



PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE

20 FEBRUARY 2024 AT 1:30PM

- 1 Procedure for Speaking
  
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak
3. Briefing Update

# UPDATE REPORT AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

## PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

### PUBLIC SPEAKING SCHEME - PLANNING APPLICATIONS

#### Procedural Notes

1. Planning Officer to introduce application.
2. Chairman to invite Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives to present their case.
3. Members' questions to Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives.
4. Chairman to invite objector(s) to present their case.
5. Members' questions to objectors.
6. Chairman to invite applicants, agent or any supporters to present their case.
7. Members' questions to applicants, agent or any supporters.
8. Officers to comment, if necessary, on any matters raised during stages 2 to 7 above.
9. Members to debate application and seek advice from Officers where appropriate.
10. Members to reach decision.

**The total time for speeches from Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives (collectively) shall not exceed ten minutes, or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.**

**MPs will be permitted to address Committee when they have been asked to represent their constituents. The total time allowed for speeches for MPs shall not exceed five minutes, unless the Committee decides on the day of the meeting to extend the time allowed due to unusual or exceptional circumstances.**

**The total time for speeches in respect of objectors, applicants, agents or supporters (collectively) shall not exceed five minutes, or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.**

**LIST OF PERSONS REGISTERED TO SPEAK**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Ward Councillor / Parish Councillor / Objector / Applicant</b>
5.1	22/00600/MMFUL - Eye Landfill Site Eyebury Road Eye Peterborough	Cllr Steve Allen	Ward Councillor
5.2	22/01793/FUL - Land To the North Of Lynch Wood Peterborough	Parish Cllr Steve Swan  Cllr Day  Cllr Stevenson  Emily Armstrong Peter Campbell Paul Smith	Parish Councillor  Ward Councillor  Ward Councillor  Applicant/ Agent/ Architect
5.3	24/00025/HHFUL - 140 Northfield Road Millfield Peterborough PE1 3QE		

## BRIEFING UPDATE

**P & EP Committee 20 February 2024**

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	22/00600/MMFUL	<b>Eye Landfill Site Eyebury Road Eye Peterborough</b> , Eastern extension for Non-Hazardous Landfill to Eye landfill, and ancillary facilities

Councillor Simons is unable to attend and has requested his statement be made available;

“I am thankful officers have realised the access along Eyebury Road is unacceptable. With the growth of Eye, Thorney and Crowland and the new Alison Homes development of 270 houses off Eyebury Road, I very much believe it’s going to be carnage even without this application. Myself and my fellow councillors have been arguing this point for several years. At a recent committee meeting, the committee agreed to this but still chose to allow the open composting application to be permitted. I am hopeful common sense will prevail and the committee will agree with officers' recommendation and refuse this application. It is about time all the different companies operating the quarries, collaborate directly and use the access from the A47. I thank the committee for taking my views into account”

Councillor Allen has confirmed his objections which relate to the traffic impacts on Eyebury Road and in particular the pressures from new developments including the OWC (compost) facility, Redbrick Farm and housing in Eye.

Eye Parish Council have confirmed their objection, citing concerns with traffic impacts on Eyebury Road, and the impact on the Green Wheel. Harm to the Bar Pastures Scheduled Monument and potential harm to the listed buildings on Willow Hall Lane are also a concern.

Officer Comment: All material issues raised are addressed in the main report.

2.	22/01793/FUL	<b>Land To The North Of Lynch Wood Peterborough</b> , Development of 32 Class E(g) employment units, associated access works, parking and landscaping
----	--------------	---

## Transport Addendum

A Transport Addendum has been received since the finalisation of the Committee Report. This has addressed the LHA queries surrounding junction modelling, cycle infrastructure and travel plan. In response, updated Local Highway Authority comments have been received. The comments raise no objection, subject to the recommended conditions for:

- Securing the parking, turning, loading and unloading areas as shown on the approved plans, to be provided prior to first occupation of the first units served by each area and retained thereafter. – Officer Comment: Secured under Condition 7.
- Securing the access amendments, to be completed prior to first occupation of the first Unit. - Officer Comment: Secured under Condition 11.
- Requiring drawings to be submitted to show the cycle parking for the staff of each unit (number at Day 1, and future expansion area to meet the minimum requirement of LP13), and the visitors' cycle parking with future expansion area. A minimum of 5% of the total stands to be provided for non-standard cycles. 118 spaces (59 stands) to be provided prior to the first occupation of the units, and they and the future expansion areas to be retained thereafter for cycle parking. - Officer Comment: Condition 26 is updated to the following:

*Notwithstanding the details submitted, prior to the commencement of the use, full details of the 118 internal and external cycle parking spaces shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details supplied should illustrate locations for future expansion of external cycle provision should this be required in accordance with the findings of the Travel Plan. The cycle parking shall be available for each unit prior to its occupation and retained in perpetuity.*

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

- An Access Management Plan to manage delivery access to the site. - Officer Comment: Condition 27 has been updated to the following:

*Prior to the commencement of the use a parking and access management plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include details of the parking overflow capacity in the adjacent car park and the access barrier management for deliveries, servicing and emergency services.*

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

- CTMP – Officer Comment: Secured under Condition 6
- Wheel Wash – Officer Comment: Secured under Condition 6
- Restricting the use to Class E(g) only and for no other Class E purposes. - Officer Comment: Secured under Condition 3.
- A S106 to secure the developer's funding of the Active Travel Wayfinding Improvements at the 3 junctions on the route between Lynch Wood and Wistow Way.

Officer Comment: Three locations have been identified on the cycle route identified in the Transport Assessment for improvements to the signing and lining. This includes two locations on Lynch Wood and

one location at Wistow Way. These have been agreed between the Local Highway Authority and the applicant.

The proposal is to provide a sum for the works to be completed, which will be secured via a Section 106 agreement.

### **Revised Condition 10**

Condition 10 has been updated to provide greater clarity to which accesses it relates to:

*Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or any Order superseding this, Schedule 2 Part 2 Class A; no gates or other means of enclosure shall be erected across the two vehicular accesses on the western boundary.*

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

-----

### **Further Representations**

5 representations have been received since the finalisation of the Committee Report, these have been summarised below:

- Development and design does not align with the business park.
- Out of keeping.
- Types of businesses is not referenced.
- Traffic and noise disturbance for surrounding residents.
- Lack of public consultation.
- Light and environmental pollution.
- Number of units has increased to 32.
- Works have been undertaken on the land since November 2023, including an access into the site.
- Trees on the boundary of Ascot House have been thinned.
- Scale represented in images is inaccurate.
- Plant/ventilation/air conditioning is unknown
- Noise & Traffic Assessments are vague

Officer Comment: All material issues raised are addressed in the highways comments above and in the main report.

---

### **Civic Society**

A further representation was received from Peterborough Civic Society, who were unable to attend but wish for the statement below to be considered:

“Firstly, it is the wrong design in the wrong place. We risk damaging the quality of the established Lynch Wood Business Park by allowing a semi-industrial scheme to be built on a designated office park. The proposed design would be fine on an industrial estate, but not here.

Secondly, whilst the submitted Transport Assessment covers in great detail vehicle numbers and junction capacities, it does not address the key issue which is safety of pedestrians, particularly young schoolchildren who need to walk across the access to this site twice a day on their journey to and from school. We are greatly concerned that, despite a vague statement that large HGVs are not "expected" on site, there is nothing to stop access by such vehicles.

Thirdly, elements of the design proposals are poor. The rear elevations of the units on the eastern boundary are completely unbroken walls of metal cladding with very little soft landscaping along this edge of the site, which is not good for the neighbouring site in residential use.

For these reasons this scheme should be refused. However, if the Planning Committee does decide that the application should be permitted then draft conditions C3 and C10 proposed in the Officers Report in

relation to site use and access should be strengthened to specifically exclude any warehouse or storage use which might attract deliveries by articulated vehicles. There is discussion in the Officers Report about vehicle height restriction barriers at the site entrance and Condition 10 states there should be no entrance gates installed without a further application being submitted. We think this should be reworded to ensure that service and emergency vehicles are able to enter the site but taller, heavier vehicles be prohibited. There is also some discussion in your Officers Report about operational plant and machinery. We think Condition 12 should be reworded to prohibit any external plant, including wall-mounted condensers, which can disfigure a building.”

Officer Comment: All material issues raised are addressed in the highways comments above and in the main report.

-----

3.	24/00025/HHFUL	<b>140 Northfield Road Millfield Peterborough PE1 3QE</b> , Single storey rear extension as a disabled bedroom and wet room - retrospective
----	----------------	---

Since the finalisation of the Committee Report, the agent has supplied additional clarification to outline why the existing property is not suitable for the needs of the child (in addition to the doctor’s letter supplied at the time of application). Please see the justification below:

“The current dwelling is not able to provide the facility is required to have a quality of life and the needs must be met. Currently living at the property are, the parents, 3 sons, and daughter in law - living in a 3-bedroom house. The daughter in law is due a baby in March and this will have an effect on the child. The proposed extension will be a sensory room with soundproof walls for the child and living accommodation. The annex is not suitable as it has no water and gas supply.”

Officer Comment: Whilst the clarification is noted, the scale and design of the development remain contrary to Policies LP16 & LP17 and the above is not considered sufficient justification to outweigh the conflict with policy.

This page is intentionally left blank