

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2021  
VIA ZOOM VIRTUAL CONFERENCE**

**Committee Members Present:** Harper (Chairman), Casey (Vice Chairman), Bond, Brown, Hiller, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, Hussain, Jones, Rush and Warren.

**Officers Present:** Sylvia Bland, Group Lead Development Management Place and Economy  
Stephen Turnbull, Planning Solicitor  
Nick Greaves, Principal Engineer  
Daniel Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**38. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence received.

**39. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest received.

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

There were no declarations of interest received to address the committee as a Ward Councillor.

**41. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15 DECEMBER 2020**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2020 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

**42. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

**42.1 20/00554/OUT - The Solstice Northminster Peterborough PE1 1YN**

The Committee received a report, which sought outline planning permission for the demolition of existing nightclub and erection of a seven storey and three storey block comprising 56 apartments, ground floor Class E(a) retail or E(b) restaurant units, accommodation for up to 77 students and associated car parking. Layout (insofar as the site layout but not internal layout), access and scale are proposed in detail, with all other matters (appearance and landscaping) reserved.

In support of the application, plans had been submitted which illustrate the scale and site layout of development, as well as forming a vehicle access from Brook Street serving an underground car park providing 36x car and 90x cycle parking spaces. The above ground

works would comprise an L-shaped building with a maximum footprint of 69m x 32m. The taller seven storey element would have a maximum footprint of 32m x 27m and stand at no more than 23.8m in height. The lower, three storey element would stand at no more than 8.7m in height and would have a footprint of 52m x 28m.

Whilst appearance and the internal layout of the development are to be reserved for later consideration, the ground floor would be occupied by Class E (a) & E (b) retail and restaurant uses addressing Northminster and the corner with Brook Street. The residential and student accommodation would be situated on the upper floors. Indicative floor plans have accompanied the application, but these have only been submitted to demonstrate that the number of residential/student units can be acceptably accommodated.

The Group Lead for Development Management introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and update report. Members were directed to the update report which contained an updated recommendation which stated:

The Executive Director of Place and Economy recommends that Outline Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the signing a Section 106 legal agreement, the conditions set out in the Committee Report (and updated within the Briefing Update Report) and subject to receipt of no new material considerations having been raised by objectors following further consultation on the revised description of development.

Members of the Committee were also informed of further representations from the Peterborough Civic Society and Historic England which were also contained within the update report.

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

- As Deputy Leader of the Council the regeneration of the area was important and was supportive of the proposal that was in front of Committee.
- The regeneration of Northminster which was opposite the proposal was one of the Council's corporate priorities and this development would fit well with achieving that aim.
- The application that was now being proposed was an improvement on that which was presented to the Committee back in 2005, which at that time, had full support of the Committee.
- Although the views of the Cathedral would be reduced the best views of the Cathedral were those right outside the Cathedral and not from a distance. It was not practicable to protect 360-degree views across a modern urban city.
- It was important to keep a consistency in decision making, as this may impact on future regeneration proposals for the city which were much needed.
- The Cathedral was fully accessible for people with disabilities who wished to go and view the Cathedral and support this cause.
- There was already a limited view of the Cathedral from the application site, having a view from the accommodation was a bonus and not the reason for occupying the flats.
- The planning officers had weighed up and given consideration to views from the Peterborough Civic Society and Historic England and on balance the proposal outweighed those concerns.

Mr Richard Astle and Mr Simon Machen, on behalf of the Applicant addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal in front of members was popular, although there had been a few objections, in the whole these were well supported by the local community and by officers within the Council.
- The area around Northminster was in desperate need of updating and this proposal was the start of that process. The site in question was in desperate need of upgrading.
- The accommodation would bring people back into the city centre and create an additional buzz within the local economy.
- During the consultation phase there was support for the scheme from a number of stakeholders, with recognition that investment was needed in this part of the city. This application would also provide affordable and student accommodation and would be within walking distance of the proposed university.
- This was a better scheme than the one that was granted back in 2007. The impact of the proposal was less harmful than the one originally granted in 2007.
- The developer was known to many local people and they had the best interests of the city in mind.
- It was hoped that work on site could start within the next 12 months and that the project could be completed in a short time frame.
- This project would bring a significant amount of investment into the city centre and the benefits of the application outweighed the concerns that had been raised.
- The applicants had sought to avoid long legal debates over whether work had started based on the previous application granted in 2007. It was confirmed that the buildings on the site were demolished and the pylons inserted for the start of the original proposals, however some of the pre-commencement conditions did not go to the heart of the application. Having taken legal advice the applicant was satisfied that this did not start commencement of the original application.
- The key material planning consideration that needed to be taken into account was that the original application was approved which had already taken account of the views and the benefits outweigh these considerations.
- Much of the previous residential development around Peterborough in the past was around the peripherals of the city centre. Using sites like this for residential settings was a benefit as it created a more sustainable environment for the city centre itself. Having more quality residential blocks such as the proposal allowed for more natural surveillance and would bring potentially high crime levels down. This application was also supported by the Police for that reason.
- There was too much empty floor space for retail in the city, it was hoped developments such as these would increase the desire of businesses to open up in the city centre.
- It was still too early to know what sort of retail and business would occupy the ground floor unit. The aim was to have a café or restaurant take up the unit if it proved to be commercially viable.

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

- The difference between the application in front of members and the one being proposed for the University was that the application in front of members already had a previous permission and this was not the case for the University site. The committee needed to have regard to the previous permission when making a decision.
- The planning officers had given consideration to the 28 proposed parking bays and 8 visitor bays and this was deemed adequate. This was a city centre location and the local plan stated that extra cars in the city centre were to be discouraged. It was within walking distance of the bus station and train station.
- When reserved matters applications is submitted at a later date, the design and appearance of the building would be considerations that could then be taken into account. With regards to commercial use the applicants had sought to put these units in the area that would generate the most footfall.
- Members were advised that the commercial aspect was not a planning consideration, but the land usage was. It was common in a city centre location to see some form of commercial unit on the ground floor of a block of flats. Council policy encouraged mixed use buildings.
- There was flexibility in the application for the developer to look at the commercial unit and they could look at the design at a later date, in consultation with potential businesses.
- The main issue was the view of the Cathedral. The heritage officer had commented that the views were no worse than those that were proposed in the original application in 2007.
- The application did not change much in terms of the view of the Cathedral. The application was pivotal for the success of the new University and for the continued development of the Northminster area. The applicant had considerable expertise in these applications.
- The Northminster area was run down and was in desperate need if regeneration. This application was the start of that process.

#### **RESOLVED:**

A proposal was made and seconded to go with the officer's recommendations that Outline Planning Permission be **GRANTED** subject to the signing a Section 106 legal agreement, the conditions set out in the Committee Report (and updated within the Briefing Update Report) and subject to receipt of no new material considerations having been raised by objectors following further consultation on the revised description of development. On a vote this was (Unanimous) to **GRANT** the application.

#### **REASON 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 application site is situated within the City Core, would provide a mix of residential, student accommodation, retail and restaurant uses as well as affordable housing. As such the proposed development would introduce a mix of residential development into the City

Core, and go towards enhancing the vitality and viability of the City Centre. The principle of residential development would accord with Policies LP2, LP3, LP4, LP6, LP8, LP15 and LP47 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 85 of the NPPF (2019);

- The proposed scale and layout of development would not harm the significance of the Grade I listed Cathedral building or the City or Park Conservation Areas above and beyond development which has previously been granted permission on the site, it would not have a harmful impact on buried archaeology and would not harm the character or appearance of the immediate area. As such, the proposal would accord with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 196 of the NPPF (2019);
- The proposed scale and layout of development would not have an unacceptable harmful impact to neighbouring amenity, and would provide satisfactory amenity for future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 180 of the NPPF (2019);
- There are no Highway safety concerns and parking can be accommodated on site, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The development would make provision for surface water drainage and uncovering unsuspected contamination, and would accord with Policies LP32 and LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan, 36 and Paragraphs 178-180 of the NPPF (2019); and
- The development would secure 17x affordable dwellings, a fall back in the event that the student accommodation becomes available on the open market, and off-site public open space enhancements towards Stanley Recreation ground and Burton Street Allotments, and would therefore accord with Policies LP8 and LP21 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

#### **42.2 20/01642/HHFUL - 24 Melford Close Longthorpe Peterborough PE3 9NG**

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for a single storey front and rear extension, and a two storey side extension. The plans originally submitted with this application, proposed a two storey front extension. However, amended plans have been received during the course of the application changing the front extension from a 2 storey to a single storey extension.

The proposed single storey front extension would provide the property with a new entrance hall. It would have a pitched roof design and would extend approximately 3m beyond the property frontage elevation at its furthest point, and 1.60 metres beyond the existing garage and lobby/porch. It would measure approximately 4.5m in width, and have a maximum height of 3.45 metres and 2.4m to eaves height. A canopy structure would extend from the side of the new extension in front of the lounge window to the side of the property. The 2 storey side extension would be set back slightly from the property frontage and set down slightly in height from the main ridgeline.

At ground floor level it would accommodate a garage and kitchen, and at first floor an en-suite bedroom. The single storey rear extension proposed would have a flat roof design with 3 roof lanterns and would extend beyond the rear elevation by 3 metres. This extension would cover the whole width of the rear of the property including the proposed side extension and would have an overall height of approximately 2.85 metres, with the roof lanterns projecting approximately 0.3 metres above this.

This extension would accommodate the extended kitchen, family and dining rooms. The extensions would be all be finished in materials that match those on the existing dwelling

The Group Lead for Development Management introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report.

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

- This application was only being presented to committee as the applicant was a relative of a Councillor.
- This was a good application and was sympathetic to the street scene. The extensions would also enhance the house itself.

**RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimous) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers particularly in relation to the treatment of the tree.

**REASON 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 extensions would not acceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the site or the surrounding streetscene, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Neighbours surrounding the application site would retain an acceptable standard of amenity, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- There would be an acceptable provision of on-site parking spaces to serve the dwelling, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

CHAIRMAN  
1:30 – 3.08PM