

Application Ref: 20/01502/FUL

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling, construction of replacement dwelling plus construction of 3no. new dwellings, along with access, parking and landscaping alterations.

Site: 266 Eastfield Road, Eastfield, Peterborough, PE1 4BE

Applicant: Allerton Developments
Allerton Developments

Agent: Mr Andrew Tregay
Boon Brown Architects Ltd

Referred by: **Councillor Yasin**

Reason: Highway and traffic impacts, and setting an unacceptable precedent for future development

Site visit: 31.03.2021

Case officer: Mr Jack Gandy

Telephone No. 01733 4501733 452595

E-Mail: jack.gandy@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises No. 266 Eastfield Road, a residential dwelling located on an L-shaped plot to the western side of Eastfield Road and within a predominantly residential area. Access is provided directly onto Eastfield Road. The application site does not fall within, but it is adjacent to, the Park Conservation Area. Whilst the surrounding area is predominantly residential in use, to the north of site is No. 270 Eastfield Road, also known as The Limes, which has extant planning consent for extensions and works to provide 24no. assisted living units.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing dwelling, No. 266 Eastfield Road, with a replacement dwelling to be constructed in its place. In addition, 3no. two-storey dwellings, comprising 1 detached dwelling and 2no. semi-detached dwellings, are proposed to the rear of site, each with parking and private garden spaces. An access road is proposed to link the rear of the site to the existing access opening to Eastfield Road. Swing gates are proposed adjacent to the front elevation of the replacement dwelling and finally a bin collection point is proposed to the front of site, surrounded by soft landscaping provisions.

Amendments

Following comments received by consultees, members of the public and in the opinions of officers, the following amendments were made:

- Deletion of Plot 5: A fifth dwelling was proposed to the rear-most part of the site, nearest to the boundary shared with No. 7 College Park.
- Setting back of entrance gates: The entrance gates to enable access to the 3no. dwellings to the rear of site have been relocated from being adjacent to the bin collection point to being set in 1.8 metres behind the front elevation of Plot 1.
- Bin Collection Point: The bin collection to the front of site is to be enclosed with soft landscaping to three elevations, rather than a hard boundary that was previously proposed.

Other information

'The Limes' at No. 270 Eastfield Road has extant planning consent for 24no. assisted living units granted under 17/02482/FUL. There is, however, another planning application being considered by the Local Planning Authority, under planning application reference 20/01534/WCPP to vary the previous plans approved. Although this planning application has not yet been determined (at the time of writing this report), the impacts of the development proposed within the curtilage of No. 266 Eastfield Road have taken into account both the approved and varied development, in the event that the pending application is approved.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
00/01294/FUL	Single storey rear extension to provide ancillary residential accommodation (amended plans received 18.12.2000)	Permitted	21/05/2001

3 Planning Policy

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

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 72 - General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019)

LP02 - The Settle Hierarchy and the Countryside

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

LP03 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

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

LP08 - Meeting Housing Needs

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

LP8b) Rural Exception Sites- Development for affordable housing outside of but adjacent to village envelopes maybe accepted provided that it needs an identified need which cannot be met in the village, is supported locally and there are no fundamental constraints to delivery or harm arising.

LP8c) Homes for Permanent Caravan Dwellers/Park Homes- Permission will be granted for permanent residential caravans (mobile homes) on sites which would be acceptable for permanent dwellings.

LP13 - Transport

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

walking and cycling routes and facilities.

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

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

LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

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

LP17 - Amenity Provision

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

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

LP19 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance where appropriate the local character and distinctiveness of the area particularly in areas of high heritage value.

Unless it is explicitly demonstrated that a proposal meets the tests of the NPPF permission will only be granted for development affecting a designated heritage asset where the impact would not lead to substantial loss or harm. Where a proposal would result in less than substantial harm this harm will be weighed against the public benefit.

Proposals which fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a designated heritage asset will not be supported.

LP28 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Part 1: Designated Site

- International Sites- The highest level of protection will be afforded to these sites. Proposals which would have an adverse impact on the integrity of such areas and which cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where there are no suitable alternatives, overriding public interest and subject to appropriate compensation.

- National Sites- Proposals within or outside a SSSI likely to have an adverse effect will not normally be permitted unless the benefits outweigh the adverse impacts.

- Local Sites- Development likely to have an adverse effect will only be permitted where the need and benefits outweigh the loss.

- Habitats and Species of Principal Importance- Development proposals will be considered in the context of the duty to promote and protect species and habitats. Development which would have an adverse impact will only be permitted where the need and benefit clearly outweigh the impact. Appropriate mitigation or compensation will be required.

Part 2: Habitats and Geodiversity in Development

All proposals should conserve and enhance avoiding a negative impact on biodiversity and geodiversity.

Part 3: Mitigation of Potential Adverse Impacts of Development

Development should avoid adverse impact as the first principle. Where such impacts are

unavoidable they must be adequately and appropriately mitigated. Compensation will be required as a last resort.

LP29 - Trees and Woodland

Proposals should be prepared based upon the overriding principle that existing tree and woodland cover is maintained. Opportunities for expanding woodland should be actively considered. Proposals which would result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland and or the loss of veteran trees will be refused unless there are exceptional benefits which outweigh the loss. Where a proposal would result in the loss or deterioration of a tree covered by a Tree Preservation Order permission will be refused unless there is no net loss of amenity value or the need for and benefits of the development outweigh the loss. Where appropriate mitigation planting will be required.

LP32 - Flood and Water Management

Proposals should adopt a sequential approach to flood risk management in line with the NPPF and council's Flood and Water Management SPD.. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate. Development proposals should also protect the water environment.

LP33 - Development on Land Affected by Contamination

Development must take into account the potential environmental impacts arising from the development itself and any former use of the site. If it cannot be established that the site can be safely developed with no significant future impacts on users or ground/surface waters, permission will be refused.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Tree Officer (15.03.21)

No objections: Request that a full and detailed landscaping scheme/plan is submitted for consideration/approval, including details of the proposed native species hedge and replacement tree planting.

PCC Archaeological Officer (18.03.21)

No objections: The proposed development site is located in an area which has witnessed no archaeological investigations. In the absence of conclusive evidence, the archaeological interest and significance of the site and immediately surrounding area cannot be determined with any satisfactory degree of confidence.

A programme of trial trenching should be secured by condition in order to determine the presence, character state of preservation and date of potential buried remains.

PCC Conservation Officer (05.01.21 and 15.03.21)

Objection: The detached frontage building is sited on a spacious plot which is consistent with its surroundings. Its demolition and replacement with a strangely narrow building which is proposed to be shifted to the far extent of the boundary in order to shoehorn an access road in.

The resultant substantial formal access width and proposed dwelling being squeezed to the boundary of the plot will undoubtedly appear contrived.

The Conservation Officer advises that he does not particularly support the principle of this proposal, nor the resultant contrived scenario of a wide access with detached dwelling pushed to the extent of the plot. If officers are minded to support development here in some form, further considerations need to be made on an acceptable design and material appearance of the proposed frontage dwelling.

Additions were allowed at The Limes due to the very large building and plot that accompanies it. This is a different scenario entirely.

Updated comments (15.03.21)

Subsequent to amended plans, the Conservation Officer advises that his views do not change for the overall development and the contrived new frontage building and access. However, there are no issues raised with the relocated gates nor the reduction from 4 to 3 units to the rear.

The bin store remains in a poor position on the frontage, however the proposed landscaping and existing fencing on the frontage would conceal it to a degree.

PCC Wildlife Officer (16.03.21)

No objections: Hedgehogs have been confirmed as being on site, so all excavations >0.2m should be covered overnight or a means of escape installed (e.g. a ramp). Open ended pipework should be covered overnight and equipment and materials appropriately fenced off if left on site.

Recommended that the boundary treatment plan be conditioned, and any close board fencing should include hedgehog holes to allow hedgehogs to forage among the gardens.

Any external lighting should be LED, on a sensor if possible and directed away from the trees.

PCC Pollution Team (11.03.21)

No objections: Recommends that a condition be secured relating to unsuspected contamination that may be found during the period of construction.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services (29.03.21)

No objections: The increase in traffic use would not be considered adverse, owing to the small number of proposed dwellings served. The alignment and gate location would not likely result in excessive speeds. There are no concerns with the proposed layout.

The traffic generation associated with the proposal is also not considered to be significant, with limited peak-hour increases detailed within the Transport Statement.

Pedestrian visibility splays measuring 2.0 x 2.0m would also be required. It is evident from the plans that this may not be achievable to the south as a result of the proximity of the access to the neighbouring plot. However, the existing access (as well as a number of others in the vicinity) does not currently meet this requirement. Furthermore, DMRB-compliant splays (Figure 3.3, CD 123 Rev 2) are achievable within the access as a result of its 5.5m width. This is again mitigated by the width of the footway at this location. Therefore, whilst the desirable solution may not be achievable, compliance with national guidance is achieved.

Cycle storage is confirmed within the Transport Statement, to be provided in accordance with the Appendix C of the PCC Local Plan. Details of proposed cycle parking should be conditioned, owing to the lack of garages proposed for each of the dwellings.

10 vehicular spaces are proposed which is considered to be in accordance with Appendix C of the PCC Local Plan. The site is also considered to be well-served by more sustainable means.

The following conditions are therefore suggested:

- Details of cycle parking
- Parking and turning areas to be provided, demarcated and retained
- No gates shall be erected within 6 metres of the public highway
- The proposed access would need to be provided prior to first occupation of any dwelling
- Provision and compliance of 2.4m x 43m vehicular visibility splays prior to first use of the access and maintained thereafter and retained free from any obstructions over 600mm in height above carriageway ground level.
- Wheel washing facilities
- Details of a Construction Management Plan

PCC Waste Management (18.02.21)

No objections in relation to waste services and provisions.

PCC Lead Local Drainage Authority (01.02.21)

No objections: The submitted drainage scheme for the site is accepted and request that it be secured by condition.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 10

Total number of responses: 16

Total number of objections: 15

Total number in support: 1

16. letters of representation have been received from local residents and one Councillor. This comprises 15no letters of objection and 1no. letter of support. The following matters are raised:

Support

- There are other comments about the buildings looking out of place I don't think that is necessary the case. The houses are of high quality and will bring much needed housing in the area.
- Would be keen to see some sort of security gates as aware of quite a few burglaries in the area.

Objection

- Invasion of privacy.
- The level of development is too large for a small piece of land, making it out of character within the existing area.
- The dwellings in this part of Eastfield Road have a layout whereby they are all exclusively detached in form, adjacent to the public highway and served with large front and rear gardens. The proposed dwellings are to the rear of site and therefore any proposal would breach the layout character.
- The dwellings to the rear are far too large and aesthetically overbearing. If reduced to single storey level, this would address the issue of excessive bulk, whilst reducing the number of bedroom and resultant car parking requirement.
- The proposed parking arrangement is contrived and far too dense.
- The proposal will result in up to 11 vehicles on-site.
- Little or no account has been taken of the visibility to the south, looking towards the traffic lights at the junction of Eastfield Road and Broadway. Not only is visibility in that direction limited to approximately 30 metres, for vehicles coming out of Broadway, but vehicles frequently emerge from Broadway at speeds far in excess of 30 mph.
- When attempting to drive out of my property (No. 262 Eastfield Road), it is necessary to wait from traffic light to turn green to avoid vehicles entering Eastfield Road from Broadway. A similar comment was received from the occupiers of No. 264 Eastfield Road.
- Cars frequently 'jump' the lights from Broadway and invariably emerge into Eastfield Road at speeds considerably in excess of 30mph.
- The vehicle swept path drawings take no account of vehicles entering or leaving the site from the south, where the safety issues lies.
- It is difficult to believe that the larger vans would be able to turn around on-site and leave in a forward gear. The maximum width of the plot in front of the 4no. dwellings, at the turning head, is approximately 10.5 metres. The average 7.5 tonne van is approximately 8.5 metres long.
- The proposed dwellings in particular are extremely ill conceived, far too large, and aesthetically overbearing, being almost 10m high to the ridge. This is ludicrous, totally inconsiderate, and a wholly unacceptable mass to inflict on the area. This height exceeds that of the Eastfield Road dwellings adjacent to the plot.
- The proposed dwellings would be considerably less obtrusive if they were reduced to single storey or one-and-a-half storey. This would, of course, reduce the income generated from the site, but a developer's profit is no reason to consent approval, for an otherwise unacceptable scheme.
- The site appears to resemble a car park, with some houses.

- The proposal will result in, up to, 11 vehicles on the site, instead of the current 2. The provision of 11 spaces fails to meet parking standards, which would be for 12 spaces, and that is required as a ' minimum '.
- The level of noise and general disturbance caused by this large number of vehicles entering, leaving and manoeuvring within the site, behind the existing properties would be highly unacceptable.
- This density of traffic within the site would be passing by No. 264 Eastfield Road's back door at little more than 1.5m distance. As such a satisfactory boundary treatment is required, where nothing at all is shown in the drawings. The current boundary fence of approximately 1.5 metres in height is unacceptable for separation between the number of vehicles which will use the road and No. 264 Eastfield Road.
- A large proportion of modern passenger vehicles are tall, with eye levels of the occupants sufficient to see over the present fence, into the whole of our back garden.
- No account has been taken of the visibility to the South, looking towards the traffic lights at the very busy junction of Eastfield Road, and Broadway.
- If a commercial vehicle, unable to enter the site, stopped on Eastfield Road, which is highly likely, those vehicles emerging from Broadway would need to use the centre of the 3 lanes, at that point, to pass it, a lane which accommodates traffic running in the opposite direction to that traffic from Broadway. Road users, almost universally, when their own lane is blocked, will simply move across to the opposite direction lane, with no regard for traffic coming in that direction. One (stolen) vehicle attempted to negotiate the bend at such a speed that he was unable to retain control of the car, and collided with a lighting standard on his right hand side of the road.
- In addition to entry / exit problems, it is difficult to believe that the larger vans would be able to turn around, on site, and leave forwards. The maximum width of the plot in front of the 4no rear dwellings, at the turning head position is approximately 10.5m. The average 7.5 tonne van is approximately 8.5m long and can be as much as 9m long.
- The above point has a considerable bearing on access for firefighting appliances. Building Regulations Approved Document B, Volume 2:2019 requires that vehicle access must be provided to a position not more than 45m from any part of a building. The total distance from the highway to the furthest point in plot 5 is approximately 80m, therefore an appliance would be 35m from the highway. The Regulations also require that a dead end access road more than 20m long must be provided with a turning facility, with an absolute min of 16.8m diameter, as mentioned above, the plot is only 10.5m wide. Whilst Planning and Building Regulations are separate, but inextricably connected issues, we cannot believe that any Local Authority would approve a scheme that failed to meet the necessary firefighting requirements.
- As a planning agent, I have acted as agent for another, very similar, backland development at the rear of 152 St. Paul's Road (reference 20/01509/OUT), which was assessed by the same Case Officer. This was a far simpler scheme, for only 2 single storey dwellings, with better separation to existing, adjacent dwellings, but which was judged unacceptable. These comments appear to be directly applicable to the development currently proposed.
- The modest amendments do not make this a more attractive proposal.
- The revised scheme has barely addressed any of the substantial issues which we brought to your attention in the original application.
- This is still a poor design in general, impacting negatively on local residents in various ways, and including potentially hazardous commercial vehicle movements in Eastfield Road.
- This is a bad proposal for this area, taking my privacy (No.264 Eastfield Road), and that of surrounding neighbours.
- The proposed development would create traffic problems along Eastfield Road.
- This development is far too much and it does not blend well with the existing dwellings around the site.
- The demolition of No. 266 Eastfield Road is completely unnecessary.
- The rear 3no. dwellings are far too large, overbearing and located far too closely together. Their height is more than the existing houses on Eastfield Road.

The **Broadway Residents Association** have submitted two letters of objections. The following

matters are raised:

- No. 266 Eastfield Road is one of several substantial good quality detached houses built around the 1930s close to the junction with Broadway. It forms part of a row of similar properties which make an important contribution to the character of the area.
- The proposal to demolish it to provide simply an access route through to a development of five infill houses will be seriously detrimental to Eastfield Road and to the Park Conservation area which it adjoins.
- The proposal for five semi-detached, three storey properties crammed into the back garden of one former property will result in significant degradation to the character of the area and adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- There is also concern about the loss of green space and the impact on wildlife in this area adjacent to the Conservation Area.
- There will be increased traffic close to a busy road junction.
- The proposal constitutes back garden grabbing and should be refused on environmental protection and planning grounds. It is contrary to the Council's planning policies in many regards.
- The Peterborough Local Plan (adopted July 2019) does not accept destruction of good housing stock to enable more intensive development. In Policy section 6.4.6 it is stated that "Large existing houses in generous plots, including older properties and those in conservation areas, will also help to meet this particular need". The policy therefore seeks to prevent the loss of larger houses close to the city centre.
- The proposal is contrary to Policy LP16: Design and the Public Realm. The proposed development would diminish the character of the area, which comprises good sized traditional detached properties in generous gardens. The proposal is for a highly cramped over-development of a back garden. Around three quarters of the site would be covered by buildings, roads and parking areas, which is a significant over development.
- Considerable restrictions were imposed on building the extension at No. 270 Eastfield Road, which is designated "of special character". The restrictions successfully ensured that the extension was in character with the established house. The proposed property at Plot 1 is right on the boundary with 270 Eastfield Road, unlike the existing house, and will detract from the recognised special character of No. 270 Eastfield Road.
- The proposal is contrary to Policy LP17: Amenity Provision on existing occupiers. The proposed development fails to meet all of these to various degrees: i) Houses on plots 2 and 5 are less than one metre from boundaries with neighbouring properties in College Park and Eastfield Road and will closely overlook gardens leading to loss of privacy; ii) Extensive back garden space and several trees will be lost, to the detriment of many neighbouring properties and the adjacent Park Conservation Area; iii) There will be a significant increase in noise from occupants and traffic; iv) The huge bulk of the proposed houses on Plots 2-5 and their close proximity to boundaries will inevitably result in overshadowing and loss of light, particularly to properties to the north west; v) The footprint and size of the proposed closely packed three-storey 10 metre high houses, very close to boundaries on Plots 2-5 will have an overbearing effect on neighbours, particularly with houses on Plots 2 and 5 being less than one metre from the boundaries and the house on Plot 5 being less than three metres away from the house at 7 College Park; vi) The additional traffic to five properties will increase pollution from exhaust fumes; and vii) There will be considerable light pollution from the development and necessary street lighting and signs.
- The proposed development will adversely affect the amenity of residents at No. 270 Eastfield Road. The front of the dwelling on Plots 2-5 will directly face windows and overlook gardens and accommodation on the approved plans for 270 Eastfield Road. The proposal will have a significant adverse impact on 222 Broadway whose garden and home will be overlooked.
- The proposal is contrary to Policy LP28 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. In section 6.5 of the Planning Statement, it is claimed that the ecological assessment concludes that the site is of low ecological value. This is incorrect as nowhere in the submitted Ecological Appraisal is it concluded that the site is of low ecological value.
- In fact, in the Ecological Appraisal it is stated that "The proposal will result in the loss of a native rich hedgerow" and "there is potential for impact on protected species" which include bats and

native birds, both of which are abundant on site. Bats are very commonly seen in the Broadway Residents Area, particularly at dusk. The Ecological Appraisal confirmed the presence of bats in the garden at No. 266 Eastfield Road. Further studies should be required before any development is allowed as bats are well established in the Park and surrounding Conservation area.

- The Ecological Appraisal is incorrect in stating that there is no connectivity with wider habitats in that there are large gardens in Broadway, Broadway Gardens and Park Crescent providing an extensive green corridor to Central Park, where bats are known to roost.
- A wide variety of bird species, including sparrow hawk and green woodpecker are frequently seen in the area and even red kite are not uncommon. Hedgehogs are also seen in local gardens and their presence was noted in the Ecological Appraisal. The extensive loss of green space in the proposed development will undoubtedly result in loss of species diversity.
- The submitted ecological assessment does not provide recommendations on increasing biodiversity which can be incorporated into the build, but rather actions that might ameliorate the effects of the damage done by the development.
- Some of the proposed ecological mitigation would be impossible to implement within the development proposed.
- No details of landscaping are proposed.
- The revised Arboricultural Assessment gives no consideration of the pressure that is likely to come from future occupants of proposed properties on plots 2-5 to remove the three remaining trees, two of which are the large lime trees with preservation orders. These trees form part of a line of four lime trees, all of which have preservation orders and make a major contribution to the amenity of the area. The proposed houses would be little over 10 metres from the lime trees, which are greater than 20 metres tall and have canopies that would extend over a large proportion of the rear gardens on proposed plots 2-5. As these trees are to the south of the proposed houses on plots 2-5 they will severely shade the houses and gardens and it is highly likely that occupants will in the future claim that the trees need to be severely pruned because of shading or removed because they are a danger to the houses.
- A valuable lime tree was removed without warning in May 2020 yet appears on the submitted drawings as existing. It is difficult to understand why this tree does not appear in the table of trees assessed in the survey done on 1 April 2020 and is removed from proposed site plan (dated 22 Oct 2020) in the arboricultural assessment rather than being marked as one of the trees listed for removal. The tree is completely removed from revised arboricultural assessment submitted 10 December 2020. It is highly likely that the tree officer would have objected to felling of this tree and no more damage to the local environment should be permitted.
- The Peterborough Local Plan (adopted July 2019), Policy 6.24.10 Trees and Woodland also notes that the council is committed to increasing the overall tree canopy cover, and therefore opportunities for new tree planting should be explored as part of all development proposals. There are five trees removed in this proposal and there is no new tree planting proposed.
- The proposed development provides 11 parking spaces for residents and visitors. This indicates that there will be a very significant increase in traffic to and from the site. The entrance is only 25 metres from the traffic lights at the busy junction of Eastfield Road with Broadway and is likely to add to existing hazards by reason of traffic entering and leaving the site.
- The entrance will be a risk for pedestrians as there are no visibility splays to the pavement. The visibility splays marked on plans simply cover views across the pavement to the road.
- The application cites the development at 270 Eastfield Road as a precedent however this is not comparable.
- The application cites the back-garden development at 220 Broadway as a precedent. This is again not comparable and the development highlights why backland development is inappropriate.
- The existing location plan is inaccurate in that it does not include the recently completed large extension on the south side of 270 Eastfield Road, now a special needs facility.
- The existing location plan is inaccurate in that it shows a large old extension to the rear of 270 Eastfield Road and that was demolished more than a year ago.
- The existing and proposed site plans are inaccurate in they show a curved boundary with 222 Broadway. It is clear from the OS map that the boundary is straight and not following the

meandering poor quality fence installed a couple of years ago by the owner of 266 Eastfield Road.

- The existing site plan is inaccurate in that it shows a large lime tree in the north-west corner of the plot. Unfortunately, as noted above, this mature tree was recently removed, prior to submission of this proposal.
- We note the letter of support from a Mr Khan at No. 33 Park Crescent for the proposed development and we would point out that there does not appear to be any link or relationship in planning terms between these properties. We are sure the Council will attach such weight and credibility to such a letter of support as is appropriate.

Councillor Yasin has objected to the proposal on two grounds:

Traffic issues

- The proposal provides 11 parking spaces for residents and visitors. This indicates that there will be a very significant increase in traffic to and from the site. The entrance is only 25 metres from the traffic lights at the busy junction of Eastfield Road with Broadway and is likely to be a hazard for existing traffic and traffic entering and leaving the site.
- The entrance will be a risk for pedestrians as there are no visibility splays to the pavement. The visibility splays marked on plans simply cover views across the pavement to the road.

Inappropriate citation of precedent development

- The proposal cites the development at 270 Eastfield Road as a precedent. This is a very poor precedent as the 270 Eastfield Road development did not require demolition of the existing house, is on a very large site, does not consist of multiple closely packed houses, has retained the character of the existing property and is at least 10 metres from the boundary at the rear of the development. This contrasts with the proposed development at 266 Eastfield Road where the house on plot one is right on the boundary with number 270 and the houses at the rear are less than one metre from the boundaries of properties in College Park and Eastfield Road.
- The proposal cites the back-garden development at 220 Broadway as a precedent. This is again a very poor precedent as the 220 Broadway development did not require demolition of the existing house and the existing property retains a large garden, the development being on a former orchard beyond the formal garden. Even with these caveats, the development cannot be considered a success as it is visually dense and has degraded an attractive green area and adversely affected the amenity of several surrounding properties in Broadway Gardens, Broadway and College Park. The limited appeal of the development is shown by the fact that to our knowledge only one of the three properties has been sold despite repeated marketing efforts over the past 15 years. In addition, the permission was granted prior to inclusion of the property in the Park Conservation Area and it is unlikely that the development would be allowed now.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Park Conservation Area
- Neighbour amenity
- Future occupier amenity
- Meeting housing standards
- Highway safety and parking provision
- Trees
- Ecology
- Flood, water and drainage management
- Archaeology
- Contamination

a) Principle of development

The application site falls within the urban area of Peterborough and, more specifically, within an established residential area well-served by services and facilities. The proposal represents the construction of dwellings within the sizable rear garden to No. 266 Eastfield Road. This backland development is not specifically precluded by adopted national and local planning policies. As such, the principle of residential development is accepted under Policies LP2 and LP3 subject to assessment of the material planning considerations below.

b) Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Park Conservation Area

The application site does not fall within the Park Conservation Area (CA), but the CA abuts to the southern boundary. As such, the impact to the setting of the Park Conservation Area must be considered. Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) requires special regard to be paid to the desirability of preserving conservation areas such as the Park Conservation Area. This is further emphasised within the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which requires that significant weight be placed on the need to preserve heritage assets.

In addition to the above, the adjacent building to the north, known as 'The Limes', is a locally listed building with an Article 4 Direction. The Local Planning Authority has a duty under the NPPF when considering whether to grant permission for development which affects a non-designated heritage asset, or its setting, to have regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

The surrounding area comprises a mixed layout of dwellings. Nos. 260 to 266 Eastfield Road comprise two storey dwellinghouses with similarly-sized front gardens. The rear gardens are also similar in size, minus the large, L-shaped garden of the application site. Within the immediate area, there is variation to layout character. For example, opposite the driveway serving the application site, is a site where planning approval has previously been granted for 'backland development' for 3no. dwellings. Backland development has also occurred within the curtilage of No. 220 Broadway to the south, where permission was granted for the construction of 3no. detached dwellinghouses and to the north of site is 'The Limes' (No. 270 Eastfield Road), which has planning permission to provide 24no. assisted living units including parking and landscaping arrangements, all which would be served on the large site. Finally, neighbouring dwellings to the north-west of the application site (College Park) are of a more modern estate development in a cul-de-sac layout. These predominantly comprise detached two storey dwellings on modest-sized plots, situated close to the highway.

It is noted that the Council's Conservation Officer has objected to the proposal, advising that it would fail to preserve the setting of the Park Conservation Area. In addition, the Conservation

Officer has objected in terms of the principle of development, and harm to the setting of The Limes.

It is not considered that the three dwellings proposed in the rear garden would unacceptably impact upon the established layout character of the surrounding area. As described above, backland development is an existing characteristic within the immediate area and there are no local or national policies that would specifically preclude such development. The footprint of the 3no. proposed dwellings to the rear, plus their respective rear gardens, are considered to be similar to other properties within the locality. Whilst it is acknowledged that the gardens to the existing properties along Eastfield Road are larger, the proposed gardens are larger than those of the nearest dwellings along College Park and thus it is not considered that this factor is unacceptable. Furthermore, the siting of Plot 4 is considered to be appropriate to avoid any terracing effect with No. 7 College Park. It is not considered that the proposal would appear cramped or overdeveloped, with dwellings of appropriate size/scale for the plot served by adequately sized gardens, parking and access.

The Conservation Officer considers that the proposed access to serve the rear dwellings to be contrived and overly wide, with the proposed replacement dwelling being described as narrow as a result of the requirement to construct the revised access. Beginning with the existing dwelling, No. 266 Eastfield is considered to be pleasant in its appearance, but it has been harmed predominantly by its rendered, flat roof extension to the front elevation. Whilst other dwellings in the row have had render applied, the use of render to these dwellings is considered to be proportionate and enhances the appearance of these neighbouring dwellings, unlike the appearance of the application site. The Conservation Officer has also not specifically objected to the demolition of the existing dwelling and whilst local concerns have been raised against the demolition of the dwelling, Officers do not consider it is of such architectural merit that its demolition could be resisted. It is not considered that the loss of the dwelling would unacceptably impact upon the existing character of the surrounding area.

The proposed replacement dwelling would measure approximately 6.3 metres in width and 7.3 metres in height up to its ridge (excluding the chimney). The overall width of the existing dwelling is approximately 9.1 metres. Therefore, the proposed dwelling would be approximately 2.8 metres less in width, however, the proposed dwelling does contain details including sash windows, bay windows, plinth detailing that attempt to provide a positive and proportionate appearance to counteract this reduction in width. Balancing the revised dwelling against the proposed access: the width of the existing access measures approximately 3.7 metres, which would extend to 5.5 metres when measured adjacent to the footway. The proposed access width is required to ensure safe two-way traffic flows for the first 10 metres into the site. The expansion of the access would be visible within the street scene. In character and appearance terms, the impact is not considered to be unacceptable for two reasons: Firstly, the existing fence and hedge to the front of site could be removed without planning consent, provide a clear opening into the site that is visible from the street scene, which is similar to what would result from the proposed access. Secondly, the access serving Nos 283B, 283C and 283D Eastfield Road, opposite the application site, measures approximately 5 metres in width to provide for two way traffic. Although the Conservation Officer is uncomfortable with the proposed access, there are existing accesses of similar proportions within the immediate area. Overall, and on balance, Officers do not consider that the proposed replacement dwelling and the proposed access to be unacceptably out of character such that unacceptable harm would result to the visual amenity of the locality, or the setting of nearby heritage assets.

The proposed dwellings to the rear of site would have similar proportions to each and would utilise details to provide further identity to each dwelling are considered to be similar in appearance and proportions. There is separation provided between the dwelling to enable 'breathing space' which is considered sufficient to avoid them being unacceptably cramped in. The proposed dwelling 'Plot 4' is situated further forward beyond the front elevations of Plot 2 and 3, but this is not considered to be unacceptable.

Officers are aware that the dwellings proposed to the rear of site measure approximately 9.8

metres in height from ground level to the ridge (excluding the chimney) which are taller than the more standard two storey dwellings along the frontage of Eastfield Road. However, the nearest dwelling to Eastfield Road, Plot 2, would be approximately 58 metres from the public highway, which would also be predominantly screened by the existing dwellings along Eastfield Road that are set back from the public highway. On balance, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the site or surrounding area as this taller height would not be unduly prominent within the public realm. It would be necessary to secure full details of materials by way of a planning condition along with site levels to ensure that the site is not built up significant such that the height of the dwellings was increased.

With regards to other design matters, the proposed gates to the vehicular access would be situated approximately 1.8 metre behind the front elevation of the proposed replacement dwelling. This was revised from its previous position adjacent to the bin collection point. It is considered that the location of these in-swinging gates, whilst visible from the street scene, would not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

The proposed bin collection point store would be located to the front of site. In terms of use, its position is necessary to enable refuse collection. Officers do share concerns with neighbouring residents about its visual impact within the streetscene. However, the Applicant has agreed to the use of soft landscaping to screen the collection point when directly facing the site. Given that bin storage areas are provided within the curtilage of each proposed dwelling, it is considered that this collection point would predominantly remain empty except on collection days, thus limiting the visual harm of bins from site and within the street scene.

The Local Planning Authority has a duty under paragraph 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) to identify and assess the significance of any heritage assets that may be impacted upon by a proposal to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. For this proposal, the key assets identified include the Park Conservation Area to the south-west which has an adopted Appraisal, and the locally-listed The Limes. The Council's Conservation Officer provided an assessment of the proposal via comments received and efforts were made to improve the proposal, which include improvements to the bin collection point, revising the location of the vehicular gate and altering the design and appearance of Plot 4 (following deletion of what was Plot 5). It is not considered that the proposed backland development would result in significant harm to the setting of the Park Conservation Area or adversely impact upon the setting of the Article 4-listed No. 270 Eastfield Road, also known as The Limes.

The NPPF (paragraph 196) requires that development which results in less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets be weighed against the benefits of the proposal. Further, Paragraph 118, and more broadly Section 11, of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) support developments would development that makes effective use of under-utilised land and it is considered such applies here given the current, substantial garden that serves No. 266 Eastfield Road. Further, the proposal constitutes a windfall housing site which the Local Plan relies upon in regards to ensuring that housing delivery meets with the Local Plan targets. Whilst the Council has a demonstrable five year housing land supply, and it meeting the housing delivery test by over 100%, the provision of windfall housing does carry some weight.

On the basis of the above, Officers consider the proposal to be in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

c) Neighbour amenity

There are a number of residential dwellings surrounding the site, with dwellings served by Eastfield Road (Nos. 260 - 264 Eastfield Road and 'The Limes'), College Park (No. 7 College Park) and Broadway (No. 222. Broadway).

Eastfield Road neighbours

With regards to the dwellinghouses along Eastfield Road, the access road would abut to the side boundaries of Nos. 264 and 266 Eastfield Road, with the 3no. dwellings to the rear of site.

It is accepted that the proposal would result in additional movements to/from the site in close proximity to the rear garden area of No.264. However, the movements are not considered to generate such a significant level of noise/general disturbance that unacceptable levels of harm would result to occupants.

The curtilage of Plot 2 abuts to the rear boundaries of Nos. 260, 262 and 264 Eastfield Road, with the proposed dwelling covering the width of the rear garden to No. 264 Eastfield Road. The garden to No. 264 Eastfield Road measures approximately 27 metres in depth. At this distance, it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would cause adverse overbearing or overshadowing impact that would unacceptably impact upon the use and enjoyment of this garden. One window is proposed to the first floor of the facing side elevation, which would serve a bathroom. Given that this is not a primary habitable room, it is considered reasonable to secure obscure glazing to this proposed opening through a planning compliance condition.

Plot 2 would also be visible to Nos. 260 and 262 Eastfield Road. It is not considered unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing effects would impact upon the enjoyment and use of these neighbouring dwellings their garden. There are first floor window opening proposed to the rear elevation, however it is considered that clear views into the rear garden of No. 262 Eastfield Road would not occur given the oblique angle from this proposed opening into the garden. For No. 260 Eastfield Road, Officers consider that some views would be gained into this neighbouring rear garden, but it is not considered that the impact would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy given that the views would be to the rear-most portions of the garden.

Finally, The Limes (No. 270 Eastfield Road) to the north of site is a sizable complex across a large site. It is not considered that the proposed dwellings to the rear of site would appear excessively overbearing or prominent across this neighbouring site given their set back nature. Some views would be obtained given that the proposed dwellings would be set back approximately 17 metres from the south-facing elevation of The Limes, but on balance this is not considered to be unacceptable.

No. 7 College Park

No. 7 College Park is adjacent to the north-west boundary of the application site. This detached dwelling would be nearest to the proposed dwelling 'Plot 4', where there would be approximately 7.5 metres between the two storey elevations of each building, which is reduced to approximately 4 metres when accounting for the proposed single storey side element. It is considered that there is sufficient separation between the dwellings to avoid unacceptable overbearing impacts and shadows to the rear garden and conservatory of No. 7 College Park would only fall across this land during early morning periods. This time frame is considered to be too short to cause unacceptable harm to occupants.

Finally, it is not considered that the occupiers to No. 7 College Park would have an unacceptable reduction in their privacy. There are no windows to the side elevation of that neighbouring property and therefore no views would be established to the dwellinghouse via this elevation. Furthermore, there are no upper floor windows proposed to the north-west facing elevation of Plot 4. There are opening proposed to the first floor rear elevation serving bedrooms, but it is not considered that they would overlook the conservatory or patio areas to No. 7 College Park. As such, Officers do not consider the proposal to unacceptably impact upon this neighbour.

No. 222 Broadway

Finally, the rear garden serving No. 222 Broadway abuts to the south-west boundary of the application site. With the rear elevations of the proposed 3no. dwellings to be set approximately 16 metres from this boundary, it is not considered that any undue harm to this neighbour would result. No. 222 Broadway is served by a very large garden, large in both in depth and width, which is

considered to be sufficient to enable the neighbours to enjoy both their property and their garden without a loss of privacy. Furthermore, there are two lime trees to the boundary protected through a Tree Preservation Order (T15 and T17). It is considered that these protected trees would provide further screening and privacy to this neighbour.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

d) Future occupier amenity

All four of the proposed dwellinghouses are considered to be spacious and laid out appropriately. Each of the proposed habitable rooms, including bedrooms and living rooms, are considered to be served by acceptably sized windows to allow both adequate light provision whilst avoiding an unacceptable sense of enclosure. With regards to Plots 2 and 3, i.e. the semi-detached pair, it is considered that the proposed layout is acceptable to avoid unacceptable noise and disturbances.

Bin storage is proposed within each dwelling's garden, which is considered to be acceptable and furthermore, there are access points either side of the dwellings to enable bins to be moved out from the rear gardens. The bin collection point is proposed to the front of site, near to the site access, which is proposed to be surrounded in landscape. Whilst concerns have been as to the impact of the bin collection point upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the collection area is considered to be appropriate for refuse collectors and the Waste Officer has raised no objections to this matter. A condition is proposed to ensure this area, as well as the bin storage points within the private gardens areas, are retained for these purposes only and that no hard enclosure is provided.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

e) Meeting housing standards

Policy LP8 requires all new dwellings be constructed to accord with Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations (often referred to as lifetime homes standard) unless there are exceptional reasons to justify otherwise.

Level access is proposed to all of the dwellinghouses, each with their own private, principal entrance points. The required clearance of 1.2 metres are also proposed to each dwelling beyond the front door and upper floor landings are considered to be acceptable. Ground floor sanitation facilities are also considered to be acceptable, with sufficient clearances provided between the toilets and wash basin to enable wheelchair turning (if required). The general clearance spaces to the dwelling are considered to be appropriate to enable the dwellings to meet the requirements of Part M4(2).

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

f) Highway safety and parking provision

Turning first to parking provision, under adopted parking standards, two spaces are required to serve dwellings with two or more bedrooms.

Of the four dwellings proposed (1no. replacement dwelling, 3no. 'new' dwellings), each would have two bedrooms, so there is a minimum need of 8no. parking spaces plus 1 visitor space. 9 parking spaces are proposed and the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has not objected to their layout. Tracking diagrams have also been provided to demonstrate that all parking spaces are accessible and vehicles could enter the site, turn and exit in a forward gear. The private rear gardens are large enough to accommodate cycle parking without impacting upon the enjoyment and use of the

gardens.

Objectors have raised concern with regards to the turning availability for delivery vehicles which it is noted can be a daily occurrence. The proposal includes a turning area which would ensure vehicles can enter and exit the site in a forward gear.

With regards to access in and out of the site, the proposal would utilise the existing access, albeit widened to 5.5 metres in width. It is accepted that three additional dwellings would generate more movements than the existing single dwelling. However the Local Highway Authority do not consider the increase in traffic to be unacceptable and it is considered that the public highway has capacity to accommodate the limited additional trip generation. The position of the gate and the road alignment would not likely result in excessive speed being generated on-site which could pose a risk to pedestrian users of the footway.

Finally, the Local Highway Authority consider that vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays can be adequately conditioned rather than requested prior to determination. The LHA advises that the required x-distance (2.4 metres) would predominantly fall within the existing footway and the splays themselves, at 43 metres in length would fall across the existing public highway.

With regards to vehicle-pedestrian visibility splays, 2.0 x 2.0 metre visibility splays would normally be required for shared accesses. However, it is evident that the splay to the southern boundary of the access would overlap onto the neighbouring plot at No. 264 Eastfield Road and therefore cannot be provided. However, the Local Highway Authority quote that splays compliant with guidance from the 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' (DMRB) can be achieved as a result of the access, which is further mitigated by the width of the footway. This would ensure that adequate visibility was provided of oncoming pedestrians to vehicles exiting the site, and thus the Local Highway Authority raise no objection.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

g) Trees

The site contains a number of trees to its boundaries. Two trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order, which are adjacent to the south-west boundary of the site, which abuts to the Park Conservation Area boundary. Further to an arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) and arboricultural method statement (AMS) submitted by the Applicant, the Council's Tree Officer has raised no objection to the proposed development. The Tree Officer however requests further details to be submitted, specifically a landscaping plan, comprising replacement tree planting and details of the proposed native species hedging. It is considered that this matter can be secured through a planning compliance condition. It is considered to be appropriate for details to be secured prior to first occupation of any dwelling and the planting to take place no later than the first planting season after occupation of any dwelling.

It is noted that objections have been received which raise concern with regards to the future pressure to prune/fell the trees within the site given their siting in relation to the gardens proposed. The mature lime trees within the site which are protected, are located to the rearmost areas of the gardens serving Plots 2-4. Whilst some shading would result due to their orientation to the south of the dwellings, all plots would be afforded areas of garden which would not be subject to considerable overshadowing or leaf litter. It is considered therefore that any future pressure to prune/fell could reasonably be resisted.

Objectors have also raised that 1no. mature lime tree was felled prior to the submission of the application. As this tree was not subject to any formal protection, its felling did not require the benefit of any consent.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP29 of the

Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

h) Ecology

Further to review of the proposal, the City Council's Wildlife Officer has raised no objections, subject to the following matters being secured through appropriate planning conditions.

Firstly, from the information submitted, it is advised that hedgehogs have been confirmed as being on site. The Wildlife Officer therefore suggests that all excavations greater than 0.2 metres in depth be covered overnight or a means of escape installed. Any open ended pipe-work should also be covered and materials fenced off. These matters could be secured through a planning compliance condition and thus one is recommended covering these matters.

In addition, the Wildlife Officer recommends that the boundary treatments are secured through a planning condition, to ensure that appropriately sized openings can be installed within the fencing to allow easier movement for hedgehogs passing between gardens. Details of the boundary treatments would be secured through a condition regardless and reference to the need to provide hedgehog holes shall be included.

Finally, the Wildlife Officer suggests that any external lighting should be LED and be on a sensor (if possible), directed away from trees. To ensure that only appropriate external light provisions are installed, it is considered necessary to secure these details as a planning condition, prior to first occupation of any dwelling.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

i) Flood, water and drainage management

No part of the application site falls within Flood Zones 2 or 3. Therefore, whilst there are more dwellinghouses within the curtilage of the site, it is not considered that they would be at unacceptable risk of flooding.

A drainage strategy has been submitted by the Applicant covering foul and surface water drainage. Further to review of the strategy, the Council's Drainage Officer has raised no objections to this scheme and recommends that a condition be secured to ensure that the sustainable drainage is completed prior to first occupation of any new dwelling. This is considered to be reasonable and this shall be secured as a planning compliance condition.

Policy LP32 requires all new dwellings to accord with the Optimal Technical Housing Standard of 110 litres per person per day, as defined in Building Regulations G2, to ensure efficient water usage. This matter can be secured under a planning condition.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

j) Archaeology

The City Council's Archaeologist advises that the application site is within an area that has witnessed no archaeological investigations. Without evidence, the archaeological interests and significance of the site and the immediate area cannot be acceptably determined. Therefore, it is recommended that an archaeological programme comprising trial trenching methodologies and assessment should be secured to determine the presence, state of preservation and date of any potential buried remains. Officers consider these matters are reasonable to secure through a planning condition.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough

Local Plan (2019).

k) Contamination

There is no record of known contamination associated with any part of the application site. As such, the City Council's Environmental Health Officer has raised no objections to the proposed development. In the event of any unexpected contamination being uncovered during construction, it is considered necessary and essential for the contamination to be dealt by way of a planning condition. This would require a method statement to be submitted to the planning department for assessment and approval to deal with this contamination.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Other matters not considered above

- *Proposals considered elsewhere*: Comments were raised about the determination of planning applications elsewhere in Peterborough, specifically planning application 20/01519/OUT - Land to the rear of No. 152 St Pauls Road. In the view of Officers, this property and its immediate setting is an entirely different character and layout to that considered under this current planning application and thus is not relevant to the determination of this application. In any event, all proposals must be considered on their own merits.

- *Inappropriate precedents*: This proposal has been assessed on its own merits. Notwithstanding this, backland development is not specifically precluded in any local or national policies.

- *Building regulations*: Unless specific Building Regulations matters are covered under adopted planning policies, such as Part M4(2) under Policy LP8 or Policy G2 under Policy LP32, matters of building regulation compliance are not material planning considerations.

- *Fire safety*: No comments were received by Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue. Officers are aware of building regulation requirements with regards to the distance of dwellings from the public highway through Approved Document B. Sprinkler systems can be utilised and thus it is considered necessary to secure details of these matters prior to first occupation of Plots 2, 3 or 4. It is reiterated however that fire safety is assessed through the building control stages post development to avoid the planning duplicating other legislation and it may well be the case that the Applicant cannot implement any planning consent (if granted) if building regulations approval cannot be obtained.

6 Conclusions

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

- The principle of development is acceptable.
- The character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Park Conservation Area would not be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would not adversely impact upon the amenity of nearby neighbours, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The amenity of future occupiers would be acceptable, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The dwellings would be constructed to appropriate housing standards, in accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would not unacceptably impact upon the safety of the surrounding highways, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Trees on and immediately surrounding the site would not be unacceptably impacted upon by the

proposed development, in accordance with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would not unacceptably impact upon any protected species on-site or within the immediate area, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposed development would not be at adverse risk of flooding, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- No known buried heritage assets would be adversely impacted upon by the proposed development, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The application site would not unacceptably be impacted by any known contamination, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

7 Recommendation

The Executive Director of Place and Economy recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

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

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

- C 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Location Plan (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL100)
- Existing Site Plan (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL112)
- Proposed Site Plan (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL101, Revision F)
- Topographical Survey (Drawing number MSL35467-T)
- Vehicle Swept Paths (Drawing number P20032-SMCE-ZZ-XX-DR-C-0101, Revision P04)

Plot 1

- Proposed Ground Floor and First Floor Plans (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL102, Revision A)
- Proposed Elevations (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL103)

Plots 2 and 3

- Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL104, Revision A)
- Proposed Second Floor Plan (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL105, Revision A)
- Proposed Front and Rear Elevations (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL106, Revision A)
- Proposed Side Elevations (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL107, Revision A)

Plot 4

- Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL108, Revision C)
- Proposed Second Floor Plan (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL109, Revision C)
- Proposed Front and Rear Elevations (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL110, Revision C)
- Proposed Side Elevations (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL111, Revision C)

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

C 3 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place unless and until details of the following external materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Walling (samples);
- Roofing (samples);
- Cills and lintels;
- Windows and doors;
- Roof lights;
- Driveway and access surfacing; and
- Rainwater goods.

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

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C 4 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the following:-

- Planting plans including species, numbers, size and density of planting;
- Details of the proposed native species hedge
- Details of replacement tree planting
- Details of all hard and soft boundary treatments, including gates;
- Details of appropriately sized holes within boundary treatments to ensure hedgehog movements are not harmed and
- Hard surfaces including driveways and patios.

The approved hard landscaping scheme (boundary treatments and hard surfaces) shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and retained thereafter.

The soft landscaping shall be carried out within the first available planting season following first occupation of the dwelling to which it relates or alternatively in accordance with a timetable for landscape implementation which has been approved as part of the submitted landscape scheme.

Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme (except those contained in enclosed rear gardens to individual dwellings) that die, are removed or become diseased within five years of the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the developers, or their successors in title with an equivalent size, number and species to those being replaced. Any replacement trees, shrubs or hedgerows dying within five years of planting shall themselves be replaced with an equivalent size, number and species.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity of this area and to preserve the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C 5 Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, the foul and surface water drainage scheme set out within the document 'Drainage Strategy' (Document reference document (P20032-SMCEZZ-XX-RP-D-0001, Rev. P06) shall be completed. The approved

scheme shall be retained, managed and maintained in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plans.

Reason: To ensure appropriate drainage measures are retained for the longevity of the dwellings permitted, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 6 No development shall take commencement unless and until a programme of archaeological work, including a Written Scheme of Investigation (comprising trial trenching methodologies, assessment and analysis), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place unless in complete accordance with the approved scheme. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full including any post development requirements e.g. archiving and submission of final reports.

Reason: To mitigate the impact of the scheme on the historic environment when preservation in situ is not possible, in accordance with paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no groundworks harm potentially important buried heritage.

- C 7 Prior to first occupation of the relevant dwelling, the following windows shall be fitted with obscure glazing to a minimum of Pilkington Level 3 and be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed:

- Plot 1 at first floor to the north facing side elevation;
- Plot 2 at first floor to the west-facing side elevation;
- Plot 3 at first floor to the east-facing side elevation; and
- Plot 4 at first floor to the east-facing side elevation.

The obscure glazing shall be continuous and shall not incorporate any clear glazing features. The windows shall subsequently be retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupants and future occupants, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 8 Prior to first occupation of any of the dwellings on Plots 2, 3 or 4, as shown on the drawing 'Proposed Site Plan (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL101, Revision F)', details of a scheme for the provision of internal fire sprinkler systems shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall specify the technical details of the sprinkler systems, a plan for each unit for where they would be installed and details on how they would operate. The approved sprinkler system shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of each dwelling and shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring appropriate fire safety measures.

- C 9 Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, the areas shown for the purposes of parking and turning on the drawing Proposed Site Plan (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL101, Revision F) shall be provided. Such provision shall thereafter be retained for these purposes associated with the dwellings hereby permitted, and not put to any other use.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C10 No development shall take place, excluding works of demolition, unless and until full details of the finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floor of the proposed building, in relation to existing ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: In the interests of accessibility for future occupiers as well as in the interests of surrounding neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C11 No development shall commence unless and until fully operational wheel cleaning equipment has been provided on the exit from the site with the public highway, and it shall be maintained free from mud, slurry or any other form of contamination whilst in use. All vehicles leaving the site shall be served by the wheel cleaning equipment which is to be sited to ensure that vehicles are able to leave the site and enter the public highway in a clean condition and free of debris which could fall onto the public highway. The wheel cleaning equipment shall be retained on site in full working order for the duration of the development.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C12 Prior to first occupation of any dwelling on Plots 2, 3 or 4, the widened vehicular access shown on the drawing 'Proposed Site Plan' (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL101, Revision F) shall be constructed and hard surfaced in accordance with the details approved under condition C4 above.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C13 Prior to first use of the widened access hereby permitted, vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays measuring 2.4 metres (from the back edge of the carriageway along the centre line of the proposed access) x 43 metres (measured along the channel line of the public highway from the centre line of the proposed access) shall be provided to both side of the access. The visibility splays shall thereafter be retained and kept permanently clear of all obstacles above 600mm in height from ground level in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C14 Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without amendment), the vehicular access hereby permitted shall only be gated in accordance with the details as shown on the drawing 'Proposed Site Plan' (Drawing number 4091-BB-XX-XXX-XX-A-PL101, Revision F). The gate shall open inwards only and shall be maintained and retained as such thereafter.

No enclosures or boundary treatments shall be constructed forward of the front principal elevation of Plot 1 unless those expressly authorised by this or any future planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policies LP13, LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C15 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 3 Class L of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the residential units hereby permitted shall each be a single residential unit within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) only.

Reason: The site is not served by sufficient parking to accommodate the demands generated by small-scale houses in multiple occupation such that harm would result to highway safety from such a use, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C16 During construction works, all construction trenches and excavations greater than 0.2 metres in depth shall be covered overnight and a method of escape for mammals, specifically hedgehogs, shall be provided to each trench (such as a ramp). All open-ended pipework shall be fully covered and equipment and materials shall be secured with appropriate fencing if left on-site.

Reason: In the interest of preserving the biodiversity value of the site, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C17 Prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby permitted, details of all external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the technical specification of the light fittings (including product codes and supplier), as well as plans as to where the lights would be fitted. The approved lighting shall be installed prior to first occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and thereafter maintained as such.

Reason: In the interest of future resident amenity, their security and to ensure that there is no adverse impact to surrounding wildlife, in accordance with Policies LP17 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C18 The development hereby permitted shall achieve the Optional Technical Housing Standard of 110 litres of water usage per person per day.

Reason: To minimise impact on the water environment, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C19 No development shall take place unless and until the tree protection measures within the rear garden detailed within the documents 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment (reference: 20-4237, version 2, dated 29 October 2020) and 'Arboricultural Method Statement' (20-4238, version 2, dated 29 October 2020)) have been installed. The protective fencing shall be retained throughout the duration of construction of the development hereby permitted. No materials or equipment shall be stored within the area enclosed by the tree protection measures during the period of construction.

Reason: In order to safeguard retained trees, in accordance with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C20 Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B, and E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification):

- No rear extensions to Plots 2, 3 and 4 shall be constructed;
- No side extensions to Plot 4 shall be constructed;
- No roof enlargements to Plots 1, 2, 3 and 4 shall be constructed; and
- No outbuildings to Plots 1, 2, 3 and 4 shall be constructed;

other than those expressly authorised by this permission or any future planning permission.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of surrounding neighbours, as well as the amenity of trees on-site and immediately off-site, in accordance with Policies LP17 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copies to Councillors Joseph, Nawaz and Yasin