been identified for retention. Otherwise there is no vegetation of value on the application site. It is noted that there are trees surrounding the site therefore the protection of trees from accidental damage e.g. from construction compound/welfare facilities in close proximity must be considered. There is no objection to the proposal. It is recommended that a Tree Protection Plan is produced to protect the onsite trees and those immediately adjacent to the site. This can be secured by way of condition.

PCC Property Services - No objection to proposal. Confirmation will need to be sought as to the access to the telecoms masts on roof. There is currently a door and access ladder.

PCC Strategic Housing - 30% of the units should be affordable units - 13. The mix is supported. We would expect to see 70 % affordable rented and 30 intermediate. 20% of the units should meet lifetime homes. The developer should approach the city council for funding.

PCC Lifetime Homes - No comments received

Anglian Water Services Ltd - The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Flag Fen Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We will then advise them of the most suitable point of connection.

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable. No evidence has been provided to show that the surface water hierarchy has been followed as stipulated in Building Regulations Part H. This encompasses the trial pit logs from the infiltration tests and the

investigations in to discharging to a watercourse. If these methods are deemed to be unfeasible for the site, we require confirmation of the intended manhole connection point and discharge rate proposed before a connection to the public surface water sewer is permitted. We would therefore recommend that the applicant needs to consult with Anglian Water and the Environment Agency. Recommends Surface Water Management condition.

Peterborough Cycling Forum - No comments received

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service - No comments received

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) - Supports application as it will bring the building back into use and provide emergency accommodation for vulnerable people. There is no mention of security in the design and access statement. An access control system should be provided. There is no mention of security gates at the rear.

Bretton Parish Council - The following concerns have been raised:

- There is no provision for car parking and we believe that the applicant's two presumptions are dangerous to the future viability of their scheme, in that the residents at no time will want cars, and that at the same time there is parking available if they do want it. We say this because the original offices had rights to the car park at the rear. But the building has not been occupied for years and in that time Bretton Centre was re-developed and Sainsbury's have stopped the use of their car park for general centre parking. The car park at the rear has now been used for general parking in recent times.
- We believe that the allocations of bins are totally inadequate and more are needed.
- We hope the bollards that will be put in will not stop access to the Health Centre and that cars and the disabled will still be able to get through
- There does not seem to be accommodation for a caretaker. Is he or she going to be living on site?
- This development is considered Sheltered Housing and as such provision is required for the welfare of the residents in the premises. Does this mean that 1 of the 2 part time workers will be employed either as a warden or caretaker?
- Has consideration been given to the possible purchase of the entire building which would ensure a cohesive development?
- There appear to be telephone masts on the roof of the building. How is access to the roof obtained?
- Is there any provision being made for the storage of the existing trade bins?
- We have concerns that the cladding will be fire retardant. What steps are being made to ensure they are?

Further comments following re-consultation

We still have several issues and until they are resolved we object to this planning application. We agree to the idea of creating temporary accommodation at this location, however, until amendments have been made to the plans we are unable to fully agree to them.

Our objections are as follows:

- Upon consideration of the first plan we asked whether the development was sheltered housing. This question was posed to the developer and the reply was "no this is not sheltered housing". With all due respect this is complete nonsense as the planning application clearly states that this renovation is for sheltered housing. In this case it seems that the response from the developer is inconsistent with the application they have put forward.
- If this development is sheltered housing, there is no provision for car parking. We would anticipate that a warden will need to be in attendance and on site, this would require a parking space which has not been allocated within the plans.

- If this development is not for sheltered accommodation, then there is no provision for resident's car parking at all. As per Appendix V of the Peterborough Local Plan there should be an allocation of one parking space per dwelling.
- It is anticipated that there will be families living in this development, there is no provision for storing pushchairs and items associated with having a young family in this development.
- We are pleased that additional cycle spaces will be allocated, however, we are concerned about where they will be situated. It is a concern that the cycle shelter may obstruct the emergency access routes. It is noted that the bins are also situated within this area.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 151

Total number of responses: 2

Total number of objections: 2

Total number in support: 0

2 letters have been received from neighbouring occupiers raising the following issues:

- The shared-use path near to the front of the site is not wide enough for a buggy/wheelchair and there is no path of the opposite side.
- Improvements are needed to the pedestrian/cycle/motor vehicle interactions in the area close to the front of Rightwell House.
- There are many desire lines pedestrian and cycle crossings of the bus/cycle/pedestrian-only street which links Rightwell with Flaxland. Its straight through aspect for buses and cycles gives the impression that the vehicles have priority, and motor vehicle speeds are sometimes rather high, even where sightlines are poor. It nevertheless tends to operate as a "shared-space" area where all users generally look out for others.
- The developer should at the least be required to create a distinctly coloured or textured surface to link the sides of the two crossings which have textured paving and dropped kerbs, and are close to the entrances to Rightwell House. These crossings will be of use both to the future residents of the building and to the public at large. They will also remind drivers and cyclists of their need to give way to pedestrians. Ideally the surface should be of red blockwork, or at a minimum red resin to overlay the existing patched tarmac.
- The more northerly crossing is exactly opposite the northern entrance of the building, and the southerly crossing (which includes a cycle approach on its western side) is opposite Betfred, adjacent to Rightwell House's southern entrance.
- A further comment is that the pedestrian and cycle approach from the south, to the bus-only link, is poorly laid out at its junction with the entrance to the car parking of the pub, health centre and an office block. An appropriate change to the raised planting bed which restricts the pedestrian footway would be a great improvement, and reduce the frequent diagonal crossing of the junction by pedestrians. It would also support the use of the crossings described above.
- The site, and the car parking behind it, have been an eyesore for some 10 years, and I welcome their redevelopment.
- The exterior design proposals are too "loud" for this suburban site. They are architecturally incoherent, neither complementing nor matching the existing exterior walls which would remain unaltered. In no way do they sit well with other surrounding buildings either.
- Air conditioning and exterior appearance: the existing building proved to require large and unsightly addition of air ducts and air conditioning units on the roof. The elevations and visualisations show these as removed - thank goodness! No explanation is given as to why the proposals will not require air conditioning. I object to the application as it provides no explanation for this.
- Our Environment Capital City presumably demands high sustainability standards for its developments. It would be wrong for any new development to be approved unless it were certain that energy consuming equipment would later be added.
- The existing office floors have toilets etc adjacent to the two staircases, with the foul water

piped down to existing sewage drains. The proposed flats have bathrooms distributed along the whole plan, which will require their waste be piped horizontally, at floor level, to reach the existing drains. Even if practical this would occupy space in many flats, and would be most undesirable to their occupants. Without an appropriate explanation I object to this aspect of the proposal.

- The applicant, who owns part or all of the car parking to the building's rear, must be required to take responsibility for it. At present the markings are worn out, various spaces are blocked by overgrown vegetation, and fly tipping has been present for a long time.
- Vehicle parking proposals: The applicant rightly states that Bretton Centre is a hub for walking, cycling and bus services, but this is an insufficient reason for not providing car parking for the residents and their visitors. While it may be true that any homeless families for which the flats might be used are likely to have low car ownership, the flats would be an attractive renting proposition for ordinary families, indeed compared with flats in London would be spacious and economical. There is every reason to suppose that they would have similar car ownership to the residents of my own street, where parking is a problem.
- As an occasional transport activist I find the proposal that the flats should be "car-free" an attractive one. It is however entirely unrealistic without enforcement as part of a "green transport plan".
- The proposed provision of 22 cycle parking spaces at each staircases is unlikely to be sufficient, given the special location of the site, and would certainly not be so if "car-free" residence were enforced.
- Though details of the cycle parking are not given, the 10 stands (presumably 20 cycles) shown at the northern staircase don't match the claimed 22 spaces.
- It is important that the cycle parking provided should be secure and easy to use. It is important that the northern doors should be easy to open while pushing a cycle, eg powered doors. It is equally important that the exterior cycle parking proposed for the other staircase should be easy to access but entirely secure.
- For use either as flats or emergency accommodation for homeless families it is essential that proper security arrangements are in place, including on-site management staff in the case of emergency, temporary residence. This needs to be spelled out and should be required of the applicant.

Stirling House

- Generally supportive of the application and refurbishment of Bretton Centre
- We note the intention to replace the existing precast concrete panels, the details of which we understand will be made available at full planning application stage.
- The addition of a fourth floor will create a more symmetrical roof line to the structure.
- The proposal would transform this dated, dull & rather ugly building for the better.
- Concerned that the Roundhead is not included in the proposals & therefore, it seems it is likely it will continue to remain an eyesore & 'a blot on the landscape' for many years to come.
- The City Council should make every possible effort at this time to either purchase the Roundhead or take on the Lease which has been advertised for many years with, obviously, little or no interest from prospective tenants. Additional flats could then be included in the overall proposal &, at the same time, control the use of this part of Bretton Court as, clearly, the Council is extremely concerned about the potential noise level & overall disturbance if indeed its use reverted to an active Public House.
- If neither of these options are possible we would request that the Council take all measures in their power to enforce the Owner to improve this element of Bretton Court to bring it into keeping with other properties in Bretton Centre.
- As owners of Stirling House we have for far too long had to endure overgrown landscaping, graffiti, boarded up & broken windows together with a likely rat & pigeon infested interior greatly detracts from the remainder of this refurbished part of Bretton.
- This privately owned employer, has carried out its business from this office since 1972 enjoying the highs & tolerating the lows in the fortunes of this Peterborough Township.
- The recent refurbishments in & around the Centre, now to be extended by the current

proposals for Bretton Court, have generated an atmosphere of improved optimism for the Centre. But to leave the Roundhead as it is, semi if not totally derelict, would be to 'spoil the ship for a ha'peth of tar.' Every effort you could take to avoid this situation would be greatly appreciated.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

a) The Principle of Development

The application site is currently in sole commercial use with shops, etc. at ground floor and offices above and the public house occupying the southern end of the building at ground floor and first floor. The principle of the conversion of the existing upper floors to residential is supported and indeed under Schedule 2, Part 3 Class O of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015, the conversion is permitted development subject to the transport and highway impact, risk of contamination, risk of flooding and amenity provision of the future occupiers is satisfied. For the conversion of the existing building the applicant could have applied to the Local Planning Authority as to whether prior approval would have been required for the conversion, however as the proposal seeks permission to add an additional floor to part of the building and changes to the facades of the building a full planning application is required.

The site is located within the Bretton District Centre; a sustainable location and close to services and facilities which would meet the needs of the future occupants.

The principle of the development would accord with policy CS2 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and is therefore acceptable subject to meeting the requirements of other relevant planning policy and material considerations.

b) Highway implications

The site is situated within Bretton District Centre which is considered to be a sustainable location in terms of access to facilities and services as well as being served by a good public transport service.

No car parking would be available to serve the development and whilst there is a car park located to the rear of the site this is not under the control of the applicant.

It is understood that the office was served by off site parking but that this is no longer associated with the existing office building. Under policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD the office building would require one space per 30m² of floor space. This would equate to 87 parking spaces. In accordance with the parking standards the proposed scheme would require 56 car parking spaces; one space per one bed flat and two spaces per two bed flat. 10 unallocated visitor parking spaces would also be required to comply with the parking standards.

The Local Highways Authority recommends refusal of the scheme as the development would not provide adequate parking facilities and is contrary to policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

It is considered that there would be a lesser demand for parking as a result of the conversion of the office building and the additional floor space for residential than would be the case for the existing use. It should be noted that the existing building could be reoccupied as an office at any time, with no parking provision. It is therefore considered unreasonable to refuse the application on the grounds of a lack of parking provision.

The adjacent Bretton Centre Car Park would not be available for use long term by the occupiers of the building whether as an office or as residential as the use of the car park is time limited for up to 4 hours and this is controlled by an ANPR system. However the car park could potentially be used for visitors.

The applicant has indicated on the plans the provision for cycle parking. The plans have been amended since the initial submission relocation cycle parking from the lobby area to staircase B to an area to the rear of the building. The original location would be not appropriate and would have restricted access to and from the building in the event of a fire/emergency. In accordance with the parking standards the development should provide one cycle parking space per bedroom; 56 spaces. This however, is considered to be an over provision of cycle parking and one space per flat would be reasonable. This level of provision along with the details of the shelters would be secured by condition.

The proposal would provide much needed short term housing and is in a location which is sustainable with local services and facilities to meet the residential needs of the future occupiers of the development and which is served by a frequent bus service. On balance it is considered that the lack of car parking provision is outweighed by the overwhelming need to provide housing for the city, particularly affordable housing.

The LHA has raised concern regarding the servicing of the retail/commercial units on the ground floor, for example where the waste collection points would be located. A revised plan has been submitted which has identified the location of the commercial refuse bins.

A tracking plan has been submitted which demonstrates that a refuse collection vehicle can enter the site and leave in forward gear. The Waste Management Section raises no objection to the proposal subject to the applicant confirming that that the vehicle could cross third party land.

Refuse bins would be located in the lobby areas. The applicant has confirmed that the bins would be moved outside to the collection point on the collection day by a visiting caretaker.

The Parish Council has raised concern regarding the location of the cycle shelter and refuse bins which they consider may obstruct the emergency access routes. The revised plans indicate where the commercial refuse bins would be located and it is not considered that access would be obstructed.

It has also been confirmed by the applicant that the proposed bollards to the rear of the site will not prevent access to the Health Centre and that cars and the disabled will still be able to get through.

The proposal would not unduly impact upon the adjacent highway and a safe and convenient access can be achieved. Hence the proposal would accord with policy PP12 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Comments have been received regarding the roads/footpaths in close proximity to the site. It is stated that the shared-use path near to the front of the site is not wide enough for a buggy/wheelchair and there is no path of the opposite side. It is suggested that improvements are made to the pedestrian/cycle/motor vehicle interactions in the area close to the front of Rightwell House for example, there should be a distinctly coloured or textured surface to link the sides of the two crossings which have textured paving and dropped kerbs, and are close to the entrances to Rightwell House. It is argued that these crossings will be of use both to the future residents of the building and to the public at large. They will also remind drivers and cyclists of their need to give way to pedestrians.

A further comment is made regarding the pedestrian and cycle approach from the south, to the bus-only link, which is poorly laid out at its junction with the entrance to the car parking of the pub, health centre and an office block. It is suggested that a change to the raised planting bed which restricts the pedestrian footway would be a great improvement, and reduce the frequent diagonal crossing of the junction by pedestrians.

Whilst it is accepted that these changes would improve the footway network near to the site; this is an existing building and the works are not deemed to be reasonably related to the development per se and are not needed in order to make the proposal acceptable. It should be noted that PCC

Highways has not identified the need for these enhancements.

c) Visual Amenity

The project involves work to an existing building, originally believed to be a 'Clasp Mk 5 prefabricated' building constructed in the 1970's. It is proposed to cover/replace the external fabric of the building with silicon insulated external render. The facing material would sit 60mm outward from the face of the existing façade, making the envelope of the building slightly bigger. The concrete panels would be retained where possible and a change of fenestration design; essentially filling in some of the large areas of glazing associated with the office use resulting in a more residential/domestic appearance. The colour of the render would be white with blue detailing. The windows will be aluminium faced timber windows, designed to allow cleaning from the inside. The details would be secured by condition.

The Parish Council questioned the cladding/render material and whether this material would be fire retardant given the recent issues with the cladding of buildings. The applicant has confirmed that the material would meet Building Regulations requirements and would be of appropriate fire retardant standards.

The appearance of the ground floor of the building, including the part occupied by the Roundhead public house would be unchanged.

It is proposed that the new façade design, with fragmented horizontal lines, acknowledges the original design of the building but also deconstructs it, providing a domestic identity.

A neighbouring occupier has raised objections to the exterior design of the building stating that this is too "loud" for this suburban site and that they would not complement or match the exterior walls which would remain unaltered. It is considered that the existing concrete clad building is not of any aesthetic benefit to the area and whilst it is accepted that it would only be the upper floors which would be re-cladd it is considered that the proposal would enhance the appearance of the building and would respect the surrounding development within the Bretton Centre and the neighbouring Aldi supermarket to the north of the site.

The issue that the public house is not part of the scheme has also been raised by the owner of the neighbouring property at Stirling House who fears that *'it is likely it will continue to remain an eyesore and 'a blot on the landscape' for many years to come.'* The neighbour requests that *'every effort is made to purchase the Roundhead or take on the Lease. Additional flats could then be included in the overall proposal and, at the same time, control the use of this part of Bretton Court as, clearly, the Council is extremely concerned about the potential noise level & overall disturbance if indeed its use reverted to an active Public House.'*

No changes are proposed to the appearance of the public house. This is disappointing however, it is not in the control of the applicant and the situation doesn't render the proposal unacceptable.

Reference has been made to the number of air conditioning units on the existing building and that the removal of these units would improve the appearance of the building. This is accepted. It is questioned as to how the building would be ventilated in the future without the need for external units on the building. The details of noise mitigation would be secured by condition and in addition to that a condition would be appended requiring details of any plant/services to be installed on the external elevations be agreed in writing.

d) Meeting Housing Need

Policy CS8 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD requires residential development of 15 or more units, including converted buildings, to provide 30% affordable homes. The proposal would require the provision of 13 no. affordable units with a tenure of 70% affordable rented and 30 intermediate units. 20% of the units should meet lifetime homes.

As stated earlier the applicant could have implemented his permitted development rights and applied to convert the existing office building under a prior approval application in which case the Local Planning Authority would not be able to insist on affordable housing provision. With this in mind, it is only reasonable to consider the uplift of units to be provided with the addition of the fourth floor element. The number of units in this element of the scheme would be 10 units which would not trigger the requirement for affordable units to be secured under the Council's plan policy.

Furthermore, the Government's vacant building credit regime is applicable in this case and so the existing floorspace cannot be taken into account for affordable housing provision purposes.

The Parish Council has queried the use of the building stating that the application refers to 'sheltered housing'. This question was raised with the applicant who confirmed that the use would not be for sheltered housing. It is unclear where the Parish Council has seen this reference as the application refers to social rented housing and or temporary accommodation.

e) Residential Amenity

The development would achieve a satisfactory level of amenity for the future occupiers of the building. It is accepted that the conversion of an existing building poses more challenges than would be the case for a complete new build. For example the need to cover the large areas of windows and the dividing of the building into small units reduces the amount of natural light available to the habitable spaces. However all bedrooms and living areas would be served by windows.

The two current staircases will be reduced in size internally, to comply with residential use and allow service areas around them for refuse collection store.

Due to the nature of the site there would be no private amenity space available. However, Bretton Park is located just a short walk away. The site is situated with good pedestrian/cycle links to the city centre.

Although no parking is available to serve the development cycle parking provision for each flat would be provided as discussed above.

The Police Archaeological Liaison Officer has advised that no information on security/vulnerability to crime has been submitted with the application. It will be important to implement an access control system and security for the cycle storage would be required at the very least. These details would be secured by condition.

It is considered that the proposal would provide an acceptable standard of amenity and would accord with policy PP4 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

f) Noise

A main concern with the proposal is the neighbouring public house (The Roundhead). The public house has been vacant for a number of years however, it could re-open at any time, although a new licence would be required and this would consider the mix of uses, including residential near the pub.

A noise report supports the application. The report acknowledges that significant adverse impact is expected given the close proximity of the mechanical plant at the rear of the site to the NSRs. Mitigation measures has been recommended to minimise the impact of these units on any future occupants of the proposed development. The adjoining public house, whilst currently vacant, has been assessed and a scheme of additional soundproofing to the adjoining partitions has been advised to achieve minimum standards of sound insulation. Additionally, glazing and ventilation recommendations have been provided as to achieve the internal noise levels for the proposed development according to BS8233:2014 noise criteria.

The Pollution Control Officer accepts the findings of the report and recommends a condition seeking the noise mitigation measures to be agreed and implemented prior to occupation of the development.

It is considered that with the proposed mitigation measures adequate noise protection can be achieved. The proposal therefore accords with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and section 15 of the NPPF.

g) Drainage

Surface Water Drainage

This is an existing building however there will be a small area of additional hard surfacing which should be sustainably drained. These details would be secured by condition.

Anglian Water currently raises of objection as the hierarchy for drainage in accordance with the Building Regulations has not be followed. Again this will be agreed by condition.

Foul Drainage

Comments have been made regarding the foul drainage and there is concern that the conversion of the building to individual flats would require waste be piped horizontally, at floor level, to reach the existing drains. This matter would be dealt with under the Building Regulations.

Anglian Water has confirmed that there is capacity in the sewerage system.

It is not considered that the proposed development would be at risk of flooding nor would the proposal result in flooding outside the site and the amenity of the future occupiers would be protected. Hence the proposal accords with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

h) Accessibility

There are obviously constraints with the conversion of an existing building. It is proposed that the existing lift, in the north staircore B, will be removed and a new lift provided which would be DDA compliant. Staircore A will have a completely new DDA compliant lift. The 2 no. existing steel staircases are to be redesigned and reduced in size, for residential use. It was originally proposed that cycle storage would be provided in staircase B. This has now been removed to ensure the exit is not obstructed.

The Parish Council has commented on the lack of provision for the storage of pushchairs, etc. given that the apartments are likely to be occupied by families. However, the units are modest in size so could not be occupied by large families. A lift would be available and it is therefore likely that such items would be taken to the respective apartments.

i) Landscape Implications

There are limited trees/shrubs within the site however, it is proposed to retain two Rowans to the rear of the site. The Tree Officer had advised that these are protected during the works to the building. The proposal would not result in any adverse landscape implications in accordance with policy PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

j) Telecoms Equipment

It has been confirmed that access to the telecoms units on the roof of the building would be provided through 2 no. roof hatches accessed with ladders from the stair landings on the 3rd floor.

k) Help for Occupants

Whilst the flats may be initially used for temporary accommodation, there is no need for on-site support to be available. On-site support is not available at the locations where existing temporary accommodation is in operation.

6 Conclusions

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 provide 43 affordable housing units which would meet an identified housing need for the city;
- The site is located within a sustainable location which is close to services and facilities to meet the needs of the future occupiers without the need to travel by car;
- Cycle parking would be provided for each of the units;
- The proposed refurbishment of the building would respect the surrounding character and would significantly improve the appearance of the building; and
- The proposal would provide a satisfactory level of amenity for the future occupiers.

Hence the proposal accords with policies PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12 and PP16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, policies CS2, CS8, CS16 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF (2018).

7 Recommendation

The case officer recommends that Planning Permission (Regulation 3) is

- C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 2 No hard-standing areas shall be constructed until a surface water management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed strategy shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development for which planning permission has been granted.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding and in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

- C 3 Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for protecting the proposed noise sensitive development from noise has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority; all works which form part of the scheme shall be completed before any part of the noise sensitive development is occupied.

Reason: In the interests of amenity for the future occupiers of the development and in accordance with policy PP4 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This is a pre-commencement condition as the main works involve replacing windows/re-cladding and it is appropriate that these details are agreed before works commence.

C 4 No development other than internal works shall take place until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- Walling and roofing materials - samples shall be made available on site for inspection
- Windows and doors
- Rainwater goods
- Any externally visible sustainable technologies
- Any externally visible flues, vents, air conditioning units or similar features

The details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C 5 Notwithstanding the details hereby approved a scheme for the security/crime prevention measures to be provided shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include an access control system, security gates and lighting. The approved details shall be provided prior to any part of the development being occupied.

Reason: In the interests of security and vulnerability to crime and in accordance with policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C 6 In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) below shall have effect until the expiration of twelve months from the date of the occupation of the building for its permitted use.

(a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work);

(b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

(c) The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

C 7 Prior to the commencement of the development a construction management plan (CMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP shall include:

- Haul routes to and from the site.
- The location of parking, turning, loading and unloading areas for construction vehicles.
- The location of storage compounds and welfare facilities.
- Location of any temporary access points.
- Hours of construction and delivery times.

The information in the CMP shall be adhered to throughout the entire construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy PP12 adopted Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition because it is necessary to demonstrate that the development can be undertaken without resulting in a detrimental impact on the adjacent highway.

- C 8 Notwithstanding the approved plans details of the proposed cycle stands and shelters shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until the cycle parking has been provided in accordance with the approved details. The cycle parking shall thereafter be retained for the purpose of the parking of cycles and for no other use.

Reason: In order to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, and in accordance with policy CS14 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policies PP12 and PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C 9 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the following approved plans:

- OS Map (Location Plan) drg. no. PC-BC-AL-0-0000 Rev P3
- Existing Site Plan drg. no. PC-BC-AL-0-0001 Rev P3
- Proposed Site Plan drg. no. PC-CC-AL-0-101 P3
- Landscaping and Refuse Tracking drg. no. PC-BC-AL-0-124 Rev P2
- Proposed east and west elevations drg. no. PC-BC-AL-0-120 Rev P2
- Proposed north and south elevations drg. no. PC-BC-AL-0-121 Rev P2
- Proposed ground and first floor drg. no. PC-BC-AL-0-0110 Rev P1
- Proposed second and third floors drg. no. PC-BC-AL-0-0-111 Rev P1
- Proposed roof plan drg. no. PC-BC-AL-0-112 Rev P1
- Accommodation schedule drg. no. PC-BC-AL-0-123 Rev P1
- Noise Report

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

Copies to councillor:

Angus Ellis
Stuart Martin
Scott Warren