

**Application Ref:** 20/01678/FUL

**Proposal:** Change of use of redundant agricultural building to 2 no. two bedroomed Holiday lets

**Site:** The Black House Farm, Crowland Road, Eye, Peterborough  
**Applicant:** Mrs Heather Phillips

**Agent:** Mr John Hartley  
 J J & J Hartley

**Referred by:** **Councillor Nigel Simons**  
**Reason:** Disputed access along the driveway/gates

**Site visit:** 22.01.2021

**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 Black House Farm, which is located in the open countryside, approximately 0.5km north of the village boundary of Eye Green. The existing dwellinghouse on the farm was granted consent in 1983, with access via a private track to Crowland Road. The site is served by a sizable garden and an agricultural building is located west of the existing dwellinghouse.

This agricultural building is the subject of the application and is single storey and brick built in nature. It is set out in a horse-shoe arrangement, with a courtyard in the centre.

**Proposal**

Permission is sought to convert the agricultural building to serve as 2no. 2-bed holiday lets. Minor external works are also proposed, associated with the conversion. These predominantly relate to new or altered window and door openings, but also includes the removal of a lean-to element and closing up of a currently open side to the northern elevation facing into the courtyard.

It should be noted that re-consultation followed on this proposal after Officers noted that the private access road serving the site is not in the ownership of the Applicant. The Applicant amended the ownership certificate from Certificate A to Certificate B, and served the requisite notice upon all landowners.

## **2 Planning History**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Date</b>
10/01004/FUL	Extension of time of application 07/00964/FUL - Construction of two storey side extension	Permitted	13/09/2010
07/00964/FUL	Two storey side extension	Permitted	07/08/2007
07/00211/FUL	Use of soft standing for pony and horse jumping practice, including erection of fencing	Permitted	30/04/2007
P0389/83	Reintroduction of residential use, extension and alterations to form habitable dwelling	Permitted	02/06/1983

## **3 Planning Policy**

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

### **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.

#### **LP11 - Development in the Countryside**

Part A: Re-Use and Conversion of Non-Residential Buildings for Residential Use in the Countryside- Change of use proposals will be supported provided that the use has not ceased, for agricultural buildings they were not constructed in the last 10 years, no more than 3 units would be created, significant reconstruction is not required and there are no fundamental constraints to delivery or harm arising.

Part B: Replacement of Permanent Existing Dwellings in the Countryside- Proposals will be supported provided that the residential use has not been abandoned, it is a permanent structure and the dwelling is not of architectural or historic merit. The replacement dwelling should be of an appropriate scale and design and is located on the site of the original house (unless suitable justification is provided).

Part C: Mobile Homes/Temporary Dwellings in the Countryside- Applications will be considered in the same way as permanent dwellings.

Part D: New Dwellings in the Countryside- Permission for a permanent dwelling in the countryside for an agricultural worker will only be granted to support existing agricultural activities on a well established agricultural unit subject to demonstration of a functional need which cannot be met by an existing dwelling or conversion.

Part E: The Rural Economy- Development involving the expansion or conversion of an existing employment use/building or use for tourism/leisure will be supported provided it is an appropriate scale, would not adversely affect the local community/services and would not cause harm to the character of the area and would be accessible.

Part F: Protecting the Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land- Proposals should protect this land to ensure the continuation of the agricultural economy. With the exception of allocated sites proposals affecting this land will only be accepted if there is lower grade land available, the impacts

have been minimised through design solutions and where feasible the land is restored when the development ceases.

Part G: Agricultural Diversification- Proposals will be permitted provided that the location and scale are appropriate for the use and the scale is appropriate for the business.

### **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.

LP13d) City Centre- All proposal must demonstrate that careful consideration has been given to prioritising pedestrian access, to improving access for those with mobility issues, to encouraging cyclists and to reducing the need for vehicles to access the area.

### **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.

### **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.

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

### **Eye Parish Council (22.01.21)**

No comments. [N.B. *This comment was received prior to Councillor Simons' call-in request*]

### **PCC Peterborough Highways Services (23.04.21)**

Objection - The additional untitled drawing shows the existing access arrangements. It is evident that the existing access is sub-standard when compared to our current standards for accesses serving more than 1 dwelling or a commercial use. This is particular in relation to vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays, vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays and width. As a consequence, the manoeuvring of vehicles likely to be generated by the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the safety of users of the adjoining public highway.

**North Level District Internal Drainage Board (20.04.21)**

No objections - The drain, Green Drain, forms the western boundary of the site and therefore, the Board's byelaws apply. In particular, byelaw no.10, which states 'no person without the previous consent of the Board shall erect any building or structure whether temporary or permanent within 9 metres of the drain'.

**Environment Agency (01.04.21)**

No objections - The Applicants are advised that future occupiers /occupants of the site fully sign up to Floodline Warnings Direct. This can be done online at <https://www.gov.uk/sign-up-for-flood-warnings> or by phoning Floodline Warnings Direct on 0345 988 1188.

The Local Planning Authority are advised that the proposal is not supported by a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan (FWEP). In this instance, it is considered that a warning and emergency response is fundamental to managing flood risk. We strongly recommend that a FWEP is obtained prior to determining the application and that you consult with your Emergency Planning staff on its contents.

**Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 2

Total number of responses: 4

Total number of objections: 4

Total number in support: 0

Four letters of objection were received from one local resident. The following matters were raised:

- The applicant illegally developed one addition barn conversion some years ago avoiding the proper planning permission and council tax process. The applicant lived in the barn conversion while from 9 February 2015 renting out her main house on long term lets, using rental agents. Their first tenants stayed for some months. At that time, objections were raised with her and her partner by the neighbouring householder. In 2015, the letting agents confirmed in writing that the owners (now the applicant) would be living onsite in their barn development whilst renting their house.
- No permission had been sought for this development with any of the necessary appropriate authorities or affected parties: Peterborough City Council and neighbouring properties.
- The applicant knowingly falsely claims that foul sewage is to be disposed of via the mains sewer. No mains sewer accesses the Black House. Neither is there any option for accessing any mains sewer for the planned properties. Their current limited sewage system for their house empties somewhat controversially into the nearby drainage dyke. Where does the existing barn development sewage go?
- Additionally stable waste has regularly run off into the drainage dyke and the remaining waste straw has been openly burned generating heavy (carcinogenic) smoke clouds blown by the prevailing winds causing neighbours to move indoors.
- The additional traffic flow from the proposed two 2-bedroom holiday lets development from the busy 60mph Crowland Road would clearly introduce safety risks. (Vehicles of renters, their friends and additional delivery service and grocery supply vehicles.)
- Numerous temporary holiday home renters would be a clear security risk to the owners of the neighbouring property (whose private house driveway allows limited access rights to the Black House). There would be a clear security risk in this secluded area.
- The introduction of regular tourist traffic with renters' cars and other vehicles would represent a

- loss of amenity to the neighbouring householders and their grounds alongside their driveway.
- Multiple renters, their children and visiting friends (and additional delivery service and grocery supply drivers) would bring a loss of privacy to the neighbouring homeowners in this secluded area.
  - Extra refuse bins for the additional two 2-bedroom holiday lets would bring a loss of amenity to the area bringing a commercial look at the entrance to what is a single driveway to a house. Furthermore, the proposed signposts at the entrance would introduce further infringements on amenity. These would be completely out of character.
  - The expected noise and disturbance from multiple new additional holiday let properties would without doubt cause disturbance in this secluded area to the neighbours.
  - The Black House does not own the access driveway. No right of way exists for additional properties along the privately owned driveway across which the Black House, as a single property, has clearly defined and limited right of way access.
  - Increased traffic flow along the owning householder's private driveway would have a negative effect on nature conservation. The possible introduction of holiday-let renters bringing dogs and other animals would be a clear risk. The current owner of the Black House has ineffectual fencing which does not properly contain her dogs and allows them to cross into the neighbouring properties.
  - The Applicant does not own the driveway. The householder whose driveway it is has worked closely with the Cambridgeshire County Council over many years to plant the grounds to introduce wildlife. The increased activity from any holiday-let properties would adversely affect nature conservation.
  - The applicant falsely claims to have lived at the property for 25 years (in the Flood Risk Assessment document). June 2006 (approximately 14 years ago) is the public record date of the purchase of her property.
  - It is clear that PCC have not been informed that the applicant does not own the private driveway, has no control over it and, therefore, has neither the authority to build the required 'passing bay partway along the driveway' nor make any other required changes.
  - As the owner of the driveway in question, the map incorrectly shows the width of the driveway as expanding (north-side) in width some halfway along the outlined portion. This is not the case. The driveway does not expand as indicated. Indeed, the driveway is firmly bordered by mature trees along its entire length on this north-side. Additionally, there are mature trees and mature hawthorn plants along the full length of the southern side.
  - The applicant suggests removing the existing gates. The applicant does not own the driveway, nor the gates, nor has any right to modify the gates and only has limited right of access along the driveway to the one existing dwelling.
  - 'Right of way' access is clearly restricted in the deeds and only allowed along a strip "having a width of metres to and from the highway. The appropriate Council departments have already advised that a 5 metres strip of driveway (along its 300 metre length) is inadequate for the planning application and will not meet acceptable requirements.

**Councillor Simons** has referred the application to Committee as follows:

'I been asked by Eye Parish for this application to be considered by the planning and environmental committee subject to you approving the application.

There grounds are disputed access along the driveway/gates.'

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area
- Neighbour amenity
- Highway safety and parking provision
- Flood and water management

### **a) Principle of development**

The application site is located outside of any identified settlement boundaries and is therefore within the open countryside. It is proposed to convert an existing non-residential building for use as 2no. 2-bed holiday lets. For the avoidance of doubt, such units fall within use Class C3, and are the same class as residential dwellings. Policy LP11 (Part A) is therefore the appropriate policy to establish whether the principle of development is acceptable.

Policy LP11 allows for the conversion of non-residential buildings within the open countryside to residential use subject to accordance with a number of criteria. Firstly, the use must have ceased.

The building appears to have been previously used as stables, and this was referenced as part of planning application reference 07/00211/FUL which granted use of part of the wider site for domestic pony and horse jumping. It should be noted that this use has since ceased, and the building subject to the current application was not included within the red line boundary. Taking this into account, it is considered that the building retains a lawful use for agricultural purposes, was constructed more than 10 years prior to this application and is not presently within use. In addition, no more than 5 residential units are proposed, which is the maximum limit granted under Policy LP11. In addition, and further to visiting the site, it is considered that the building is not of such a state of dereliction or disrepair that would require the building to be significantly constructed, a further criteria of the Policy.

The final criteria, is that there are no fundamental constraints to deliver the site, or significant harm arising. This is discussed in more detail below, according to each material planning consideration.

In light of the above, it is considered that the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the following material planning considerations.

### **b) Design and impact to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area**

The stables to Black House Farm are located approximately 300 metres west from Crowland Road, with access via a private track surrounded by trees. Although the site is located within the open countryside, these trees, along with the various vegetation and uses along the west boundary of Crowland Road, provide a significant proportion of screening to the site. It is therefore not considered that the proposed change of use and external works proposed would unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

The main proportions of the stables would predominantly remain as existing. The external alterations proposed for new/altered window and door openings are considered to be appropriate and proportionate to the building they would serve. Timber elevations are proposed which is considered acceptable given the existing stables are constructed in this material and the slate proposed to the roof would also match to the existing roofing materials. A condition shall be secured to ensure that these external materials match to the existing. Overall, it is not considered that the alterations proposed or the change of use would unacceptably impact upon the character and appearance of the site.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

### **c) Amenity**

Given the isolated nature of the site, the only immediate neighbour to the proposed change of use and its associated alterations is the dwelling on Black House Farm.

The footprint of the stables is not proposed to significantly alter through this proposal and would certainly not alter in relation to the neighbouring dwelling. As such, it is not considered that

unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing would impact upon the residents residing within the Black House Farm dwelling or impacts upon its private garden.

The eastern-most holiday let proposed would have east-facing windows which serve two bedrooms, two bathrooms and a kitchen. There are two openings to the west elevation of Black House Farm, both which serve a kitchen. The southern-most of these would not be visible from the proposal as an existing wall connect the two buildings would cut off views. It is considered however that Bedroom 2 and the kitchen would gain clear views into the kitchen of Black House Farm.

The Applicant is the landowner of Black House Farm. Despite being within the same use class, the holiday lets are not proposed to be used as single family dwellinghouses and therefore the impacts between both the Black House Farm occupiers and future occupiers of the holiday lets are considered to be reduced compared to those of a single family dwellinghouse. Particularly given that the Applicant would be running the holiday lets business and is therefore accepting of this relationship. To ensure that no future subdivision of the dwelling and holiday lets occurs, which could give rise to future amenity issues, it is considered that a tie is required between the holiday lets and the Black House Farm. This would ensure that any future owner/occupier of Black House Farm must also operate the holiday lets. This shall be secured through a planning condition.

In addition, the proposed holiday lets are not considered appropriate for permanent residence owing to the lack of privacy between habitable windows, and lack of dedicated and private outdoor amenity space. As such, a condition shall be imposed which restricts their use to holiday lets only, thereby preventing residential occupation.

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

#### **d) Highway safety and parking provision**

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) object to the proposed development on a number of grounds relating to the access. Their main concern relates to the access width, as they consider that it is not to an appropriate width to allow two way, free flows of traffic. Concerns have also been raised with regards to the proposed parking layout and visibility splays.

Through revisions, the Applicant has tried to demonstrate that the access width is more than the minimum 5.5m wide for the first 10 metres into the site. Whilst the original plans submitted exceeded this, proposing a 6.5m wide access for the first 11 metres, upon review, it was not considered appropriate. This is due to the negative and unacceptable impact that would result to the character and appearance of the site within the open countryside. Furthermore, a number of trees would need to be removed which is not considered to be necessary.

Furthermore, and on balance, it is not considered that the traffic generated by the two holiday lets would be to levels that would require an expanded access to form. The Applicant has demonstrated that there are opening along the private road where two vehicles can pass each other along the private road via a 'passing place'. This also stops the need for any vehicles to reverse back onto Crowland Road.

It is not considered that the proposal would generate an unacceptable increase in vehicular movements that would require the private track to be upgraded to standards to connect to a carriageway such as Crowland Road. The private road serves only Black House Farm and Lakeside Manor Farm at present and it is not considered the proposed 2no. holiday lets would generate unacceptable levels of traffic beyond the existing movements such that significant harm would result to highway safety. Whilst holiday traffic can result in regular comings/goings, it is not considered that it would be to a constant level such that an upgraded estate-type access is required, including provision of vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays which are not currently afforded to the access. Whilst Officers accept that the width and visibility is not ideal, it is considered to be sufficient and is common for many agricultural/residential accesses and holiday lets within the

open countryside.

Pedestrian visibility splays have also been requested by the LHA, however, the site is not served by any public footways and it is considered the norm that most visits to or from site occur via vehicular means, especially given that Crowland Road is a classified B-road, with speeds restricted up to the national speed limit of 60mph. It would be too dangerous to enter or leave the site via foot on a regular basis and therefore it is not considered reasonable to secure these splays.

Finally, the Local Highway Authority consider that the proposed parking layout would be problematic given that it appears to obstruct an internal access road. However, they have advised that space for adequate parking and turning could still be provided. Further to a site visit, it is considered that the proposed parking layout is acceptable and that acceptable on-site turning would remain. It is not considered that the layout unacceptably obstructs any internal access within the site and in any event, this would not impact upon the public highway given its distance away. The matter of parking and access to the farm would be a matter for the Applicant to resolve.

With respect to the Local Highway Authority's comments, Officers consider that the proposal is acceptable in highway safety terms and in light of this, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

#### **e) Flood and water management**

The existing buildings fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3, which are at higher risk of flooding. The use of the buildings previously, to what is proposed now, i.e. 2no. holiday lets, represents an increase in flood risk vulnerability. Usually a sequential test would be required to determine whether any other land within the Authority area could accommodate the proposed use.

However, paragraph 164 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that applications for some minor development and change of use should not be subject to the sequential or exceptions tests, but should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments. Footnote 51 advises that the minor development and change of use referred to "includes householder development, small non-residential extensions (with a footprint of less than 250m<sup>2</sup>) and changes of use; except for changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site, where the sequential and exception tests should be applied as appropriate". On the basis of paragraph 164 and footnote 51, it is not considered that a sequential test is required.

Additionally, the Environment Agency raise no objections to the proposed development, but advise that a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan (FWEP) is required prior to the determination of this proposal. The Applicant did submit details which advised that future holiday let occupiers would move to the first floor of the Black House Farm dwelling in the event of any flooding, but this was not considered to be acceptable. A route onto land that is at less risk of flooding is required. Whilst the Environment Agency recommend the details to be submitted pre-determination, it is considered reasonable for this details to be discharged prior to first occupation of either of the holiday let. This matter shall be secured through a planning condition.

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

#### **f) Others matters**

In response to those matters raised by objectors but not discussed above:

- Historic activities: The Local Planning Authority has no records of planning enforcement investigations and/or actions logged with regards to Black House Farm and the land within its curtilage. As such, any potential breaches in planning would not have been investigated. In any event, these are not matters that should be considered as part of this application.

- Land ownership: Following investigation by the Local Planning Authority, given that the Applicant



does not own the private access road, the Applicant had to sign Certificate B and serve notice on all landowners. A subsequent re-consultation of the application followed to notify these landowners.

- Sewage: As this is a minor application, consultation with Anglian Water with regards to sewage has not, and would not, occur. In any event, any sewage connections would need to be resolved outside of the planning process.

- Issues of stable waste: This appears to be a previous problem and not one the Local Planning Authority would have been able to deal with.

- Security risk: The Local Planning Authority cannot control the actions of individuals. Its duty is to assess the proposal in line with adopted planning policy. However, Officers are of the view that the proposal would not pose a significant crime risk to neighbouring properties.

- Bins: It is not considered that the waste generated from two holiday lets who lead to an unacceptable cluttering of bins. Spaces is available on site to store bins.

- Rights of access, private gates and private driveway: Similar to the point made with regards to land ownership, the Local Planning Authority places good faith on details submitted by Applicants. If they are incorrect, it could be that they cannot implement any permission granted. Covenants relating to rights of access are outside of the planning process and cannot be taken into consideration.

## **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 area would not be adversely impacted by the proposed development, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- The proposed development would not adversely impact upon the amenity of surrounding neighbours, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- The proposal would not unacceptably impact upon the safety of surrounding highways, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- The proposed use would not contribute to an unacceptable increase in flood risk, in accordance with Policy LP32 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, Existing Floor Plan and Existing Elevations (Drawing number 4462/1, Revision B, received 30 March 2021)
- Existing Site Plan, Proposed Floor Plan and Proposed Elevations (Drawing number 4462/2, Revision B, received 30 March 2021)
- Existing Site Plan 1:500 (received 30 March 2021)

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

- C 3 The materials to be used in the construction of the alterations to the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building and shall accord with the details as shown on the drawing 'Existing Site Plan, Proposed Floor Plan and Proposed Elevations' (Drawing number 4462/2, Revision B, received 30 March 2021). These materials shall be maintained and retained in perpetuity thereafter.

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

- C 4 Prior to the first occupation of any holiday accommodation hereby permitted, the area shown for the purposes of parking and turning on the drawing 'Existing Site Plan, Proposed Floor Plan and Proposed Elevations' (Drawing number 4462/2, Revision B, received 30 March 2021) shall be provided. Such provision shall thereafter be retained for this purpose and not put to any other use.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of those residing on-site and to retain adequate turning to enable vehicles to leave and enter site in a forward gear, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order(s) revoking and re-enacting those Orders with or without modification), the use hereby permitted shall as holiday accommodation only and no unit/accommodation shall be occupied by any person(s) as their sole or main place of residence at any time.

No holiday accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied by the same occupant(s) for more than 28 continuous days in any one period (with at least one calendar day between the end of such a period and the start of the next) and the operator of the holiday accommodation shall keep a diary of every let which shall be made available for inspection by an Officer of the Council at reasonable request.

Reason: In order to ensure that the development is used for holiday lets only and not as a permanent dwellinghouse as the site is not suitable for this use in accordance with Policies LP11, LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 6 The holiday accommodation use hereby permitted shall enure for the benefit of the landowners of Black House Farm, Crowland Road, Eye, Peterborough only and to no other party, and the holiday accommodation shall not be let or run by any person(s) other than those who permanently reside at Black House Farm.

Reason: Permission would not have been granted given the window openings to the east-facing elevation of the building to be used for holiday let accommodation, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C 7 Prior to first occupation of any holiday accommodation hereby permitted, a scheme detailing a flood warning and evacuation plan for future occupiers shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be followed during all flood events.

Reason: In the interests of managing flood risk and increasing resilience to flooding, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copies to Councillors: Steve Allen, Brown and Simons.

This page is intentionally left blank