

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 3 SEPTEMBER 2019
BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: (Chairman) Casey, Councillors, Brown, Amjad Iqbal, Jones, Hiller, Hussain, Rush, Hogg, S Bond, Jamil and Warren

Officers Present: Nick Harding, Head of Planning Peterborough and Fenland
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer
Stephen Turnbull, Planning Solicitor
Chris Stanek, Senior Strategic Planning Officer
Nick Greaves, Principal Engineer
Claire Dowsett, Engineer

Others Present:

17. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Harper, Jones and Andrew Bond. Councillor Jamil was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Jones. Councillor Sandra Bond was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Andrew Bond.

The Committee agreed to move agenda item 6.2 19/00506/R3FUL - Fletchers Farm Thorney Road Newborough Peterborough to the end of the agenda.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hiller declared an interest in agenda item 19/00506/R3FUL - Fletchers Farm Thorney Road Newborough Peterborough and stated he was a Director of NPS and would therefore leave the meeting during this item.

Councillor Brown also declared an interest in agenda item 19/00506/R3FUL - Fletchers Farm Thorney Road Newborough Peterborough and would not take part in the meeting for this item.

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

Councillor Brown declared to speak as ward Councillor in relation to item 19/00506/R3FUL - Fletchers Farm Thorney Road Newborough Peterborough.

20. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23 JULY 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2019, were agreed as a true and accurate record. Approved

21. CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN - PROPOSED SUBMISSION

The Committee received a report on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan - proposed submission.

The purpose of the report was to enable the Planning and Environmental Planning Committee to make recommendations to Cabinet, with Cabinet then in turn being asked to consider and recommend to Council the approval of the Proposed Submission Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste (C&P M&W) Local Plan for public consultation during November 2019 - January 2020, and then submission to the Secretary of State.

The Senior Strategic Planning Officer introduced the report to Members and requested them to make comments on the proposed Minerals and Waste Local Plan prior to its consideration by Cabinet on 23 September 2019.

Members commented that all the consultation comments submitted about the proposed Minerals and Waste Local Plan were available on the Council's website.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee (unanimously) considered and noted the report.

REASONS

It was important for the Committee to consider the emerging Plan, as it has done previously, as this Committee would be the primary user of such a document once adopted. Its views were, therefore, important.

22. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

22.1 19/00490/FUL - SITING OF TWO SHEPHERDS HUTS FOR HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to change of use of the land to allow the siting of two shepherds' huts for holiday accommodation.

The Head of Planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report, which included a letter of representation, which highlighted a number of suggested changes such as relocation of the proposed huts by 20 metres north so they would not be visible to the neighbours and temporary planning consent. In addition, there had been concerns raised about parking and the noise management schedule. Members were informed that an amendment was required to adjust conditions three relating to outdoor seating and nine to refer to the applicant by name.

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

- There had been a divided opinion between villagers over the application, around half were for and half against;
- There had also been a divided opinion from the Parish Council.
- There were business and economic opportunities associated with installing the shepherds huts, and the proposal would also encourage people to visit and enjoy the area.
- There were a number of Air Bed and Breakfast (Air B&B) facilities operating in the village, however there was no clear number of how many there were.
- The proposal could encourage a shop or market stall to develop, which would provide additional work opportunities in the village.
- Some villagers were of the opinion that the proposal could generate more traffic as a result of deliveries. In addition, there were concerns raised by resident in regards to noise pollution from holiday makers.
- There was also a concern that agriculture land was on the decline in the area.
- There was a concern that permitting the proposal could encourage further holiday outlets in the area.

Mr Alan Brown, objector, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There had been a good relationship with the applicant since they moved to Grange Farm 11 years ago.
- A strong objection had been submitted in addition to a report produced by John Dudge, which outlined the reasons objection.
- The proposed Shepherd Huts would be located outside of the village envelope.
- The proposed Shepherd Huts were out of character for the area and there had been no evidence to suggest they had ever been in use historically in Southorpe Village.
- The holiday accommodation referred to in the planning report were glamping facilities and these were located 800 metres away from the village in a very secluded woodland area.
- None of the supporters for the application were residents in the village, but had spent a holiday at Pea Cottage in the past.
- The Parish Council had received 15 written objections to the planning proposal for the installation of Shepherd Huts and felt the need to refer the matter to the Committee.
- The main objections cited were in relation to noise, visual pollution and there would be no benefit to the community.
- A holiday facility or bed and breakfast could operate within Grange Farm, which was the applicant's home.
- The Conservation officer's submission stated that "the concept appeared to be that of two caravans cloaked in a pseudo agricultural outward appearance for the sole purpose of gaining planning permission, where it would otherwise be resisted."
- The applicant had not been honest about his alternative uses of the paddock area for events such as weddings, live bands and rat races. Two weddings had already been held in the paddock area.
- Granting planning permission for the Shepherd Huts could open the door for further developments and consideration should be given to restrict to temporary permission, including prevention of holding events such as weddings and live music.

- In addition, the proposed Shepherd Huts should be moved to a different location.
- All residents were visited by the objector personally to seek their views.
- Every supporter had made comment on the planning portal had lived outside of the area.
- A guest of the applicant staying at Pea Cottage had made a complaint in relation to a birthday party held at the objectors neighbouring property. Noise issues arising from Pea Cottage, owned by the applicant had never been raised by the objector.
- The objector would be able to see the Shepherds Huts from his property by about 70 yards. In addition, the car park for the proposed Shepherd Huts would be located outside the objectors office.
- Pea Cottage was a one bedroom building, that backed onto the objectors courtyard.
- The proposed Shepherd Huts would be located a short distance away from the objectors office, however, they would be located outside. Pea Cottage was not located outside and would attract less noise.
- The proposed Shepherd Huts would invite the same type of living environment as that of a caravan, where people would want to enjoy alcohol beverages outside.
- Members commented that the conservation officer had only raised some concerns, but had not objected to the planning proposal. However, the objector felt that the area of Southorpe should not be taken for granted as it was set in a conservation area and had held heritage significance.
- If the proposed position of the Shepherds Huts were to be relocated, it would make a significant difference to the objecting neighbour to the Grange Farm, as he would not see or hear any activity resulting from their use.

Tim Slater, The Agent and Mr Mogridge the applicant addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The planning position for the proposal had been set out in the planning statements. Holiday accommodation was acceptable within a rural setting and was in line with the Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- A heritage impact assessment was undertaken and a landscaping plan was drawn up to mitigate any conservation issues. Officers also confirmed that there would be no conservation or heritage impact for the Southorpe area.
- A noise management plan had been developed to outline how the guests would be expected to behave.
- There had been various consultations with the neighbours over the noise management and landscaping proposals. The noise and landscaping plan was felt more than adequate to accommodate all fears felt by the neighbours.
- The applicant had used his marketing knowledge to develop the successfully operated Pea Cottage as a holiday let. In addition, he intended to apply the same approach to the Shepherd Huts.
- The proposed Shepherd Hut holiday accommodation would be aimed to attract the mature clientele and provide the scene expected at a Chelsea flower show.
- The planting of 200 fruit trees in the orchard would be of environmental benefit.
- Any noise disturbance arising from guests residing at any of the Shepherd Huts would be dealt with swiftly and effectively.
- The proposed orchard would be planted before the Shepherds Huts were installed.

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

- Members were advised that the Shepherds Huts had a metal roof and wood wall exterior. Although the proposed huts would be slightly out of historic context, they would not be too detrimental to the rural scene of the area.
- Members commented that the proposed Shepherd Huts seem sympathetic to the area. The Ward Councillor had also stated there had been half of the residents in objection and half in favour.
- Members felt that there would be no more noise generated from the Shepherds Hut than what had been experienced at Pea Cottage.
- Members felt that the proposed holiday accommodation would attract visitors attending events such as Burghley Horse Trials.
- Members felt that the two proposed Shepherd Huts would be located far enough away from the neighbouring property and would not be overbearing to them.
- It was apparent from the applicants address that the clientele likely to be attracted to the Shepherd Hut accommodation, would be well behaved guests.
- Members commented that the extra traffic movements generated by guests visiting the Shepherd Huts was negligible.
- Members felt that the figures provided in relation to the number of Southorpe villager objections was unclear.

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.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

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

- The proposed shepherd huts would be consistent in scale with its rural location, would not have any unacceptable environmental impacts, it would not adversely affect existing local community services or facilities, it would be compatible with the character of the village and landscape, it would not cause undue harm to the open nature of the countryside, it would be easily accessible and had been demonstrated that there had been demand for the development and it was a viable business proposition on a long-term basis, as such the proposal would accord with Policy LP11 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraphs 83 and 84 of the NPPF (2019);
- The proposed shepherd huts would not harm the landscape character of the area, the immediate street scene, the setting of the Conservation Area, the adjacent non-designated heritage assets known as Grange Farm and Abbots Barn, or unknown buried archaeology, and would accord with Policies LP11, LP16, LP19 and LP27 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 197 of the NPPF (2019);

- The proposed shepherd huts would not have an unacceptable harmful impact to neighbouring amenity, and would accord with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposal would not result in the net loss to the biodiversity value of the site, and would accord with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- There were no Highway safety concerns and parking can be accommodated on site, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

22.2 19/00104/FUL - Cranford Drive Boiler House Quinton Garth Westwood Peterborough

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for the erection of a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO), which would provide nine bedsitting rooms with communal lounge and eating area.

The proposed building would have a floor area of 17.5 metres by 9.8 metres and proposed to stand at 5 metres to the eaves and 9.2 metres to the ridge.

Each room would provide a dedicated shower, toilet and wash area, with a communal kitchen area at the ground floor level. The accommodation would be provided over three floors, ground, first and second, the second floor of which would be accommodated within the roof space.

Nine parking spaces were proposed along the southern boundary, a secure cycle and bin store area to the east and a secure private amenity space to the north.

The Head of Planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report. The scheme had been revised due to an existing Anglian Water infrastructure. An objection had been raised by a Ward Councillor. In addition, amended plans had also been submitted.

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

- Members were advised that the original application refused by Members had been successful at appeal as there had not been sufficient evidence that there would be a significant noise, disturbance or an increase in crime increase.
- Members were also advised that Police Architectural Liaison Officer had suggested that a noise and disturbance management plan was required if planning permission for the HMO, should be approved.
- Members commented that they had provided reasons for refusal for the last application which had been inaccurately reflected in the Ward Councillors representation for this revised application.
- Members were advised of the trees protection plans proposed.
- Members commented that during their site visit it was apparent that the area was quite with no additional traffic. There was no evidence that granting the planning permission would add to the existing crime issues in the area.
- Members commented that there appeared to be sufficient parking provision for the HMO units.
- Members commented that the extant planning permission was for an eight unit HMO development and that it would be difficult to refuse the amended application of nine units. In addition, the parking provision had been acceptable.

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.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

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

- The proposed development would not result in unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the area, or unknown buried archaeology, and so would accord with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed development would not have an unacceptable harmful impact to neighbouring amenity, and would provide satisfactory amenity for future occupiers, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- There were no Highway safety concerns and parking could be accommodated on site, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed development would not result in surface water flooding and a condition was recommended to be imposed in respect of contamination, this was in accordance with Policies LP32 and LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan, and Paragraphs 178-180 of the NPPF (2019); and
- The proposed development would also not result in a net loss to the biodiversity value of the site, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the NPPF (2019).

22.3 19/01141/FUL - 43 Crowland Road Eye Peterborough PE6 7TP

The Committee received a report, which sought planning permission for the erection of a detached three bedroom bungalow to the rear of the existing property. It was also proposed for the existing vehicular access from Crowland Road (along the southern boundary) to be widened and repositioned. Parking for both the host and proposed dwellings would be provided at the front of the site.

It was noted that the proposal was a revision of application reference 17/02303/FUL which sought the construction of two three bedroom dwellings to the rear of the site. This proposal was refused by the Council and subsequently dismissed at appeal.

To facilitate the proposed development, a single storey rear extension to the host dwelling and a detached double garage would be demolished, as well as the removal of a mobile home.

The Head of Planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report. The update report provided a copy of the inspectorates report and comments from a Ward Councillor. The officer recommendation was one of refusal, which was in line with the planning inspectorate's comments in relation to parking and the character of the building.

Steve Milner, the Applicant addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Applicant had resolved all of the street scene issues raised by the Planning Officer.
- The application had been rationalised since the last proposal was submitted for planning permission
- There had been no objections included in the report regarding the new bungalow format.
- The proposed bungalow would be hidden away from the road, and there had been no objection received from the Eye Parish Council. In addition the neighbours were in favour of the permission and had submitted a letter of support.
- Cllr Allen had provided his support in writing and other Ward Councillors were in favour of the proposed development.
- The current site was a blight to neighbours and they welcomed seeing the area developed.
- There was a mix of houses along Crowland Road consisting of bungalow and terrace formats, so the proposal would not detrimentally impact the street scene.
- There was infill, landfill and backfill located across the road of the proposed development, which was in keeping and the character of the area.
- The property had been recently investigated by environmental health, which found the property to be infested with rats.
- The existing property would be redeveloped.
- The site had been cleaned up by the applicant about two years ago. However further attempts to keep the site clean had been difficult due to a number of vandalism incidents, which resulted in the proposed site being boarded up.

At this point, Councillor Brown declared an interest that he could be predetermined when considering the planning permission and therefore stood down from the Committee.

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

- Members were advised that the inspector's report highlighted that the proposed scheme was of a sizeable scale, which would reduce the space around the property at number 43 Crowland Road. Therefore the surrounding area of the existing property would be cramped, whereas existing dwellings along Crowland Road had more space around them.
- The comments made by the inspector alluded to the proposed development being seen from the street, however, the reason for the officer recommendation for refusal was because the proposal was out of kilter with established development patterns in the area.
- Members were advised that although there were varied property developments on Crowland Road, the inspector undertook a site visit and felt that there was no precedent set for a proposal of this type in a location of this nature.
- Members were advised that officers were no longer concerned about noise and disturbance, however the issues were around the amount of space that the host property would be left with was unacceptable.
- Members were also advised that there was an issue with vehicle access down the side of the proposed bungalow.
- Members felt that the view from the street of the proposed plot would barely be seen. In addition Members felt that the site was next to an unsightly public house and houses of varying different sizes and styles. Members were aware

that the issue remained with the size of the proposed development and what the existing property would be left with.

- Some Members felt that the amount of land left to number 43 Crowland Road was of a concern along with the car parking proposal at the front of the property, however, there were other properties in the area with backfill plots.
- Some Members felt that the applicant had addressed a lot of concerns raised by the inspector following the appeal. In addition, Members recognised that the neighbour at number 45 Crowland Road had also shown support for the proposed development.
- Some Members felt that the proposed property would be marketed and sold on the basis it was surrounded by very small land and this would be reflected in the price.
- Some Members felt that although the site was run down, there would be a disturbance felt in regards to parking and putting the bins out on refuse collection days. In addition, the proposal was felt too large and overbearing to the existing property.
- Members felt that the development would not affect the street scene on Crowland Road.
- Some Members felt that although parking for the proposed development would be located in front of the existing property on Crowland Road, there should not be cause a disturbance when gaining access.
- Members recognised that the officer recommendation for refusal was in relation to the proposed property configuration.
- Members recognised that the proposed development on Crowland Road was located in a conservation area, however this was felt not too detrimental as most of the properties had similar layouts.
- Some Members were conscious about setting a precedent however in the light of the evidence provided there was nothing to suggest that the development would be detrimental to the area.

RESOLVED:

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

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Members felt that on balance:

- The proposal was in keeping with the outlay of other properties in the area that had built additional buildings to the rear;
- The issues raised by the inspector in respect of the original application had been addressed by the applicant;
- The parking arrangements would not change if the proposed development was of a smaller size;
- The property was not in a conservation area; and
- The proposed development would improve the appearance of the current rundown site.

3:33pm - At this point the Committee took a 10 minute break.

Following a proposal and vote, the Committee agreed that Emily Trantor could speak on agenda item: 19/00506/R3FUL - Fletchers Farm Thorney Road Newborough Peterborough.

Councillor Hiller left the room for agenda item 19/00506/R3FUL - Fletchers Farm Thorney Road Newborough Peterborough.

Councillor Brown continued to step down from the Committee for agenda item: 19/00506/R3FUL - Fletchers Farm Thorney Road Newborough Peterborough.

22.4 19/00506/R3FUL - Fletchers Farm Thorney Road Newborough Peterborough.

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for the 'Conversion of agricultural building into two residential dwellings'.

The fabric of the building would largely be unchanged, with the majority of existing openings being re-used either as windows or doors. There was a single storey off-shoot to the south, the southern wall of which would be rebuilt. And a new first floor window would be provided to serve a bedroom on the north elevation.

Each dwelling would comprise kitchen/diner, dining room, downstairs toilet and wash basin, sitting room, study and two bedrooms with bathrooms above.

The Head of Planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report. Members were advised that concerns raised about the maintenance of the private road would be funded by the residents as per current arrangements.

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

- The Ward Councillor was not in objection to the proposed development.
- The main objection was about the condition of the access road.
- There was a concern regarding cars accessing and passing on the road.
- Potholes in the road had recently been repaired by a local resident living at the Chestnuts.
- It was feared that the road condition would worsen during the construction period of the proposed development.
- Members were requested to consider applying a condition in regards to the road before the construction works were started.

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

- The corner of the proposed barn to be converted was located 4.8 metres away from an existing property on Fletchers Farm House. In addition, there was a concern about the fence in that the existing Fletcher's Farm House residents would overlook the proposed dwelling gardens and vice versa.
- There were safety concerns over the volume of traffic both construction and domestic.
- There was a lot of free space where children would play along the private road leading to the proposed development and there was a concern for their safety.

- The road was single lane traffic and the addition of extra vehicle movements would worsen it and make up keep of maintenance very difficult. In addition, the road had been repaired twice in the space of twelve months.
- In addition there were limited passing places.
- NPS were not willing to change the road although had reimbursed the residents for the cost of repairs.
- The barns had been used for agricultural purposes and limited traffic was being experienced. However, the proposed barn conversion would increase traffic movements.
- The area attracted a lot of wildlife, which included Deers, owls and bats and this would be impacted if the proposed development was granted.
- There were large trees adjacent to current properties and the roots could be disturbed if the proposed development was granted, as they had grown underneath the development site.
- There were no path or bus route along the access road to the proposed development.
- Despite the fact the Highways department had not raised concerns about increased traffic movements, the current residents at Fletchers Farm House felt that movements would be significantly increased.
- There were around five to ten cars currently traveling along the single lane track leading up to the properties at Fletchers Farm on a daily basis.

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

- Members were advised that there had been requests from those who had made representation for the single lane track to be resurfaced, however, this was not a planning issue as there were already arrangements in place. Members were also advised that there were measures in place for residents to maintain the road. Highways had confirmed that the track would not experience a large increase in traffic movement if permission was granted.
- Members were advised that it would be difficult to refuse permission due to the limitation of passing places on the access road and it was felt by Highways that it was wide enough for anticipated vehicle movement.
- Information received from the Council's estates contractors NPS, stated that all residents would contribute to the maintenance of the access road to Fletchers Farm, as they were the main users and the Council was not.
- Members were advised that planning notification letters were sent to all affected property addresses rather than individuals. In addition, it was confirmed that correspondence was sent to the parish council, The Chestnuts and Fletchers Farm House on 30th April.
- Members commented that no other objections had been received in regards to the Fletchers Farm application.
- Members commented that the issues raised in the addresses at the meeting were not material to planning applications
- Members had sympathy with the neighbouring residents, however, they were unable to refuse permission due to the condition and maintenance of the access track.
- Members felt that the conversion would be attractive, and that there would be no significant increase in traffic

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.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

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

- The use of the agricultural building had ceased, it was constructed more than 10 years ago, the scheme would result in less than five residential units, the building was not in such a state of dereliction or disrepair that would require significant reconstruction and there were no fundamental constraints to delivering the site. As such the proposed change of use and conversion from agricultural to two residential dwellings would accord with Policy LP11 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed change of use and conversion from agricultural to two residential dwellings would not harm the character or appearance of the host building or immediate area, or buried archaeology, and would preserve the setting of this non-designated heritage asset, and would accord with Paragraph 197 of the NPPF (2019) and Policies LP16, LP19 and LP27 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed change of use and conversion from agricultural to two residential dwellings would not have an unacceptable harmful impact to neighbouring amenity, and would provide satisfactory amenity for future occupiers, in accordance with Policies LP17 and LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 178-180 of the NPPF (2019);
- The proposed change of use and conversion from agricultural to two residential dwellings would not adversely affect protected species and would not detract from the biodiversity value of the site, in accordance with Policy L28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- There were no Highway safety concerns and parking could be accommodated on site, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Chairman
1:30pm - 4:00pm