

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE

25 JUNE 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

Agenda Item	Application	Name	Ward Councillor / Parish Councillor / Objector / Applicant
5.1	24/00496/FUL - 551 Lincoln Road Peterborough PE1 2PB	Cllr Mahmood Abid Hussain Helen Cuthbert	Ward Councillor Objector (Millfield Action Group) Applicant's Agent
5.2	23/00600/R3FUL - Castor Church Of England Primary School Stocks Hill Castor Peterborough	Cllr David Shaw	Parish Councillor

BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 25 June 2024

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1 .	24/00496/FUL	551 Lincoln Road Peterborough PE1 2PB , Change of use from takeaway (Sui Generis) to adult gaming centre (Sui Generis)

Representations:

Since drafting the Committee Report, a further 11 representations have been received.

Total number of responses: 36

Total number of objections: 24

Total number in support: 12

No new material considerations have been raised.

Reconsult – Designing Out Crime Team (20.06.2024)

No further comments to make.

MAG lock system is installed in each venue as a standard.

Applicant has agreed to lock the access between 00:00 and 06:00am.

Internal lockdown area for staff to be in place.

CCTC will cover access points as standard.

There will be no lone working between the hours of 22:00pm and 06:00am.

SIA procedure is standard for these venues.

Reconsult – Pollution Control (20.06.2024)

Following consideration of the amendment material, this section lifts the objection on grounds of noise nuisance.

The existing Merkur Slots venue at 335 Lincoln Road, Peterborough is also situated in close proximity to noise sensitive receptors, however, this section notes that there have been no complaints of noise nuisance in relation to this establishment.

The ‘Operational Management Plan – Control Measures’ set out on page 12 of the Noise Assessment, and The ‘Operational Management plan’ set out in Appendix E on page 29 of the Noise Assessment, are noted, and shall be adhered to at all times.

2 .	23/00600/R3FUL	Castor Church Of England Primary School Stocks Hill Castor Peterborough , Provision of 1.85m weldmesh fencing and 2 x gates to western boundary of school playing fields, and modification of existing gates and replacement fencing to southwest boundary
-----	----------------	---

Historic England (14.06.24)

Comments from Historic England have now been received:

“Historic England has no objection to the proposed fencing and gates. Scheduled Monument Consent (S00244129) has already been granted for the proposed works by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.”

Correction of Error in Report

It has been noted that the published report incorrectly stated that the application was referred to Committee by Glington Parish Council. For the avoidance of doubt the application was referred by Castor Parish Council.

Clarification of Proposed Fence Height

The agent has clarified that the specification on plan reference "Proposed fence line E6/02/10/10" was incorrect. This has now been amended to state the correct height of the fence and gate panels which is 1730mm and not 1850mm as previously stated.

Accordingly Condition C2 has been updated as follows

:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Location plan E6/02
- Proposed fence line E6/02/10/10 (Received 21 June 2024)
- Fence line and details E6/02/10/20
- Existing and proposed gates (Received 20 July 2023)

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

Further Objection

A letter of objection has been received from a member of the public who is not able to attend the committee meeting. The various issues raised are set out below. Officer comments have been added in bold.

1) A number of errors in the Application Form, section 15 Trees and Hedges is marked "no", when in fact it should be marked "yes". The application states a fence 1850mm high, also 1800mm high and 1830mm high. Posts to be set in concrete 600mm deep or 700mm deep?

Officer Comment: These inconsistencies have been noted and the application description and plans have now been amended accordingly. For the avoidance of doubt, the description is now: "Provision of 1.73m weldmesh fencing and 2 x gates to western boundary of school playing fields, and modification of existing gates and replacement fencing to southwest boundary"

2) Betafence Nylor3D Light is not manufactured in 1800, 1830 or 1850 high panels. It is only available in 1730mm and 2030mm high panels. None of these will be in accordance with the planning documents submitted.

Officer Comment: As above, the applicant has confirmed that the fence panels would be 1730mm in height. Furthermore the reduction in height would also lessen the impact from the previously stated height.

3) Betafence advise that this type of fence is not recommended for use alongside an existing wall and should be used as a stand-alone fence. This is to prevent animals and birds being trapped between the fence and the wall. Rubbish will also accumulate between the fence and the wall and cannot be removed. Grass maintenance will also be prevented in the 100mm between the wall and the fence. All of this will cause an unsightly view on the school field and may even cause upset to the school children.

Officer Comment: Future maintenance, including grass/weed cutting and removal of litter and other debris, would be the school's responsibility and there is no obvious reason to believe it would not be possible using appropriate tools. Furthermore the fence would be set back 100mm from the wall with gaps either end as well as at the bottom where it is necessary to step the panels.

4) The planning application "pink notice" has not been publicised on Peterborough Road immediately adjacent to the site, but only on Stocks Hill which is some 120 metres from the Site.

Officer Comment: The site notice was posted at the school site, which is the site that the notice is related to. This is in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development

Management Procedure) Order 2015 (As Amended) and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

5) The school field site slopes along both boundaries so it will not be possible to erect Betafence panels at a consistent height to the existing wall. The only option is to step the panels which will be unsightly.

Officer Comment: The proposal is for 1.73m fencing and gates. It is up to the applicant to ensure the installation meets the agreed plans and heights. In any case any stepping will be minimal due to the gentle gradient.

6) Betafence panels whilst being very visible through when being viewed at 90 degrees to the panel, they create a restricted view when approaching the fence at greater than 135 degrees. This gives the visible impression of a solid block of colour.

Officer Comment: This may be the case when viewed at more than 135 degrees, but at any other angle, there would be visibility through the fence.

7) There is a great danger to the existing tree roots on the school field from the concrete. There is no mention in the application of what preventative measures are planned.

Officer Comment: The Council's Tree Officer has assessed the tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement and has confirmed its acceptance subject to condition (condition 4).

8) There is no detail of the proposed ground surface inside the 2 gate lobbies. If it is grass, how will the mower get inside to cut it? Is it intended to be paved?

Officer Comment: The maintenance of these areas is the responsibility of the school and is possible using appropriate tools.

9) Why is there a need for the 2 pedestrian gate lobbies onto Church Walk but not one for the gate onto Peterborough Road, which is the one that the child allegedly tried to get under?

Officer Comment: There are already 2 wooden pedestrian gates at Church Walk. The gate lobbies allow the existing gates and access to be retained in use. The main gate on Peterborough Road is being retained with a small change to the design of the bottom section of the gate.

Overall, this is a very poorly produced application with a significant number of errors and should therefore be refused.

Officer Comment: These comments are noted. However, the issues raised have been addressed above and Officers continue to recommend approval as per the original report.