

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2021
ENGINE SHED, SAND MARTIN HOUSE, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: Harper (Chairman), Hiller (Vice Chairman), Brown, Dowson, Hogg, Amjad Iqbal, I Hussain, Jones, Sharp, and Warren.

Officers Present:	Sylvia Bland, Development Management Group Lead Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor Sarah Hann, Principal Engineer
--------------------------	--

37. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

38. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

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

There were no declarations of interest to make representation as Ward Councillor.

40. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

40.1 21/00864/HHFUL - 17 WELMORE ROAD GLINTON PETERBOROUGH PE6 7LU

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to replace the existing flat roofed single storey utility with a proposed two storey side extension. It would have a width of 4.3m and a depth of 6.9m. The proposed side extension would be in line with both existing front and rear elevations. Windows were proposed to front and rear elevations together with a utility room door to the side elevation. It would have a pitched roof to match the existing dwelling. It would provide for a playroom at ground floor and a bedroom, ensuite and bathroom at first floor. The proposed flat roofed single storey rear extension would extend across the full width of the existing dwelling and the proposed side extension. It would have a depth of 4.8m. The extension would accommodate an open plan kitchen/dining/family area and utility room. It would have a total external height of 2.7m from the natural ground level. There would be a series of bi-fold doors across the rear elevation. 7 DCCORPT_2018-04-04 2 The proposals would create an enlarged family dwelling, increasing the overall number of bedrooms to four, and creating a larger ground floor living area. Two parking spaces would be provided.

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

John Holdich, Parish Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Parish Council (PC) had minimal objection to the planning application, however asked the Committee to note that twenty people had submitted written support for the proposal which stated that the applicant had lived in another area outside of Ginton, which had drawn suspicion of what the big playing room would be used for. Furthermore, it was requested that the Committee recommend that the property be used for domestic use only and not for business.
- The use of materials had also caused concern and that it needed to match the rest of the council houses in that area.
- The parking proposal was of concern, and it was suggested that the vehicles could back out onto the road, which the PC considered to be dangerous. The PC felt that the current application should accommodate two cars side by side.
- There were concerns raised that there could be more parking than the proposal required, and that the residents were worried that parking could increase in the area near the proposed application. Therefore, it was suggested that consideration be given for parking to be designated as residential only.
- The PC wished to be consulted on the use of material before construction commenced.

Simon Machen the agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The proposal would transform a rather run-down property on Wellmore Road.
- The family were local to the area, however currently lived in Langtoft. The two children attended the village school in Ginton and for that reason the family, wished to return to the village so that the children could walk to school and be close to their extended family who also lived in the village.
- The house was run-down, and the garden was overgrown and detracted from the street scene.
- The application proposed would be a complete renovation together with two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.
- The development would result in a well presented and functional home to meet the family's needs.
- The case officer's report was very comprehensive and recommended that the application was approved. The report assessed in detail the key planning issues which were design and impact on the local area, the impact on neighbours and parking and highway safety.
- In relation to design and impact on the area, the officer report was clear that there would be no adverse impact on the street scene and that the extension would be in relation to the original dwelling.
- Since the application was submitted the width of the side extension had been reduced to four point three metres leaving a gap of three point six metres to the shared boundary with the adjacent property chalet bungalow at 15 Wellmore Road. This was an acceptable distance and sufficient to achieve a distinct visual gap between the different heights of the properties and retained the character of the area.

- The materials originally proposed would be rendered with cedar cladding, however, the applicant would be more than prepared to construct the two-storey extension in matching brick if the Committee wished. Furthermore, the single storey extension to the rear which would be far less visible from the street scene, could be constructed with a rendered finish.
- The location of the property was adjoined by numbers 15 and 19 Welmore Road and by number 1 Scotts Road, only one of those adjoining neighbours at number 15, had objected to the application. A second resident from three doors away had also objected, but that resident was clearly unaffected by the proposals and by contrast there were 20 letters in support for the scheme.
- The officer report included a detailed assessment of the scheme, which concluded that the application complied with policy LP17 of the local plan and that there was no adverse amenity impact on neighbours.
- Number 15 Welmore Road had secondary windows on the elevation facing the application site. Those windows currently overlooked fencing and an overgrown garden and by contrast, there would be a much-improved scheme adjacent to the property at number 15 through the transformation of an unkempt house into a family home.
- The objector at number 15 Welmore Road, submitted a short report relating to sunlight and daylight loss, however, that report had not been updated to reflect the amended plans and the reduced width for the proposed two storey extension.
- The officer report had addressed the vehicle parking and highway safety concerns raised and stated that there would be adequate car parking provision and access would be maintained in accordance with policy LP13 of the Local Plan. Therefore, the proposed scheme would be safe in highway terms as confirmed by the highway officer and planning case officer.
- There had been several issues raised by objectors, however, these were not planning matters. The officer report had concluded that there would be no adverse impact on the character of the area. The proposed extensions were well designed, and the proposal should not be refused on grounds of neighbour or highways impact.
- The tandem vehicle parking arrangement satisfied policy requirements and to do anything else would be against that policy. However, the applicant would be prepared to explore other parking options that were functional and policy compliant.
- The application was intended to create a family home and not a business.

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

- Members were advised that the proposed parking for vehicles would lead off the driveway and in tandem, one space behind the other and to the side of the property. Vehicle parking to the front had not been proposed, however, if the applicant created parking space to the front of the property in the future, they would be entitled to so under permitted development rights.
- Members noted the Parish Council's objection to the application in relation to the size of the extension, exterior material treatment as well as the vehicle parking. However, the applicant would be willing to adjust certain parameters of the proposal, to negate the concerns raised. In addition, Officers had not raised any concerns and the proposal had met policy requirements. Therefore, it would be difficult for the Committee to find any reasons for refusal.

- Members commented that the proposal would improve the street scene as currently, the property was run down with an extension that was dilapidated.
- Members commented that solution for the vehicle parking issues raised would be resolved through permitted planning permission, if it arose in the future.
- The use of materials proposed for the front of the house could be resolved and Members felt that a brick finish would be in keeping with the other properties.
- The extension size was in keeping with the property and any change of use such as commercial would need to be presented to the Committee.
- Members commented that the agents address was comprehensive and that all the concerns had been addressed appropriately.
- Member commented that it was difficult to condition for business use as rooms in residential properties could be used as offices.
- Members asked for officers to ensure that condition three in relation to the use of external materials for the building, be consulted with Glinton Parish Council.

RESOLVED:

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application subject to the imposition of a condition in relation to the use of materials on the front façade of the property. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning application, subject to the imposition of conditions.

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 extension would not impact on the existing character or appearance of the host building or street scene to an unacceptable level, and is considered that on balance would comply with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposed extension would not unacceptably harm the amenity of adjoining neighbours and thereby according with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The proposal would not result in a highway safety hazard and sufficient on-site car parking can be provided in compliance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

40.2 21/01015/FUL - 4 Debdale Orton Waterville Peterborough PE2 5HS

The Committee received a report, which sought permission to change the use of a dwelling (Class C3a) to a residential institution use (Class C2) with associated alterations to driveway access.

Within the proposed Condition 2 use, the application specifically sought to change use for the provision of residential accommodation and care to people in need of care (ie. care home). The C2 use also included use as a hospital, nursing home, residential school, college or training centre. But a condition would be appended onto the decision notice to restrict use to the care home use. The arrangements for the care home, as outlined in the Design and Access Statement were proposed as follows:

- The proposal would accommodate five adults
- Two self-contained units were provided to enable temporary supported independent living for residents prior to establishment elsewhere in the community once the necessary skills were achieved

- Six members of management/support staff supporting service users on a 24 hour basis - There would be staff office accommodation but no sleep-in facilities
- The level of care provided may vary from an 'at home' level to a 'personal care' level. The proposal could provide a level of care varying from provision of some support to residents who could operate with a level of independence to a more intensive level of care which would provide support to residents in more basic living needs.

The proposal included two bedrooms and two self-contained units (each containing one bedroom) at first floor level with a further bedroom at ground floor level. The proposal had not proposed any external alterations to the application site. The proposal was revised providing a three-metre-wide access and two metre by two metre visibility splays which was provided with the reduced 600mm height of the wall adjacent to the access.

The Development Management Group Lead introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report, which included removal of trees which had been investigated by the Council's Enforcement Officer.

The Committee **AGREED** to extend the speaking time to 10 minutes.

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

- Concerns were raised about the application from residents, which included traffic congestion, noise pollution, parking and a lack of engagement by the applicant.
- The application was for a large-scale commercial venture in a residential and conservation area which was inappropriate and out of keeping for the area.
- It was understood that there would be provision for eight cars for the home, six for the staff and two for the residents needs and a shared vehicle to be used by staff. Concerns were raised about overspill vehicle parking provision at seasonal times such as Christmas when residents would receive guests.
- There would be extra vehicles to the site for other services, such as food delivery, medical services and maintenance.
- The area was a small residential Cul de SAC with no space for vehicle parking. In addition, the street was a thoroughfare for 100 secondary school students that attended Bushfield Academy, which raised a concern over the risk of an accident occurring due to the increase in traffic movements.
- It had also been highlighted that Peterborough City Council could not supply enough residents for the business to be viable, which would mean that residents would be from outside of the authority. In conclusion there had been no demand for this type of care home in Peterborough.
- The applicant had not attended any Parish council meetings or spoken to local residents about the proposals. In addition, the planning sheet notice had not been adequately displayed to attract residents' attention.
- Contact made with ward councillors had not been made by the applicant.

Ian Forsythe, Michael Chambers and Dennis Kirwan, objectors addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- There had been several contrasting and conflicting reports and paperwork submitted for the application.

- Residents had I received a letter and a glossy brochure during the summer of 2021 which had set out quite clearly who the owners were and who would be running the centre. However, accounts for Alderwood, showed under the company registration number that it had no employees as of the 28 February 2021 and it was not clear who the Director was. Therefore, it had not been clear to residents who would manage the day-to-day operation of the care home.
- Residents understood and expected that there was a need for people with special needs to receive the correct care, however it was questionable who was managing the facility and whether the proposal should be in a street where 19 out of 28 houses had objected.
- Residents were unclear about how many people would be cared for in the care home proposed. It was also unclear what ages would be cared for as the proposal stated it would be a care home for young adults, however, the company brochure stated that services were provided for clients up to the age of 65.
- Concerns were raised about the parking in Debdale as currently delivery lorries and refuse vehicles struggle to gain access and manoeuvre on the street.
- Most residents in Debdale have had to convert front gardens to be able to accommodate their vehicles.
- The proposal for vehicle parking at the centre looked good on paper as car parking spaces would be provided, however, it was questionable as to whether drivers would be able to manoeuvre out of the entrance and into a small road.
- Concerns were raised about whether there were enough people that lived local to the proposed facility that would be able to walk to work, in an industry that suffered a national shortage of trained care staff.
- Concerns were raised about there being a restriction in the property deeds for commercial use and this was not being considered.
- The proposal had set out that young men would be accommodated in the facility and there was concern that they could present very challenging behaviours in a very small neighbourhood.
- Access on the road was poor and two ordinary private domestic vehicles traveling in opposite directions was difficult.
- The photographs presented at the planning meeting were not a good reflection of the vehicle movement constrictions on the Debdale Road.
- There were issues with vehicle movement on the nearby Cherry Orton Road with commercial buildings and lorries travelling regularly along that road.
- There were many concerns about the development from residents such as traffic congestion, noise pollution unsuitability of the location and any lack of meaningful engagement by the applicant.
- In addition, there were several contradictions and changes which had happened in the applicant's submitted documentation.
- There was no evidence from adult social care according to the Peterborough Local Plan 8, that there would be a need for the proposed care home or that they actively supported it. The Planning Officer noted the concerns raised by objectors however, it was not clear if he agreed or disagreed, which was felt to be a key factor in the proposals.
- There had been confusion over whether the proposed application was a four- or five-bedroom property.
- There were three trees removed in July 2021 and it was felt that enforcement should have been initiated by planning officers as soon as they were advised.
- It should be appreciated that the residents of Debdale would have to live with the care home for the next five years to 10 years which should be given consideration.

- The refuge vehicle would reverse down Mill Crescent after the collection of waste from Debdale and then exit the area.
- Although adult social care had not raised an objection to the application, they had stated within the report that currently there was no need identified for the city at this stage. LP8 clearly stated that there must be a need identified and be supported by adult social care. Ward Councillors had also raised a concern that there had not been a sufficient supply of residents for the business.
- Residents for the proposed property could be brought in from outside and the objectors were concerned that the application could be granted even though there had been no need for the provision within the city as highlighted.

Jennifer Hodgson, The Agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The applicant Alderwood were a countrywide care home provider with numerous homes.
- Alderwood provided a support service for people with autism and learning difficulties for the last 20 years and had an excellent reputation locally, and with the Care Quality Commission.
- Alderwood's excellent services had also been mentioned in Parliament.
- Alderwood also worked under the transforming care programme as part of the Winterbourne View enquiry, and they focussed on improving health and care services so that people could live in the community close to family and friends rather than in institutional care homes.
- Many individuals with needs were accommodated within hospital settings with no option at all for their onward care and Alderwood were trying to improve that situation, particularly with the current planning application.
- Supported living model for Debdale would be regulated by the Care Quality Commission.
- It was proposed that Debdale would accommodate adults within the autism spectrum disorder and other learning disabilities that were associated. Many of the young adults would have grown up in supportive family environments locally and the intention was that Debdale would be a long-term home as the young adults with autism moved towards trying to live a more independent adult life.
- Residents' concerns raised about unacceptable noise levels compared to a large family home were understandable, however, this was incorrect as a high number of individuals on the autism spectrum were mute with the condition.
- Alderwood's ethos was to provide a person-centred care, which would be catered to each person's individual needs so that they can leave their best life.
- There was one to one daytime care, and a waking night system so there would be two staff in the property overnight, however, staff would not sleep at the premises. This arrangement provided 24-hour care needs for residents.
- Staff were sourced locally if possible, and this was a matter of principle for Alderwood.
- If any patient displayed a risk of serious harm to themselves or others they would not be supported within the community, and under the Mental Health Act the patient would need to be in suitable accommodation with the appropriate care plan assigned.
- Peterborough City Council commissioners contacted Alderwood in August 2020 to request that they explore the development of a property in the area to accommodate people that required supported living services. Up to 30 properties were viewed around Peterborough until Debdale was found. Therefore, because it

took time to source a property, Peterborough had accommodated referrals elsewhere, however that had not negated the need in the area for supported living services for young adults with autism.

- Regular contact had been maintained between the commissioning manager for Peterborough and Cambridgeshire for adult social care services every two months since 2020 in relation to the property and requirements, so it was surprising that the adult social care response within the planning report had contradicted the need for this facility when it had been requested from Peterborough City Council services at the outset.
- Residents could be placed from outside of Peterborough as the service extended to Cambridgeshire, and this had been due to the joint arrangements between Peterborough and Cambridgeshire authorities for adult social care.
- The usual public engagement had not been undertaken by Alderwood other than leaflets delivered to residents, and this was due to the restrictions of the Covid pandemic. It was important to note however, that the level of consultation expected by residents was not a planning requirement for this type of application.
- Alderwood were a company that worked hard alongside local authorities and commissioners to develop care support facilities that were essential to provide a balanced and caring society that promoted equality.
- The application proposed was a second attempt at obtaining planning permission for the care facility and there had been a substantial amount of consultation undertaken the first time around, which received a considerable amount of objection from residents. It was felt that there would be no value added to attending a parish council meeting given the first consultation. In addition, the Covid 19 pandemic had impacted the opportunity to attend a Parish Council meeting, however, it was felt that a second consultation with residents could have been better managed.
- A statement was issued by Alderwood that contained more information for residents as part of the application.
- The need for supported living services for Autism was everchanging and there could be a need in three weeks' time as somebody could come into the system needing the care. There needed to be more forward thinking and an understanding that the proposal was a probable care need for the future. Six months ago, there were four people wanting for the level of care proposed but they had been accommodated elsewhere.
- Perspective properties chosen for supported living facilities were evaluated in terms of whether there were sufficient parking, amenity access, communal space, cost of property and many other factors. The property had to be in a local area and not within a countryside location where there had been little amenity.
- The residents would be adults with families that would want to visit, however, lots of people visiting at the same time, would be too disruptive to other care home residents. Furthermore, family visits would be schedule for specific times and the care home resident would be taken off site.
- The proposal allowed for six parking spaces for staff, however, they would not be occupied all at the same time. Residents themselves would not have a vehicle as driving was something that they were unable to do. Furthermore, vehicle parking for visitors was not an allowance that needed to be catered for with this application.
- The applicant was unable to advise as to what the industry standard was in terms of the number of local employees that would be without a vehicle to travel to work at this stage.

- It had been difficult to clarify how vehicle parking and manoeuvring would work on site, however, the applicant had followed the highways standards in terms of the required dimensions for turning.
- Each resident would have a personal ongoing care plan. Any additional support would be accommodated on site where possible to avoid any disruption to them.
- There was a complaints process as part of the business need, however, complaints were not often received as Alderwood had an excellent reputation for Autism care in Peterborough.
- All residents would receive one on one care. There were five residents and five carers in the daytime, with the addition of manager visiting on site on occasion. The staff would work a 12 hour shift from 7:30AM to 7:30PM then would go home, after that, there would only be two care staff on site overnight.
- There would be eight staff in total, but only six members of staff on site at one time.

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

- The preferred highways access was between 5m and 5.5m, however the proposal was for a 3m access, so it was proposed to reduce the height of the wall to retain a longer length of the wall to minimize the conservation impact.
- It was proposed to move the current gap in the wall to a different location within the site to widen it slightly and reduce the height for access to the driveway.
- The proposal meant that access would be widened to the one that already existed.
- Members were advised that although Land Registry deeds had stipulated that there should not be any business carried out at the property, that was a private covenant and not a material planning consideration. Therefore, Members could not consider this during the assessment of the application, however, the covenant could not be completely dismissed by the applicant.
- Members were advised that the comments by adult social care within the report stated that the proposal was in line with the development of the autism strategy which had identified a need for specialist support services for autism to be developed locally with housing to be sourced and this was taken as the basis for a need within the city.
- Members commented that although reference had been made to a need for the specialist services within the report, there was also a statement that PCC was unable to identify a specific demand at this time, which seemed to them to have taken precedence.
- The access currently proposed would only be suitable for single residential home traffic rather than for a multi residential use. There would need to be a nine to nine and a half metres driveway entrance proposed to impact the conservation, whereas the current planning proposal had only seven metres.
- The current access proposed was considered unsafe by highways because there was no option for two vehicles to pass at the same time.
- Members commented that there was a lack of sufficient consultation and engagement with the local parish, local parish councillors and ward Councillors.
- It was unacceptable that the applicant had just referred anyone affected by issues to a complaint's procedure.
- The vehicle parking proposed was an issue and there had been no guarantee that members of staff would be local or be able to walk or pushbike to the site.
- The residents may have visitors and it was evident from the site visit that the road could not support vehicles parked on the road not to mention the issues that could arise on refuse collection day.
- Members commented that there was no overwhelming need provision for the supported living accommodation proposed, specifically in relation to the PCC local plan. There had been potential of only one individual being assessed currently

however, there were many uncertainties as to whether a client was ready to move into the facility once available for use.

- Some Members commented that although there had been no immediate need for an autism supported living facility currently, at some point a provision would be needed not just locally but nationally, and it was felt that PCC should be able to offer the support immediately.
- It was felt that the vehicle manoeuvring concerns raised were an issue, however, due to the fact the proposal was for supported living, the concerns were not enough to go against the proposal.
- Members commented that a caveat of a temporary two-year permission could be considered.
- Some Members felt that a temporary consent for two years would not be suitable as there had been no specific need for an Autism supported living facility currently.
- Debdale Road was a mature, quiet and narrow road and any care facility would impact the amenity of the neighbours. In addition, it had been quoted by the agent and within the planning report that residents of the proposed facility could have emergency or critical mental health needs, who would inevitably present with challenging behaviours which may cause disruption to the local community.
- The proposal had not adhered to Peterborough's LP8 and LP17.
- Members commented that there had been objectors from 19 out of 23 houses in Debdale and Ward Councillors had also objected to the application on behalf of them. However, there seemed to be a difference of opinion over the interpretation of need. It was important to note that at the time of writing the report there had been no need identified, but it had not meant that a need would not present in the future.
- It was felt that a temporary two-year consent could resolve residents' fears and they would have the opportunity to report on the permanent application at Committee in the future.
- Members commented that there were too many unknowns about the application and impact of the proposal in relation to residents, parking and whether there was a need for a supported living accommodation service. Therefore, the residents of Debdale's concerns should be given priority.
- Concerns were raised over how diligent the applicant would be to follow up complaints from residents, given that there had been a lack of consultation for the proposed development.
- It had been stated that the highways arrangement would be deemed unsafe in terms of two vehicles entering or exiting the parking area.
- Members were concerned about a development being created where there was no need for Autism services highlighted.
- PCC had stated there may be one person that needed the facility and there could be a danger that people with autism could be placed from a national location and very far away from families.
- Members commented that Covid 19 should not have impacted the appropriate level of consultation to residents.
- The vehicle parking could be managed and the deliveries had not been a concern to some Members.
- Temporary planning permissions had been used to support children in care living accommodation. The applicant would not have had to undertake a significant financial outlay and need to make too many adjustments to make the accommodation habitable, however, it was not the case for the current proposal and the applicant would need to confirm if this was achievable. Furthermore, Members could agree that a temporary consent would start at the time the property had become available to get a true and accurate perspective on how the supported living facility had operated.

- Members felt that if a temporary consent was granted and the final application was declined, it could be very disruptive to the residents with Autism.

RESOLVED:

The Planning and Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application with a two-year temporary consent. The Committee **RESOLVED** (6 against, 3 for and 1 abstention), the proposal was **DEFEATED**.

A motion second was proposed and seconded to go against officer recommendations and **REFUSE** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (6 for, 1 against and 3 abstentions) to **REFUSE** the planning permission.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

The Committee refused the planning application for the following reasons:

- Insufficient evidence had been submitted with the application to demonstrate that there was an identified need for the proposed care home. There would be a fundamental constraint to the site in respect of accommodating a safe means of access without causing harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed development would be contrary to criteria 1 and 4 of policy LP8.
- The proposed development would lead to an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing local residents as a result of increased traffic generation and vehicle movements and as a result of the complex needs of the occupants who would present with challenging behaviour which may cause disruption to the local community contrary to policy LP17.
- The proposed development would not provide for safe access to the site, including the width of the proposed entrance, which was contrary to policy LP13 and would have an impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

CHAIRMAN
1:30 - 3:56pm

This page is intentionally left blank