

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2022  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Harper (Chairman), Iqbal (Vice Chairman), S Bond, Hiller, Hogg, Hussain, Jamil, Jones, Rush, Sharp, and Warren.

**Officers Present:** Phil Moore, Principal Planning Officer  
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer  
Chris Gordon, Planning Solicitor  
Jez Tuttle, Highways Fenland Council  
Alex Woolnough, Principal Engineer  
Asif Ali, Development Management Officer

**30. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andrew Bond. Councillor Sandra Bond was in attendance as substitute.

**31. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Jamil and Iqbal declared that they were Ward Councillors for agenda item:22/01370/R3FU - Regional Swimming Pool Car Park Bishops Road Eastgate Peterborough, however, would take part in the discussions and decisions for that item.

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

None

**33. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 18 OCTOBER AND 15 NOVEMBER 2022**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2022; and 15 November 2022 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

**34. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

**34.1 22/01370/R3FU - REGIONAL SWIMMING POOL CAR PARK BISHOPS ROAD EASTGATE PETERBOROUGH**

The Committee received a report, which sought permission for the 'erection of a two-storey building, laying of car parking and associated works, infrastructure and landscaping'. The building would form Phase 3 of the University, comprising a mixture of generic and specialist teaching, academic workspace, a living lab for active learning, engaging community research and 29 DCCORPT\_2018-04-04 2 events, social learning and study, as well as welfare support for Students. A small catering facility was also proposed. The building would have an L-shape footprint with a maximum floor area of 57m x 50m. The

element fronting Bishops Road would utilise a saw-tooth roof arrangement, standing at 12.2m in height, and the rear element would be flat roof standing at 9.6m in height. A total of 80 secure cycle parking spaces would be provided, as well as 4 accessible parking spaces served by EV charging points.

The Head of Planning introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report and the update report, which included a change on the phase 3 building drawings to decrease the size of the rectangular building.

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

- The first Anglia Ruskin University (ARU) building opened in September 2022, with the second building due to open in spring of 2023.
- The University was already an established part of the city and the application represented the third stage of development and would cater for the science, engineering and maths education fields. There would also be a living lab that intended to engage with students, residents as well as visitors to the city, in the subject of science and technology.
- The proposed building would be open to the community as part of a pedestrian friendly campus and would host a variety of events, talks and classes.
- It was anticipated that the proposed building construction would start in spring 2023, with completion to welcome students and the public in 2024.
- The applicant had worked with Planning Officers to achieve a high-quality development on a previous underdeveloped piece of land. Furthermore, there had been no objection received from consultees, with minimal representations from residents.
- The proposed Phase three building would redevelop the existing regional pool car park. There had been enough vehicle parking available in the city to accommodate the proposed development and a recent planning approval had provided a temporary car park for the Regional Pool to the East of the building.
- There would also be an additional 80 cycle spaces provided for the proposed development in addition to what had been provided in phases one and two.
- The proposed development would provide a safe, attractive and welcoming place.
- The proposed building would be lower in height and smaller in size in comparison to the phases one and two and would complement the current buildings on campus.
- The additional highway works, that needed to be completed with the highways authority was anticipated to add an additional condition for offsite highways mitigation. This condition would be secured in the s106 agreement.
- As there were no residential students, it was not anticipated that there were plans to add a taxi rank, however, the applicant could explore the requirement in the wider master plan in the future.
- The construction was due to commence in April 2023, with completion in the summer of 2024.

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

- The masterplan would accommodate parking requirements for the University as a whole and would include the Regional Pool when completed, with disability provisions catered for.

- The plan for part phase two of the development was to provide a multi storey car park, however there was a section 73 variation of conditions application which replaced this provision with a temporary car park. The temporary car park would provide 128 parking spaces, based on studies for parking requirements for phase two and the provision for the Regional Pool car park. This was because there had been enough parking provision in the area. Furthermore, there would be four disabled electric charging parking bays provided as part of the proposed phase three development, in addition to the temporary car park arrangements.
- Some Members were concerned that should permission be granted for the application; car parking spaces would not be available for those using the Regional Pool. Furthermore, it was felt that there should be a condition placed on phase three application to ensure that there would be sufficient disabled parking spaces to serve the Regional Pool.
- Some Members commented there had been some dedicated disabled parking spaces adjacent to the Regional Pool entrance.
- Some Members commented that there needed to be evidence that the disabled parking spaces being lost as part of the Phase three development would be provided in the future to serve the Regional Pool disabled users.
- Members were advised that disabled parking was not considered as part of the original survey and therefore could not confirm if the loss of disabled spaces was acceptable at as part of the application for Phase three.
- Members commented that 646 residents were consulted about the application and only four to five comments were received, however, during Ward Councillor visits to properties, there appeared to be several people that were against the application. Members were advised that the majority of Eastgate residents and those that had made representations as part of phases one and two, had been consulted. It was a surprise to officers how little residents had responded, however it was felt that they had become used to the University being developed.
- Members were advised that the consultation process would have followed a standard template format. This would include a link to the plans online as part of the required statement of community involvement and the development management procedures order. There was also community engagement conducted by the applicant as part of the pre-engagement process, which was held in the Cathedral area to make residents aware.
- Some Members felt that the application seemed to be a far better use of land than a multi storey car park. Furthermore, Members commented that the proposal was a fantastic increase to the University site and that everything had appeared to be working well for ARU. However, some Members felt that there was an issue with disabled parking and that a condition should in place to cover the disabled parking issue raised around the Regional Pool and that the temporary car park should be installed before the car park development site was closed off.
- Some Members felt that a valid point had been raised about the parking, however, most were satisfied to leave the parking provision to the officers discretion. Members were advised that, if Members deemed it necessary it may be possible that a condition could be attached to ensure that no development could take place until there had been sufficient disabled parking spaces identified for the Regional Pool users.
- Members commented that there were several car parks located very near to the site, which all appeared to be under used.
- Members were advised that there were four disabled spaces in the existing Regional Pool car park that would be lost and a further four at the entrance directly adjacent to the building itself that would remain. Furthermore, there were a further seven disabled spaces to west of the existing university development (phase one and two) which are within reasonably close proximity of the pool. It was felt that

this, together with the addition of the temporary car park, would result in sufficient provision for disabled parking to serve the Regional Pool.

- Member commented that if a survey had shown that there were not enough disabled spaces, the non-disabled spaces could be converted for the provision.
- Members commented that a condition could be included that accommodate the disabled parking spaces needed in the city.
- Some Members felt that Google Maps had identified that there were currently enough spaces around the site and Regional Pool for disabled drivers.
- Most spaces were some distance from the place disabled people want to go and that there seemed to be sufficient provision around the city to serve users of the Regional Pool. Furthermore, it was rare that the disabled parking spaces were fully utilised in the city.
- Following the issues raised in the debate, officers advised that a condition relating to disabled parking spaces would not be necessary

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application as per the officer recommendation and following a vote (9 for, 2 against) the proposal was **GRANT** subject to conditions and the signing of a legal agreement securing off-site highway mitigation.

#### **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 proposal represented the next phase of the development of the University of Peterborough and would be sited on land which was in line with the vision for the Riverside North Policy Area. As such, the principle of development was considered to be acceptable in accordance with Policies LP4 and LP51 of the Local Plan (2019);
- The application scheme would result in enhanced educational offer associated with the newly created University of Peterborough, which should be afforded great weight in decision-making, in accordance with paragraph 96 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021);
- The proposed design was considered to be of high quality that would enhance the site and its wider surroundings, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- The proposal would ensure that the significance of nearby designated heritage assets was preserved and accordingly, the proposal was in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraphs 200 and 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021);
- No harm to any buried heritage assets of key importance would result, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019)
- The proposal would not result in a severe impact to the capacity of the surrounding public highway network, safe access would be afforded to all users, and adequate parking provision would be made to meet the demands arising from the Phase 3 development, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021);
- drainage from the site would be adequately managed such that no increased flood risk either on- or off-site would result, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), paragraphs 159 and 167 of the National Planning

Policy Framework (2021) and the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD (2019);

- an unacceptable level of harm would not result to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- the proposal would not result in unacceptable impact to species of principal importance and would secure overall biodiversity gain, in accordance with Policies LP22 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), paragraphs 98 and 99 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and the Peterborough Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity SPD(2019);
- the proposal would ensure that trees of key amenity value to the surrounding area are protected, and that overall enhancement to the landscape quality of the area had been secured, in accordance with 43 DCCORPT\_2018-04-04 16 Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019);
- the proposal would not pose an unacceptable risk to human health or controlled waters through contamination, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 183-185 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021); and
- the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the air quality of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

### **34.2 QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee received a report, which outlined the appeal cases which covered the period from 1 July 2022 to 30 September 2022.

The Development Management Team Leader introduced the item and highlighted key information from the report.

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

- Members commented that the Grange Road was an application, which refused by the Committee, however, was genuinely not down to the fact there had made a mistake made over the decision, or lack of Planning Committee training, it was just a difference of opinion by the planning inspector.

#### **RESOLVED:**

The Planning Environment Protection Committee noted the past outcomes and performance.

Chairman  
END - 2.34PM

This page is intentionally left blank