

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee
held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 26 April 2011

Members Present:

Councillors – North (Chairman), Lowndes (Vice Chair) Harrington, Hiller, Lane, Todd and Winslade.

Officers Present:

Nick Harding, Group Manager, Development Management
Theresa Nicholl, Development Management Support Manager
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)
Carrie Denness, Principal Solicitor
Alex Daynes, Senior Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ash, Burton, Serluca and Thacker.

Councillor Winslade attended as a substitute.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Lowndes declared an interest in item 4.1 as she had called at the property before.

Councillor Todd declared an interest in item 4.1 as she was acquainted with the agent, Mr Branston.

3. Members' Declaration of intention to make representation as Ward Councillor

There were no declarations from Members of the Committee to make representation as Ward Councillor on any item within the agenda.

4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

The Chairman addressed the Committee and stated that a member of the public had requested permission to record the meeting on a digital recorder. Approval from the Committee was required as per the Council's Constitution and Members agreed to allow the recording.

4.1 10/01705/FUL - 90 Vere Road, Peterborough, PE1 3EA

Permission was sought to construct two extensions to the property at 90 Vere Road, Peterborough.

This application had arisen as a result of unauthorised works being reported to the Planning Compliance (enforcement) team. Work had already started to construct the rear extension without obtaining either Planning Permission or Building Regulations approval.

The purpose of this extension as stated on the plans was to create an enlarged kitchen and lounge extension measuring 7.3 metres deep x 6.0 metres wide. Taking account of an existing kitchen extension which would be incorporated into the new rear extension, the proposed floor space measured approximately 35.4 sq metres. The proposal would create an additional WC in place of the area currently occupied by the kitchen.

Subsequent communication with the applicant had revealed that the purpose of the rear extension was to be an annex for the applicant's disabled mother.

Members were advised that the revised application was acceptable to them except for the choice of material selected for the construction.

In response to questions from Councillor Hiller, the Planning Officer confirmed that some of the existing construction would need to be removed and that a render could cover the brickwork, but a matching brick to surrounding properties would be preferred. The use of render could be conditioned, as could the type of tiling used in order to match to those already used.

Following debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, subject to an amendment to conditions to state that brick be used rather than render and the tiles to be used are to be in keeping with those already used.

RESOLVED: (7 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. Conditions 1 and 2 as detailed in the Committee report
2. The amendment to Condition 2, stating that render be used and specifying the type of tiling

Reasons for decision:

Side Extension – The proposed side extension was considered acceptable as it would not have any adverse impact on the neighbouring properties or the character of the area and indeed was similar to many other properties in the area. The design had incorporated a number of finishing details from the original dwelling house which helped to integrate it. The front wall of the extension was also stepped back and the roof ridge lower, making the extension appear subservient to the original dwelling house.

Rear Extension – The proposed rear extension, whilst considered large, was acceptable. The design of the extension now incorporated a stepped side wall which took it away from the boundary line thereby reducing its impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

4.2 03/01171/RMP, 10/01440/MMFUL, 10/01441/MMFUL, 10/01442/MMFUL - Cooks Hole Quarry, Leicester Road, Thornhaugh, Peterborough

Councillor North addressed the committee and asked if permission would be given for the local Parish Council representative, Mr Witherington, to speak on this application. The committee agreed to this request.

Permission was sought for the updating of planning conditions (03/01171RMP), installation of weighbridge, weighbridge and site offices, mess room, fuel store, equipment store, processing plant, substation and other ancillary facilities (10/01440/MMFUL), the extension of quarry area for the winning and working of minerals (limestone, sand and ironstone) (10/01441/MMFUL) and the construction of alternative means of access and wheel wash facility (10/01442/MMFUL).

The planning officer addressed the meeting and gave an overview of the applications. Compensation claims could ensue if the application was amended to remove less material from the quarry. Visual, highways and biodiversity impacts were all contained and found acceptable in the application. It was proposed to use the existing entrance to Thornhaugh 1 to access the site. The applications were considered acceptable.

Mr Martin Witherington, a representative of Thornhaugh Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. The main concern was Condition 16 regarding the rights of way and access to the site. The Thornhaugh 1 quarry was due to end in approximately 3 years but the new Cooks Hole Quarry was to continue for 15 years. Therefore, should separate access not be arranged for Cook's Hole instead of using the access for the soon to end Thornhaugh 1? The restriction on agricultural only use for the Cook's Hole access could be removed to enable this to become the access point to the re-opened quarry which could enable the installation of a bus stop on the road for nearby residents.

The applicant and agent, Drs Campbell and Wilson respectively, spoke on the application highlighting the aspects of the proposals to return the land to agriculture and natural landscape and the proposed process of quarrying the site i.e. quarry one zone before beginning another and landscape each zone as quarrying finishes. A second access point had been considered but the current Thornhaugh 1 access point was found to be the most suitable due to its distance from bends in the road and visibility accessing and leaving the site and its current ability to cope with access for large vehicles.

In response to questions Members were advised that the proposed weighbridge and wheel wash facilities would be in use and separate from the Thornhaugh 1 site equipment as that equipment was not on the access route to the Cooks Hole quarry site and only a quarter to a third of the site would look to be operational at any one time.

The Transport Officer, Jez Tuttle, advised Members that improvements were needed if the Cook's Hole access was to be used instead of the existing and proposed Thornhaugh 1 access and that an increase in traffic was not envisaged.

A motion was put forward and seconded that officer recommendations be approved for the application 03/01171/RMP.

RESOLVED: (7 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendations.

A motion was put forward and seconded that officer recommendations be approved for the application 10/01440/MMFUL.

RESOLVED: (7 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendations.

A motion was put forward and seconded that officer recommendations be approved for the application 10/01441/MMFUL.

RESOLVED: (7 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendations.

A motion was put forward and seconded that officer recommendations be approved for the application 10/01442/MMFUL.

RESOLVED: (6 for, 0 against, 1 abstention) to approve the application, as per officer recommendations.

13.30 – 15.00
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank