

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER 2018  
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** (Chairman) Harper, (Vice-Chair) Casey, Councillors, Brown, Amjad Iqbal, Shaz Nawaz, Hiller, Hogg, Rush, Stokes and Serluca

**Officers Present:** Nick Harding, Head of Planning  
Dan Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Stephen Turnbull, Planning Solicitor  
Julie Smith, PCC Highways

**Others Present:**

**14. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bond and Martin. Councillor Hogg attended as substitute.

**15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Hiller declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 5.4 by virtue of being a director of Medesham Homes and would leave the room before the item was discussed.

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

Councillor Casey declared an interest to make item 5.6 as Ward Councillor.

**17. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 3 JULY 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record save for the addition of Councillor Rush who was in attendance.

**18.1 18/00527/FUL - Madina Madrassa And Spiritual Centre 116 Midland Road West Town Peterborough**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to a Planning application seeking continued use of the site, but on a permanent basis, as an Education and Spiritual Centre.

The latest proposal also involved an intensification in the use of the site compared to the 2014 permissions, to provide a madrassa for up to 50x children between the hours of 15:30-19:15, as well as prayer 5x per day between the hours of 05:00 and 22:00.

The Development Management Manager introduced the report and update report. It was noted that Highways had concerns over the adequacy of the number of parking spaces and the width of the access ways. In addition there were concerns around visibility when entering and leaving the site.

The Head of Planning commented that there was a risk to residential amenity around the site due to the intensive use of the site, which was due to increase if the application was approved. The application was also seeking to retain the existing temporary buildings which had a limited life use and were not of good visual standing. Environmental Officers had also raised concerns over an area of hardstanding concrete as there was the possibility that the area underneath was contaminated.

Gordon Smith the agent and Mohammed Younas on behalf of the applicants addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- It was acknowledged that the request to keep the temporary buildings was unusual, however it was planned, with fundraising activities to replace the buildings with permanent structures.
- The applicants were seeking to include a condition within the application to limit the life of the temporary buildings to five years, while money was raised to create the permanent structure.
- The Local Authority wanted to secure comprehensive development of the area and this application sought to do this.
- It was disappointing that the application was recommended for refusal, when an application for a number of homes by Medesham Homes had been granted to the South of the application site.
- There was a definite need for a more permanent mosque structure in the area. Most families needed to travel into the centre of the City at the current time. The current buildings were well used by the local community. It was thought around 7000 Muslims were within close vicinity to the site.
- There had been no recorded complaints from the local community with regards to the centre.
- Although the temporary application had a condition to include the painting of parking lines it was thought that this was merely an advisory and that there had been no issues with parking or accessing the site since it had been in operation.
- The youngest children using the site were aged between five or six, it was anticipated that they would not spend more than an hour and a half on site and never up to the closing time of 10pm.
- The facility provided a number of Muslim families a centre that they would be able to walk too instead of driving too, helping to alleviate congestion around the City centre.
- The capacity of the centre currently was around 200 to 250 people.
- Because the application was keeping the existing temporary structures for the current time it was not necessary to investigate any potential hazard under the hardstanding area. However, once permanent structures were to be build a survey of that area would be completed.

- Temporary buildings had a varied life span, these were currently thought to last around 48 - 65 years.

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

- The Committee were entitled to consider approving the application with the additional condition that a permanent structure be erected within five years. However, it was impossible to know what the parameters of this would be and the Planning authority would lose control over what would happen going forward.
- In 2014 permission was granted for the modular building to be removed two years ago and this should have already happened. The operation of use was deemed as currently being unlawful as the application was only granted for two years.
- There was a question mark over the promise of a permanent structure as the temporary structure was originally planned for two years and this had already been breached by a further two years.
- If the Committee were minded to reuse permission the applicants could appeal to the Secretary of State. However if no appeal was lodged and the applicants continued to use the site the authority could consider using enforcement action.
- It was considered that this application was an over intensive use of the land and it was inappropriate to continue using a temporary structure.
- The facility was well used by the local community and it would be shame to lose this.
- If the application was refused the applicants could submit another temporary application for the site to carry on its use.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (7 for, 2 abstain) to **REFUSE** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

**REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

- R 1 The permanent use of this 0.13ha site as a spiritual and education centre, and the retention of the modular building, does not provide a comprehensive redevelopment of the Railway Station Opportunity Area (West) and would result in a piecemeal form of development which would prejudice the future delivery of this Opportunity Area. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy CC4 of the Peterborough City Centre Plan (2014).
- R 2 The modular building is not of high quality or modern design, and would only deteriorate in quality and appearance in the fullness of time, thereby detracting further from the character and appearance of the street scene. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), PP2 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012) and CC4 of the Peterborough City Centre Plan (2014).
- R 3 Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the increase in activities associated with the use of the site, over and above the temporary

consent, would fall within acceptable levels, and therefore could result in unacceptable levels of noise and disruption through the coming and going of visitors, as well as the activities themselves, to residents within the immediate locality. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and PP3 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

R 4 Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate there is sufficient off-street parking to accommodate the proposed use, therefore it could result in vehicles parking in unsafe locations within the public highway during peak hours, resulting in a highway safety hazard, and is therefore Contrary to Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

R 5 The permanent use of this site has not been accompanied by a contaminated land assessment. The permanent use of the site may require the concrete block of the site to be broken, for example to accommodate highway or parking improvements. As such it is not possible to determine whether there is a risk to the health of future or adjoining occupiers, and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

## **18.2 18/00410/R3FUL - Ken Stimpson Community School Staniland Way Werrington Peterborough**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to expanding the school by two forms of entry along with an associated increase in the number of sixth form pupils. The school would increase in size from some 1014 pupils to 1650 pupils. The number of pupils between 11-16 would increase from 866 to 1350 (so an increase of 484) and the sixth form from 148 pupils to 300. The number of full time staff or equivalent would increase from 95 to 115 (an increase of 20). The school would increase by 60 pupils per year over a 5 year period.

In order to facilitate the extension of the school the construction of a new two storey teaching block was proposed to the rear of the existing school buildings on playing field, along with a small infill extension to increase of the size of the dining area. Internal works were proposed to other existing teaching areas to create the necessary teaching facilities.

Also proposed was the relocation of a substation, a new sprinkle pumping station, the creation of new areas of hard play and a new car park (on the site of the existing tennis courts) to create 37 parking spaces on the site. Access would be from Staniland Way.

In addition, the proposal also results in a requirement for off-site highway works to accommodate extra traffic movements to and from the site. It was proposed to add an extra lane on David's Lane from the A15 roundabout and also along Staniland Way to the junction with Crowhurst. To facilitate these highway works a number of tree removals would be required, notably the removal of trees on one side of Staniland Way.

The Head of Planning updated the Committee on the proposal. Although there would be some loss to the school playing fields there would be no reduction in the overall number of pitches. Sport England had raised an objection to the application due to the loss of playing fields, however if the application was granted the Secretary of State could call in the application.

In response to question raised by Councillor Fower the Head of Planning confirmed that trees were to be re-planted to replace those removed, however they would be a different species due to their location closer to residential properties.

The Highways Officer commented that in terms of enforcement if the problem was around the locality of the school enforcement action could be taken, which could be in the form of PCSO's attending. The crossing for cycles were re-designed to make it safer. There would be no detrimental impact with the additional lane going onto the A15. It was confirmed that this had been through a road safety audit.

Vince Moon, Chairman of the Werrington Neighbourhood Council addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Council represented the views of residents of Werrington. There was general support for the expansion of the school, however some concerns had been raised.
- School traffic already created congestion around the school and the nearby roundabouts. with the increase in pupil numbers this was only going to lead to more traffic congestion.
- The residents of Crowhurst had expressed their concerns around the increase in traffic. A specific review should be proceeded with and a commitment to do so and any enforcement restrictions required should be adhered to.
- Issues around car parking problems needed to be addressed. The local centre car park was not a long term solution. Parking issues in the centre would lead to increased parking in the local streets.
- Residents were concerned over the loss of the trees especially those lining the avenue. Removal of these would create a negative visual impact on the local scene as well as creating increase noise pollution to residents.
- The association represented the views of local residents, although they had completed their own consultation they had collated the views from those who had come forward.

Brian Howard, on behalf of the applicant and Bryan Erwin, Head Teacher Ken Stimpson School, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The School had been rated as a good school. This had created an increased demand on school places at the school. It was important that the school and local authority worked at creating more spaces wherever possible.
- The school was inclusive of all children irrespective of any form of special need or disability. All pupils would be welcomed at the school.

- The school had run a number of projections and it was thought that an additional 20 staff would be effective to cover the intake of extra pupils over time.
- Although there would be encroachment onto the school playing fields the same number of pitches would be kept. Most of the spaces lost were being used solely for social needs.
- A number of public consultations had been held. Ward Councillors had generally been supportive of the scheme.
- The school would liaise with parents and the local neighbourhood council to increase awareness of parking issues. There was demand for travel alternatives that were different to cars.
- It was important that the school was a part of the local community and wanted good relationships with them.

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

- The school was well run and had integrated with the local community around.
- School places were in desperate need in the local area and across the City as a whole.
- Loss of the school land was minimal. The improvements to the highway scheme were amenable, traffic would be negated with the extra lanes being provided.
- Sympathise with the views of local residents, but there was a need for more school places. This application would provide further opportunities for school children.

#### **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.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

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

- The development will provide additional school places to help meet the school place demand in the city. The National Planning Policy Framework places great weight upon the need to provide school places and helping schools expand to provide these. The application will, however, result in the loss of school playing field to which Sport England object. In this instance it is considered that the need to provide the school places and the wider benefits this will bring to the city outweigh the loss of 0.35 hectares of playing field. As such the principal of development is considered to be acceptable.
- The traffic impacts of the development have been assessed. Subject to the implementation of the off site highway works scheme the impact on the network is considered to be accepted. The Travel Plan will further help mitigate the impacts

of the development. New car and cycle parking is to be provided to meet the needs of the expanded school. As such the proposal is considered to accord with policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy and policies PP12 and PP13 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

- The design of the new building is considered to be acceptable along with the dining room extension and will have no unacceptable impacts. It therefore accords with policies PP2 and PP3 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.
- Concerns have been raised by local residents regarding the impacts of the scheme but the impact is considered to be acceptable particularly when weighted against the need to provide the school places and the emphasis in the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to this.
- Subject to conditions relating to tree protection and ecology the on-site works are considered to accord with policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.
- The proposed off site highway works will result in the loss of a number of trees, notably on Staniland Way. Whilst the loss of these trees is not ideal the need to provide the school places and mitigate the impacts of the highway network in this instance outweigh the resulting impact of the tree loss and this can be accepted.
- Following the submission of additional information and a condition it is considered that the site can be adequately drained. The proposal therefore complies with policy CS22 of the adopted Core Strategy.

### **18.3 18/00894/FUL - Bridge Street Police Station Bridge Street Peterborough PE1 1EQ**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to seeking approval for the demolition of the existing Police Station and the construction of a 126 bed hotel (C1) over three floors with 120 x standard bedrooms and 6 x accessible bedrooms with associated restaurant/bar/café, parking, hard and soft landscaping.

The site would be accessed via an existing vehicular access to the east of the site. 39 no. car parking spaces including 3 no. disabled parking spaces were proposed.

The Head of Planning updated the Committee on the proposal and comments received as part of the update report. It was commented that the site was important to get right and not be detrimental to the assets of the City. The proposal sought to ensure the structure had as low a profile as possible so that it did not obstruct the view of the City or the Cathedral. No objections had been raised from Heritage England and the Conservation Officer had also not submitted any objections. There were conditions in place to ensure that the build was of good quality.

Mr Mehmed, Peterborough Civic Society, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There was an opportunity to create a great environment and a change in the Rivergate road system.
- The Peterborough Civic Societies proposal would be of great benefit to the site and remove congestion of traffic from one side of the hotel. In addition guests of the hotel would have better views out over the river.

- The proposal would allow people to be more easily able to cross the roads.
- Traffic could be more easily controlled and would be safer for people on foot. The current proposals made no mention of any light controls for the crossing into the main entrance of the hotel.
- The Civic Society were not asking for the application to be refused, but for a deferment to assess the proposed road layouts.
- The sketches showing the proposed layout had been sent to the planning department and also to the agent.
- Funding of the road would come from local authority. it would need to be considered on its merits, and see what the benefits would be once completed.
- Benefits to the City would over time become apparent.

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

- It was important that the application in front of Committee was the application being decided upon.
- Quality materials would be used throughout the build process and would be finished to a high standard.
- Timing was an issue, the programme of work if granted was to start before the end of the year. It was then anticipated that the project would be completed by the end of 2019 or early 2020.
- There was no light loss to neighbouring flats. This had already been thought through by the applicant.
- The City Centre location was perfect for the applicants, it was deemed an attractive site and would be of benefit to the city gateway.
- Premier Inn had given a clear mandate that they wished to deliver the hotel within tight timescales and will be delivered upon unless there were any unforeseen circumstances.

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

- There were no additional burdens for taxi drop offs. The positioning of the entrance could be looked at in terms of getting the boundary treatment wall extended.
- The Amount of movements of vehicles around the existing route were few and far between and would not necessitate the addition of further lighted trafficking.
- The design of the hotel was not visually suitable as the gateway into Peterborough. This was not the right site of the application.
- The proposal was good for the site in question. There would be few developers who would want to build on the site.
- The proposed realignment put forward by the Civic Society of the road network would help with traffic flow around the City centre.
- The application would create a number of jobs during construction and once the site was fully operational.
- The City Council had no policy or scheme for the rejigging of the highway.

- It was possible to include a condition extending the boundary treatment to prevent people cutting across the road and walking across the main entrance.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 For, 2 Against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

**REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions and revised conditions as per update report PLUS condition 16 to be reworded as follows:, C16 No development other than demolition shall take place until a scheme for the hard of soft landscaping of the site (to include measures to discourage pedestrians from crossing Bridge Street to the hotel entrance at points other than at the formal crossing point) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of

- Proposed finished ground and building slab levels
- Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting
- Surfacing / hard materials & street furniture

The approved hard landscaping scheme (including measures to discourage pedestrians from crossing Bridge Street to the hotel entrance at points other than at the formal crossing point) shall be carried out, prior to the occupation of the development and the soft landscaping shall be carried out within the first available planting season following completion of the development or first occupation (whichever is the sooner) or alternatively in accordance with a timetable for landscape implementation which has been approved as part of the submitted landscape scheme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and then enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policy CS21 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD and in the interest of road / pedestrian safety in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy 2011 and PP12 of Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012.

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 site lies within the City Centre Rivergate policy area where the principle of the hotel development is supported;
- The proposal would complement the offer of services and facilities for the city and bring economic benefits;
- The height, massing and design of the development would not adversely affect the setting of the Cathedral or the Old Customs House building and would represent an improvement;
- The site can be satisfactorily accessed by vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians;
- The site is within a sustainable location and the provision of car parking and cycle parking is considered to be acceptable therefore the proposal would not unduly impact upon the adjacent highway network;
- The appearance, layout and scale of the building is considered acceptable and will not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area; and

- The proposal would not result in any significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

The development is therefore in accordance with Sections 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS4,, CS16, CS17, CS18 and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy, Policies PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12, PP13, PP16 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy LP6, LP13, LP16, LP19 and LP48 of the Proposed Submission version of the new Peterborough Local Plan.

At this point Cllr Hiller left the room for the following item.

#### **18.4 18/00491/R3FUL - Bretton Court Rightwell East Bretton Peterborough.**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to seeking approval for the conversion of the upper floors from offices (B1) to residential (C3) and the addition of a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor above the southern element of the building which currently has 2 upper floors resulting in the entire building being 4 storeys.

The Council owned 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 were 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 it was envisaged that this may initially be used for temporary accommodation for homeless people.

The Head of Planning updated the Committee on the proposal. The Committee were informed that there was no on site parking attached to the application. However, there were strong links to public transport and local centres that could be used as parking.

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

- The Parish Council objected to the application as there were too many discrepancies within the application. It was unclear whether the scheme was for temporary accommodation or for the open market.
- There was no supporting documentation outlining who was going to be managing the building.
- The application made no mention of parking arrangements and the Parish Council agreed with the objection put forward by Highways.
- The escape route on the plans made provision through the refuse area, however this was too tight and if the bins were moved it would make it impossible for residents to be able to leave the building in case of emergency.
- The modest size of some of the units would indicate that families would be housed in some of the units. In addition if there was to be a family they would almost certainly have a vehicle, for which no parking was provided.

- There were no objections to the appearance of the scheme, this was far improved from what was currently on site. It was important that a secure maintenance and management plan was put in place.
- The biggest concern was over the use of the units, it was unclear as to the length of time this might have been used by homeless people.

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

- Planning Officers were aware of the refuse arrangements and the fire escape passage. A condition could be added for a management proposal to keep on top of the refuse area and ensure the safety of residents.
- There was no distinction between temporary accommodation and normal open market accommodation in terms of planning policy. There was no reason to suspect that temporary units would need more supervision compared to housing association tenants.
- The application did not meet parking policy provisions. Highways had no alternative but to raise an objection to the scheme on this issue. It was stressed that although this was the case Planning officers weighed up the objections and on balance recommended approval of the scheme.
- If the application was refused and the building returned to be used as offices there would still be no parking for any potential office staff as the car park adjacent to the development was owned separately.
- In order to meet parking policy there would need to be 64 parking spaces, with visitors bays. However it was stressed that occupiers of the flats could use the time restricted parking in Sainsburys.
- It was possible that the initial use of the units would be temporary accommodation, however over time it could be returned to the open market.
- As there were family units there would normally be more car parking spaces available. In most cases applications that made no provision for car park spaces would be refused.
- In most cases homeless families only had their possessions with their vehicles, if there were no spaces they would potentially have to give up their vehicle.
- There was a serious lack of homeless provisions within the City and this application sought to alleviate some of these issues.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (6 For, 3 Against) to **REFUSE** the planning permission.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

To accord with the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD Policy PP13 for a C3 dwelling, 56 allocated off highway parking spaces are required as well as 10 unallocated visitor parking spaces. The proposal makes no provision for any parking spaces. Whilst the site benefits from a District Center location with good public transport, walking and cycle links and restricted short term private parking nearby, this is insufficient to mitigate the lack of any dedicated car parking. The proposal is

therefore contrary to the provisions of Policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD 2012

At this point Cllr Hiller returned to the room for the remainder of the meeting.

### **18.5 18/00667/FUL - Land Adjacent To Werrington Police Station 6A Skaters Way Werrington.**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to planning permission for the 'erection of two single storey shop units with new access and landscaping'. The proposed land uses are A1 (shops), A2 (professional services) and A3 (food and drink).

The Head of Planning updated the Committee on the proposal. It was possible to alter the opening hours to reduce noise to local residents should the Committee be minded to do so.

Councillors Judy and John Fox, Ward Councillors addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The centre was once thriving and enjoyed a wide retail offer, however over the years the centre had fallen into neglect. The proposed new units were not appealing and there were no assurances that these would be let from day one.
- There were a lack of CCTV facilities on the site, increasing the likelihood of further Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) issues will increase ASB issues.
- There were fears that should the application receive permission it would set a precedent for future applications on the site.
- A number of empty shops was concerning, two more units might lay dormant.
- Shop owners were complaining of vandalism in the area and with the lack of CCTV it would make catching those committing offences harder.
- Potential development would not improve the look of the centre or get more footfall through. There were more consumers when the shops were occupied by independent shop owners.
- It was important that regeneration of the area was given precedent over installing more retail units.

Sally Weald, Werrington Neighbourhood Council and Andy Simmons addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Neighbourhood Council had held a number of open public meetings and produced newsletters outlining the objections to the scheme. The Council was representative of the views of local residents.
- The scheme was not in keeping with the rest of the centre. The proposed units would over look local residents.
- The centre was in urgent need of regeneration and this was more important than the installation of new shop units..

- Werrington had changed over the years. The Neighbourhood Council had worked closely with local services to try and combat some of the anti-social behaviour.
- The new units would create an alleyway leading to potential further crime in the area, especially if the CCTV was still inadequate.
- Parking at the centre was an issue. The lighting of the centre was also in need of repair.

Leon Delegate on behalf of the agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal was of significant benefit to the centre. The layout complimented the centre and would provide an updated feel to the site.
- The proposal was the start to updating and upgrading the units across the site. They would be of high quality and maintained by the owners.
- The existing landscape was unimaginative and would be upgraded on the advice of qualified landscapers.
- Local Highways Authority had deemed the service area acceptable and noise levels would be addressed.
- There was no detrimental impact to local residents and no loss of light to the surrounding areas.
- There was further demand for more shops and the agents were in negotiations with other tenants to get empty shops filled.
- It was not possible to confirm the potential tenants at this stage, however negotiations were in place with a number of retailers.
- Ongoing discussions were underway to get someone in the existing units. It was important to stress that some retailers needed to have bespoke and modern designs.
- CCTV designs would be appended to the application as a condition, making sure it covered the area.

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

- The passion of the local Ward Councillors showed how the local community was against the application.
- There were concerns over the design of the proposed application.
- It was possible that the proposed units would be empty once completed and there would therefore be a number of empty units on site.
- There was no inclination over the proposed tenants of the new units, which could make a difference over whether to support the application.
- The loss of soft and hard landscape areas would lead the site to feeling more enclosed and a feeling of insecurity.

#### **RESOLVED:**

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

## **REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

Key design characteristics of the centre include the hard and soft landscaped areas and spacious and open feel. The development proposed would result in the loss of two significant areas of soft and hard landscaped area and a significant reduction in the openness of the area and give the area a significantly more of an enclosed feel compared to the present environment. The resultant design will have the effect of creating a series of narrow corridors with an overly enclosed feel. The scheme is contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (2011), Policy PP2 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and Policy LP 16 and LP 17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission draft) as it does not make a positive contribution to the quality of the built environment and would have a detrimental effect on the character of the surrounding area as well as result in the loss of a landscaped area which is an important design feature of the center.

### **18.6 17/02205/FUL - The Eldern Eldern Orton Malborne Peterborough**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to seeking planning permission for the conversion of the first floor of the building from 1 x 3 bedroom flat into 3 x flats (2 x 2 bedroom flats and 1x 1-bedroom flat), together with the construction of a large roof dormer extension. The proposed dormer would extend along the east, south-east and southern roof slope of the building. An existing high level first floor window on the northern elevation is also proposed to be changed into a standard sized window, to serve the kitchen of Flat 3.

Amended plans have been received during the course of the application, to clarify the red-line site application boundary and to insert an additional first floor side facing window into Flat 1.

The Head of Planning updated the Committee on the proposal. A condition had been added to have parking made available on an adjacent piece of land.

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

- The building had been derelict for a number of years and had been subjected to large amounts of fly-tipping.
- There needed to be more car parking spaces provided for the units, there was currently an issue with parking in the area. Adjacent to the shops there were parking spaces however these had been designated for employee's of the shop or customers for 30 minute periods.
- With the increase in the number of residents from the development further issues with parking would be created.
- Car parking spaces needed to be locked in before the application can be approved and started with.
- People parking everywhere, create another problem with parking.

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

- It was not believed that the owner of the car parking was the owner of the site. There had been a provisional agreement for the use of the car park for residents.
- It was a condition of the application that car parking spaces needed to be secured.
- It was important to note that residents could still park in different locations and this could not be enforced.

**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.

**REASONS FOR THE DECISION:**

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

- The proposed flats would be located within the urban area of the city, and the proposed works would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the host building or surrounding streetscene. As such the proposal would accord with Policies CS1, CS2 and CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), and PP1 and PP2 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012);
- The flats would not result in any unacceptable harm to the amenity of adjoining neighbours, and a satisfactory level of residential amenity would be provided for future residents, in accordance with Policies CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2012) and PP3 and PP4 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012); and
- The proposed development would not constitute a highway safety danger and sufficient car parking would be available in the nearby car park, in accordance with Policy PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012).

Chairman  
1.30pm – 6.25pm

This page is intentionally left blank