

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 13 APRIL 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  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor  
Nick Greaves, Principal Engineer  
Daniel Kalley, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**48. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence received.

**49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest received.

**50. 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.

**51. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

**51.1 20/01550/FUL - Lorac Lodge, 4 Turnpike Road, Hampton Vale, Peterborough**

The Committee received a report, which sought planning permission for the 'Change of use from C3 (single dwelling) to C2 (children's home) for up to 3 persons'.

It was understood that the proposed children's home would provide care and support to vulnerable children and those with learning disabilities within the Peterborough area. The home would enable the children receiving care to live as independently as possible within a registered home setting, supported living service with a tenancy or home with cared (HwC) package.

The home would offer different levels of support, according to the service users specific needs. These services may range from everyday life challenges such as domestic duties, shopping, financial management, companionship and more intimate personal care such as washing and dressing. Specialist support and care would be provided to those people

with more complex and challenging needs i.e. people with Learning Disabilities, Physical Disabilities, Autistic Spectrum Disorders, Mental Health Illness, Acquired Brain Injuries and Behaviours that Challenge.

No external alterations or other associated development is proposed. Access arrangements would remain as existing.

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

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

- The responses to objections from officers was welcomed and for making sure the application was going to have less of an impact than what was originally proposed.
- There was a need for providing this type of accommodation and service to Peterborough and the children the Council was responsible for looking after. However, this location was the worst place possible for the proposal to go.
- As Ward Councillor for Hampton one of the biggest issues was the lack of parking and at times it was impossible for some residents to be able to leave their driveway.
- It was not clear from the report whether the occupiers of the premises would also have vehicles. It was important to note that the local highways authority objected to this application.
- The report outlined that there were six usable parking spaces, however when viewing the site it was more realistic to expect no more than three usable spaces could be accommodated. There would be extra vehicles parked by the premises when there was a shift change, increasing the issues around the area in terms of vehicle congestion.
- Committee were urged to look at the application in front of them and not think about what the property could be used as in the future, for example turning the premises into a house of multiple occupation (HMO).
- There was always the risk that if the application was not successful that the property could become a HMO without any need for planning permission and that could mean a number of additional vehicles being parked at the premises.
- It was important that this application was taken on its merits and not whether it could be a HMO.
- It did not matter when the handover times were, there was always going to be a number of cars on the site.
- The road was so narrow that if cars parked on the road legally there would not be enough room to get an emergency vehicle down the road.

Mr Darren Jayatilaka, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There were two main issues with the application. Firstly that there was no adequate parking in the area. Although the planning officers have stated that three cars could be parked in the drive this was just not possible.
- The proposed handover time of 8am was not ideal. There were still a number of people at home at this time and a number of residents were also preparing to take their children to school at this time.

- There was already too much traffic on the road due to the school runs and this was a risk to child safety.
- Due to the lack of parking there had been a number of aggressive confrontations between residents and visitors to the area. As there had been incidents in the past with waste disposal vehicles some of the road had been painted as double yellow, however ideally more of the road needed to be painted this way.
- There were no other businesses on the street, the homes were used as residential dwellings and were used peacefully by the residents. However, with this application it was possible that children with challenging behaviour might be more common with this application.

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

- The Highways Officer confirmed that they did not support tandem parking in any form on these types of developments. In this instance there was the possibility that there would be issues with one car trying to exit another trying to enter. It was debateable whether the three cars proposed parking alongside each other would be feasible. In addition the use of tandem parking could be problematic if there was additional visits or staff needed to attend the premises.
- There would be significant vehicle movements during shift changeovers which would most likely result in some of the vehicles being parked on the side of the road outside the premises.
- Although conditions could be included with regards to the parking these had not been discussed with the applicant and there was a reason why the applicants had made the suggestions for parking.
- It was important that members looked at the application that was in front of committee only and not make suggestions. There were strong objections from the highway team with regards to the level of parking and the suggested approach by the applicants.
- There were issues down the road at the current time, with more cars at this property it would make the situation worse and it was not possible to proceed with the application.
- The Council was short of care facilities that could be used, the only objection that had been made by the local councillor and residents was that there would be overcrowding of parking. The Care Commission had made recommendations that more care facilities such as those being proposed were needed in Peterborough.
- It was easier to manage tandem parking if there was a set time for the handover and shift patterns. If this was to be a HMO it would be more difficult to control the parking situation. In addition there was no planning permission required to turn a home into a HMO for less than six people.
- There needed to be more encouragement for homes such as these for looked after children, compared to institutions that had a number of children staying in them.
- The two-year approval was too long, if there were any issue they would more than likely be seen quite quickly and there would be too long a period to be able to do anything about this.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to go against officer recommendation and **REFUSE** the application due to insufficient onsite car parking which would lead to an increased level of off street parking in local area that would be detrimental to highways safety and residential amenity. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 for, 3 against) to **REFUSE** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers particularly in relation to the treatment of the tree.

#### **REASON FOR THE DECISION:**

The proposal was not acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan, in particular insufficient onsite car parking leading to an increased level of off street parking that would be detrimental to highways safety and residential amenity.

#### **51.2 21/00032/HHFUL - 21 Normangate, Ailsworth, Peterborough, PE5 7BF**

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for a two storey rear extension constructed to the side of and above an existing single storey rear outrigger comprising a kitchen. It would be part single storey and part two storey in height forming a staggered arrangement.

The ground floor rear extension would measure 3m in depth and 4.8m in width. The western end would have a flat roof measuring 3m from ground level with a roof light. The ground floor would accommodate a dining room. Together with the existing single storey kitchen outrigger, it would extend almost across the whole rear elevation. It would not project out from the dwelling any deeper than the existing outrigger.

The first floor rear extension would measure 3m in depth and 6m in width. It would have a hipped roof measuring 7.1m in height to the ridge and 5.6m to the eaves. The first floor would accommodate a bedroom and a bathroom with one window to serve each room. It would be situated partly above the existing kitchen outrigger and partly above the proposed ground floor extension. It would extend across two-thirds of the rear elevation. It would not project out from the dwelling any deeper than the existing outrigger.

The extension would be finished in materials that match those on the existing dwelling with the exception of the aluminium bi-fold doors.

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 was an established home and the proposals sought would improve the property. The only reason it was at committee was due to the relationship between the applicant and the Council. In addition there were no neighbours objecting to the proposal.

#### **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 Policy LP16 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).
- Sufficient parking would remain on site and therefore the proposal would be in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

CHAIRMAN  
1:30 – 2.46PM

This page is intentionally left blank