

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2018
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: (Chairman) Harper, (Vice-Chair) Casey, Councillors, Brown, Amjad Iqbal, Shaz Nawaz, Martin, Hiller, Rush, Stokes, Bond 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:

19. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

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

There were no representations to make declarations as Ward Councillor.

**22. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 4 SEPTEMBER 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

Save for the following alteration from

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.

to:

Councillor Hiller declared a non-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

23.1 18/01212/HHFUL - 22 Old North Road, Wansford, Peterborough, PE8 6LB

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to an application seeking planning permission for the following:

- Single storey rear extension measuring 2.3 metres (width) x 5 metres (length)
- First floor extension to rear measuring 7.1 metres (length) x between 4.3 metres and 5.1 metres (width) including a new side facing dormer
- Front dormer extension

The external materials are proposed to match the existing dwelling.

The Head of Planning introduced the report and update report. Concerns had been raised over the loss of sunlight and amenity with the extension moving closer to the boundary fence.

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

- In terms of design the impact to the area would make the house look lopsided. The extension was not in keeping with the local street scene.
- The public would be able to see the extension from quite a distance and be able to tell that it was not in keeping with the area.
- The overall floor space was 40% greater area than the current ground floor space. In addition the roof was to be 40% higher than what was currently in place.
- It was debatable whether the owners of number 20 were aware of the proposals as they had not registered any concerns.
- The boundary fence was eight metres high and had been erected without planning permission. The height of the fence had negatively impacted on the growth of plantation.
- Light levels in the lounge and dining rooms would be reduced by the extension and even more so in winter months.
- The loss of light would also have an impact on increased heating bills due to less sunlight coming through the windows..
- The roof extension included a window that would overlook the garden and be to overbearing.
- Most of the time was spent in the lounge and dining room where this extension impacted upon the most. Had been in the property for 18 years and had always enjoyed a good relationship with the neighbours.

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

- The case officer had taken into account the height of the fence and orientation of where the windows would be facing. Although it was a balanced decision the case officer did not see the extension as too overbearing.
- Most examples of two storey properties was that residents could look out of the first floor and had a view into their neighbours property.

- The application site was part of a pair of relatively modest semi detached chalet bungalows. The proposal appeared large for the size of the property and would excessively overlook the neighbouring property.

RESOLVED:

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

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

1. The proposed Juliette window on the rear elevation will result in a unsatisfactory degree of overlooking and loss of privacy for the adjacent owners. The proposal will therefore be contrary to the provisions of policy CS16 of the Peterborough City Council Core Strategy DPD (2011) and policy PP3 of the Peterborough City Council Planning Policies DPD (2012) which requires new development not to have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of occupiers of any nearby properties.
2. The proposal will result in an enlargement of the roof and the footprint of the rear projection bringing it closer to the neighbouring property. Consequently this property would suffer from a loss of light and increase in shadowing to an unacceptable degree. In addition the enlarged roofscape would have an overbearing appearance when viewed from the neighbouring property. The proposal will therefore be contrary to the provisions of policy CS16 of the Peterborough City Council Core Strategy DPD (2011) and policy PP3 of the Peterborough City Council Planning Policies DPD (2012) which requires new development not to have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of occupiers of any nearby properties.
3. The rear of the property (with its attached neighbouring property) is visible from Swanhill. The proposed roof alterations will give the pair of dwellings an unbalanced visual appearance which would be significantly detrimental to the appearance of the street scene. The proposal will therefore be contrary to the provisions of policy CS16 of the Peterborough City Council Core Strategy DPD (2011) and policy PP2 of the Peterborough City Council Planning Policies DPD (2012) which requires new development respond the character of the site and surroundings and contribute positively to the street scene

23.2 18/01259/DISCHG & 18/01368/FUL - Land Off Storeys Bar Road, Storeys Bar Road, Fengate, Peterborough

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to an application seeking for the discharge of Condition 8 to allow a variation to the design and layout of the scheme approved under Condition 5. The amended design would result in a single process building, 'Ethel', being located on the western half of the site, with the previously approved 'George' building, being omitted from the eastern half of the site. A separate, two storey, building, including Administration Offices, Research and Development and Visitors Centre (hereafter referred to as 'the admin building'), still forms part of the overall plan for the site, and was located in a similar position to that previously approved, albeit to a different design. The admin building was serviced by cycle and car parking, and was linked to the process building by a footpath. The

layout was predicated on the suitability of the access proposals as described below (i.e. Proposal 2).

The main process building (of which there is now only one, rather than two), with vehicular access from the proposed roundabout on the re-aligned Storey's Bar Road, would house a combined 4 flue stack of up to 80m above ground level, located at the northern end of the building. The footprint of the building would be slightly smaller than that previously approved, measuring approximately 200m by 125m, although the building at its highest point would be increased by around 15m to a maximum of approximately 35m. The combined flue stack of 80m in height will replace the 9 individual 53.8m stacks. A vehicle ramp would be located on the eastern flank of the building to a height of approximately 7m, allowing for loading and unloading of HGVs.

A guard house and visitor parking would be located to the south of Padholme Drain in front of the main building. Weighbridges and an ash bank will be located on the eastern side of the building, with a water pump house and oil tanks and pump house to the south. Car and cycle parking would be provided alongside the western elevation.

A foot / cycle way would be provided through the site, alongside Storey's Bar Road, and continuing south towards Flag Fen Visitors Centre. Landscaping and ecological mitigation would be provided across the site, including a new woodland corridor along the eastern flank of the site, planting alongside the Padholme and Cat's Water Drains and wetland habitat and ponds around the re-aligned Storey's Bar Road and new roundabout.

The proposed development, incorporating technology approved under the Section 36 consent, will generate 42.7MW electricity with an expected feedstock of 595,000 tonnes per annum. The original approved scheme had a maximum output of 80MW and feedstock of 650,000 tonnes per annum.

In addition to the above, the applicant has also requested to discharge conditions 9, 23, 37 and 46 as described.

In terms of the second proposal the original consented scheme included a re-alignment of Storey's Bar Road and the provision of access to the site by a roundabout, with a secondary point of access further east being permitted for temporary use for the duration of the construction phase. Over time, amendments to the scheme were approved such that the essence of the re-alignment of Storey's Bar Road was retained, but with two separate T junction points of access (one in place of the roundabout, and one in place of the temporary construction access). The scheme proposed under 18/01259/DISCHG sought to utilise elements of both previously approved schemes, i.e. the retention of the roundabout as the main point of access to the process building, and the retention of a T junction access to serve the Visitors Centre / Office building further east on the alignment of the original temporary construction access. It was noted that the roundabout would also be capable of serving the proposed Red Brick Farm employment area adjacent to the north.

The Head of Planning updated the Committee on the proposal. Committee were reminded that there were two proposals closely linked and therefore presented as one. The Secretary of State granted permission for two energy waste plants. The current proposal had now been amended to only one plant. The site of the second unit was now to become a meadowed area. There was a proposal to straighten out a bend in the road which would create an entrance into the facility. The development was an improvement over what had been presented previously. There were fewer chimneys than what was originally proposed, however they were taller. A number of issues were still arising, however most of these had now been resolved.

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

- In 2009 GDP secured planning permission, the original intention was to secure funding, however the recession made this impossible. A commercial collaboration was eventually agreed with K and M partners.
- A lot of time was spent looking at redesigning the scale of the facility. The new proposals used state of the art technologies. It was proposed that building would start in early 2019 and would take three years to complete.
- It was proposed that 130 new jobs would be created upon completion and that there would be 250 jobs created in the construction period.
- The project would help Peterborough realise its ambition of becoming the Environment Capital and would help recycle 600 000 tonnes of mixed feedstock that would have gone to waste.
- The visitor centre would contain an administration base for the plant. In addition the centre would be open to schools to help engage with the local community.
- There would be an overall reduction in tonnage of material for energy from 650,000 tonnes to 595,000 tonnes.

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

- Highways had given approval to the new road scheme. This had been fully dimensioned to ensure that the cycleways could be incorporated.
- Pleased that consultation had taken place with PECT. It was also pleasing to see that there had been a reduction from the original scheme.
- This was a great example of using waste for energy and would reduce the amount of waste landing up on landfills.

RESOLVED:

1. 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.
2. 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:

Proposal 1

To discharge Condition 8, the five constituent parts of Condition 5 need to be satisfied, they are:

- (i) details of the siting, design, external appearance, and dimensions of all new or modified buildings and structures which are to be retained following the commissioning of the Development;
- (ii) details of the colour, materials and surface finishes in respect of those buildings and structures referred to in (i) above;
- (iii) details of vehicular circulation roads, parking, hardstandings, turning facilities and loading and unloading facilities on the Site;
- (iv) details of all new or modified permanent fencing and gates required on the Site;
- (v) details of artificial lighting required during the operation of the Development; and
- (vi) phasing of works included in the scheme.

The applicant is continuing to work with Officers to overcome consultee objections and ensure the proposals address all material considerations and are policy compliant. The outstanding matters can be summarised as follows;

Confirmation of Conservation Officer satisfaction with regards the additional wireframes demonstrating visual impact on the Cathedral.

Clarification of methodology for viewpoints in the LVIA.

Confirmation of Landscape Architect contentment with the screening proposed to be used on the ramp on the eastern elevation of Ethel to minimise off site headlight glare, amended cladding to the Multi Function Water Pump House and to 'Ethel'.

Provision of 'designers' response with regards to flue stack cladding proposals.

Clarification of the impact of fencing to south of the Water Pump House to additional tree / vegetation screening.

Clarification of the lighting strategy, including confirmation of review procedure, height of 'Ethel' and yard lights, bollard lighting on the pathway, and use and timing of lighting systems, and provision of a 'night time image' of the proposals.

Provision of a satisfactory Landscape Masterplan demonstrating removal of 3m bund and including additional planting to Cat's Water Drain (the full details for Condition 46 discharge are not required at this stage).

Confirmation of Natural England and Wildlife Officer comments with regards to information provided in the ecological addendum.

Completion of all outstanding ecological surveys.

Confirmation of finished floor levels and provision of critical equipment in accordance with floodrisk requirements.

Confirmation of Local Highways Authority satisfaction with tracking provision across the site, alignment of access amendments and mapping base layer, and corrections to foot / cycle way requirements.

Condition 9 – in relation to provision of cycle parking

The cover letter also refers to information being provided to discharge Condition 9 in relation to cycle parking. However this is a compliance condition (requiring 60 cycle parking spaces to be provided adjacent to the reception / administration building), and cannot be discharged.

Condition 23 – in relation to commercial operation noise

Condition 23 requires a programme for the monitoring and control of noise generated by the commercial operation of the development. The submitted information does not include such information and cannot therefore be discharged at this point. However this is not a pre-commencement condition and the applicant has been advised that they are required to provide such a programme prior to the commissioning (i.e. the first supply of electricity on a commercial basis) of the development (see also detailed commentary re. noise).

Condition 37 – archaeology

This condition has been previously discharged (14/00077/DISCHG) subject to “all records being compiled in a structured archive in accordance with part 5 of the (approved) report”. The applicant has confirmed that the archiving process is being undertaken. Upon confirmation of completion of archiving this condition can be fully discharged.

Condition 46 – landscaping and creative conservation

A Landscape Masterplan has been provided with the application, demonstrating the broad principles of the landscaping and creative conservation mitigation proposals. This plan does not contain the level of detail provided under the previously approved scheme (13/01913/DISCHG), and required by condition 47 and in addition to the amendments to the Masterplan as discussed above, the applicant is advised to update the Plan with appropriate detail prior to any further construction work being undertaken.

Proposal 2

The NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development – in terms of decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.

Subject to the satisfactory resolution of the outstanding details, as described above, the proposal will be acceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan.

The material considerations for Proposal 2 centre on the issues of; ensuring the access and highway network serving the suit can be made suitable and able to accommodate any increase in traffic, and the nature of traffic associated with the development, and that any associated increase in traffic and highway improvements do not cause unacceptable harm to the environment and road safety; and the avoidance of significant adverse impacts on surrounding uses, including Flag Fen visitors centre, and the archaeological environment;

Subject to the resolution of outstanding matters and appropriate conditions to ensure an acceptable mitigation measures, the proposal will be in accordance with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies CS32, CS34, CS36 and CS39.

It is also noted that application 18/01369/NONMAT will enable the operational use of two points of access to the site, rather than the single point of access as defined under the Condition 10 of the extant consent. This non material amendment will only be progressed subject to the satisfactory resolution of Proposal 2.

Chairman
1.30pm – 2.30pm