

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee
held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 11 October 2011

Members Present:

Councillors – North (Chairman), Serluca (Vice Chairman), Hiller, Casey, Simons, Stokes, Todd, Harrington, Lane and Martin

Officers Present:

Nick Harding, Group Manager, Development Management
Harj Kumar, Senior Strategic Planning Officer (Item 5)
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)
Carrie Denness, Principal Solicitor
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence received.

2. Declarations of Interest

- 6.3 Councillor Serluca declared that she was a school governor at Orton Longueville School, but that she did not have a personal or prejudicial interest.
- 6.3 Councillor Todd declared that her daughter worked at Orton Longueville School, but this would in no way affect her decision.
- 6.3 Councillor Casey declared that he knew a resident of Longfield Gate but that he did not have a personal or prejudicial interest.

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

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

4. Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 September 2011

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2011 were approved as a true and accurate record.

5. Peterborough Local Development Framework: Peterborough Planning Policies Development Plan Document (Proposed Submission Version)

The Committee received a report which followed approval of the Consultation Draft version of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD for the purposes of public participation in February 2012.

The purpose of the report was to seek comments from the Planning Committee on the Planning Policies DPD (Proposed Submission Version) prior to it being presented to Cabinet on 7 November 2011. Cabinet would then be asked to recommend the document for approval by Full Council for the purposes of public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State.

The Committee was informed that the document was of significance to the Committee itself, as the policies contained within would be utilised for the determination of planning applications either for refusal or approval.

The document had been through the evidence gathering, issues and options and consultation draft stages. The consultation draft had been the first stage at which draft policies had been included and this had been through the Committee cycle at the back end of 2010 and had been consulted on during the early part of 2011. Following the comments received from members of the public, as statutory consultees, a proposed submission draft had been produced and was attached at Appendix A to the main committee report.

There had been a number of changes made from the previous version, and these included:

- Policy PP3 – Amenity Provision in New Residential Development. Paragraph 2.3.3 highlighted that a supplementary planning document would be provided giving more detailed information as to how a residential property should look with regards to amenity provision;
- Policy PP7 – Development for Retail and Leisure Uses. Members were advised that this was a new Policy and had been included as a result of representations received and was to enhance the district and local centres;
- Policy PP13 – Nene Valley. This Policy had been revised to enhance the role of the river as it was felt that it was an underused resource within the city.
- Policy PP19 – Flood and Water Management. Numerous attempts had been made to draft this Policy and it had been decided that the Policy was no longer needed, as there was adequate information contained within the adopted Core Strategy (Policy CS22). The Policy would therefore be deleted from the submission version;
- Appendix B (Summary of main issues raised in comments on the Planning Policies DPD (Consultation Draft) and main changes made for the submission version). There had been a couple of amendments made to the village envelopes and paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 dealt with these changes. One of the changes had been to the Newborough boundary and the others to Thorney boundary.

Members were invited to comment on the document and the following issues and observations were highlighted:

- Highlighted in Appendix B to the main committee report (Chapter 4 – Potential Changes to Village Envelopes) a query was raised as to whether the plot of land in Helpston, which had been requested for inclusion within the village envelope, was detached from the village itself. In response, Members were advised that there was a definite gap between the end of the village envelope and the properties requested for inclusion.
- Clarification was sought as to a statement included in Appendix A to the Planning Policy Document – Parking Standards (Policy PP11). It was stated that minimum parking was not required if parking was in curtilage of dwelling,

otherwise 200 bays or less. In response, Members were advised that this was with regards to disabled parking.

- Highlighted in Appendix B to the main committee report (Policy PP15 – Buildings of Local Importance) a query was raised as to why British Sugar had not been included in the list. Members were advised that a comment had been received by the British Sugar Company in objection to the proposal to make the building a ‘Building of Local Importance’. It was therefore felt, on balance that a valid argument had been put forward for its exclusion.
- Highlighted in Appendix A to the Planning Policy DPD – Parking Standards (Policy PP11), it was stated that houses in multiple occupation would receive one space per bedroom and it was queried whether this was to new builds or new applications. In response, it was advised that it would be for new planning applications going forward.
- Members questioned whether when new houses were being built, the orientation of the roofs were taken into account for the future fitting of solar panels etc. Members were informed that there were a number of factors which influenced the layout of planning applications, and if a developer could take advantage of south facing roof slopes they would do.
- Members sought clarification from the Legal Officer as to how the document would affect the Planning Committee’s decision making going forward. In response the Legal Officer advised that the document should be taken into consideration, however Members were to be mindful of the amount of weight given to a document that was emerging in comparison to a document that was already adopted.

The Committee positively commented on the document stating that it was very well written and easy to understand.

RESOLVED: the Committee offered comment on the draft Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (Proposed Submission Version) before its presentation to Cabinet and then to Council, for subsequent approval by Council for the purposes of public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State.

6. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

6.1 11/00885/FUL – Development of 18 dwellings, associated access and parking at land to the north of the Village Hall, Guntons Road, Newborough, Peterborough

The Chairman addressed the Committee and advised that the item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

6.2 11/01105/FUL – Installation of external air source heat pump unit at 10A Back Lane, Eye, Peterborough

The application had arisen as a result of a Planning Enforcement complaint.

The applicant sought the retention of an air source heat pump unit which had been installed on the north gable end of an outbuilding within the curtilage of 10A Back Lane.

10A Back Lane was a corner plot constructed in 2004. The site fronted onto Back Lane but had its vehicular access on Luke Lane. There were parking spaces for up to three vehicles within the site.

The surrounding area was best characterised as mixed use, with the Red Lion Public House situated to the west, the main High Street to the north, which included four dwellings, the Leeds Meeting Hall, a hairdressers and an MOT test centre. To the east were three more dwellings, one of which appeared to have additional mixed use within its curtilage, the area south of Back Lane was predominantly residential and made up of low density single storey dwellings.

Back Lane itself was a narrow road with parking along one side. Double yellow lines prohibited parking around the application site however there was a small public parking area for up to eight vehicles to the north west of the site.

The site itself was comprised of a dwellinghouse, an ancillary outbuilding and a detached garage. The site also had the benefit of planning permission reference 07/00193/FUL which had granted the use of the outbuilding and one bedroom within the dwellinghouse for class B1 use (Offices). From this site the applicant operated the Peterborough base of CareWatch, a care worker agency, which had a number of bases around the country.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. Members were advised that the main issues for consideration were that the heat pump represented a reduction of the carbon footprint of the development, the visual impact including the siting, design and appearance, the noise and vibration resulting from the use of the equipment and the impact on the character of the conservation area. The recommendation was one of approval and Members were advised that the unit could not be seen from any part of the public realm of the conservation area.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. A letter had been received from Eye Parish Council objecting to the unit for a number of reasons. In response, the Planning Officer advised that these objections could not be taken into account as they were not relevant to planning considerations. The unit operated quietly, as had been witnessed by Members of the Committee on their recent site visit, the unit was also visually unobtrusive.

The Committee was advised that Councillor Sanders, a provisional speaker, was not in attendance.

Mr Franco Montecalvo, the Agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The heat pump had been fitted in order to provide an energy efficient means of heating the outbuilding to the rear of the property
- The location of the unit was in a small rear yard between the back of the office building and the back of the village hall
- The business was a part time care worker agency, therefore the unit would not be utilised all of the time
- The unit was one of the smallest of its kind available, consequently the noise output was minimal and could be barely heard as background noise
- The objections raised by the Parish Council, taken in turn, were not relevant to planning considerations
- The exterior of the south building was covered with cladding

Members queried a comment included within the committee report which stated that "as of December 2011, permission would not be needed for this development", in

response the Planning Officer advised that the Government was about to introduce relaxed planning rules which would enable certain types of energy generation to take place without the need for planning permission.

It was commented that a 63db output for such a piece of equipment was quite high therefore was there a need for the surface materials on the side of the building to be looked at in order to help reduce the noise levels? In response the Planning Officer advised that the range of noise produced by the equipment was very low, however in the event of a noise complaint being made against the equipment an investigation would take place.

A motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The condition C1 as detailed in the committee report

Reasons for decision:

Continued use of the unit would help to reduce energy consumption on the site and in turn the carbon footprint of the business activity. It was therefore considered that the proposal would contribute to Peterborough City Council's aspiration to become Environment Capital of the UK, as set out in Policy CS10 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan.

It was considered that there was no detrimental impact on the amenity of the surrounding area in terms of visual impact. As such it was considered that the proposed development was acceptable in respect of Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan.

It was considered that there was no detrimental impact on the amenity of the surrounding area in terms of noise and vibration. As such it was considered that the proposed development was acceptable in respect of Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan.

The unit was not visible from the public realm and so it was considered that the proposed development was acceptable in respect of Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan.

6.3 11/01287/R3FUL – Construction of replacement school building (Nene Park Academy) and refurbishment of retained buildings with associated external works, new pre-school building with associated external works; demolition of other existing buildings and associated external works to reinstate land including the creation of grass sports pitches at Orton Longueville School, Oundle Road, Orton Longueville, Peterborough

Full planning permission was sought for:-

- The construction of a new three storey high Academy school building : - (The existing school on site had capacity for and formerly accommodated 1400 pupils. The new school would accommodate 1100 pupils (5 form intake and 200 post 16 pupils) The school currently had 120 members of staff and this was not proposed to change as a result of this proposal.);

- Retention and refurbishment of the Sports Hall, Dining area and kitchen, Blocks C and D;
- The demolition of some of the existing school buildings and pre-school building on site;
- The construction of a new single storey pre-school building: - (The Lakeside pre-school would be relocated on site, to a new purpose built building at the west of the site. It provided early years provision for up to 30 pre-school children (+2years) and had five full time equivalent members of staff);
- The provision of associated external areas, including playing fields and pitches, remodelling the landscape, 143 car parking spaces (including seven disabled spaces), 230 cycle parking spaces, and alterations and additions to the boundary treatments (to include a 2.4 metre high well mesh fence secure line);
- Retention of the existing Scout and Cadet buildings and facilities;
- Widening of the existing access road on site to 5 metre width, with 2 metre wide pedestrian footpath on its southern side;
- Creation of a new 3 metre wide shared pedestrian/cycle route to the east of the new school building;
- The use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems;
- The new buildings would be constructed to minimise energy consumption and increase efficiency, to achieve higher standards that are required under current building regulations, equivalent to Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) Very Good rating.

The site covered an area of approximately 13.66 hectares and was comprised of the existing school buildings, car parking, sports fields and pitches. It also contained the Scout and Cadet buildings, these buildings and their functionality were to be retained, together with the adjacent Multi Use Games Area. The current Lakeside pre-school building would be demolished and this facility relocated in a new purpose built unit on the west of the site. The Peterborough United football club were currently using some of the football pitches on site as a training ground.

The application site was accessed from Oundle Road via a separate in and out circular loop which was shared with the adjacent Primary school site (St Botolphs). The Longfield Gate residential development of 16 houses bounded the site to the north. To the south, east and west the site was bounded by mature tree belts. The Orton Hall Grade II Listed hotel was located beyond the site to the east.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. Members were advised that the main issues for consideration were the proposed design and layout of the development, the impact on neighbouring sites, the access to the site and highways issues and the impact of the development on trees and ecology. The recommendation was one of approval.

Members were advised that as part of the application it was intended to improve the two nearest bus stops to the school on Oundle Road and this would include realtime bus information being available.

With regards to car parking on site, the majority of existing car parking for the school was provided at the front of the site, however the application highlighted that the parking would be relocated mostly to the rear and side of the site. There would be an increase in the number of spaces available from 120 to 143. Due to traffic coming into the back of the site, the existing access drive would not be adequate in terms of width and it was therefore proposed to increase the drive to 5 metres width with a 2 metre wide footpath on one side of the road.

A 600mm landscape strip was to be provided in between the access road and the nearest adjacent residential development. Both the driveway and car park were to be lit and lighting impact plans had been received which demonstrated that the residents adjacent and the wildlife residing in the adjacent trees would both remain unaffected by the lighting proposed.

Improvements to the pedestrian access to the school had also been proposed from Oundle Road. An improved more straightforward route was to be provided that would provide for an alternative to the main vehicular access route into the site.

There was an existing vehicular access to the pitches on site, which was currently utilised by Peterborough United Football Club for training purposes, and Highways Officers had expressed concerns with regards to a section of the designs which highlighted that pedestrians would meet at the same point as the vehicular access. Revisions were therefore being sought to the proposal in order to avoid this conflict between the two user groups.

The secure fence line would need to be altered in a number of places due to the new buildings being erected and others being demolished. This fence would be in the form of a 2.4 metre mesh welded fence. One area of concern highlighted with regards to this proposal was in relation to one section originally directly adjacent to a ha-ha feature associated with the next door listed hall. It was therefore proposed to offset the secure fence line and this was to the satisfaction of the Conservation Officer and Sport England.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. There had been one letter of support received for the application and five further objections. The objections were in relation to the lack of faith offered in relation to the management of the landscaping proposals given past performance of landscape maintenance of the school and also the observation that the proposed planting down the side of the improved access drive adjacent to Longfield Gate would be ineffective in providing a buffer.

Members were further advised that as previously mentioned, Sport England had no objection to the shifting of the fence line with it being offset from the ha-ha feature, the Wildlife Officer was also happy with the proposals. The Police had no objections and the Fire Service had requested a planning condition requiring the provision of fire hydrants. The Landscape Officer had also requested an additional condition to be added requiring an arboricultural assessment and method statement. Highways Officers had also requested a series of additional conditions and a revision to the condition numbered C21 in the committee report.

The Planning Officer further advised Members that an error had been noted in the committee report. In condition C18 a piece of text had been omitted making reference to Zone E2 in relation to the threshold allowed for lighting levels on that part of the site.

With regards to Policy CS10, it was highlighted that the development would be built to a high level of thermal efficiency and the application also made satisfactory compensatory pitch provision in respect of the Bushfield Academy.

There were no speakers present therefore Members proceeded to debate the application. Questions were posed to the Planning Officer and Highways Officer and responses were provided as follows:

- There was a planning condition which identified the need for some traffic calming provision along the main access road into the site, however care would have to be taken when designing the scheme so as not to result in a level of noise which would cause disturbance to the nearby residents
- Because the school had a lower school role proposed than that already in place, there was no planning basis for requiring junction improvements along Oundle Road, however outside of the planning process colleagues in the Education Service had commissioned Atkins to undertake works to look at ways in which the junction with Oundle Road could be improved
- With regards to having PV panels on the roof of the school building, this was being dealt with as a separate Council project which would address all Council properties individually, including schools
- A planting scheme for the 600mm strip of land, to be provided in between the access road and the nearest adjacent residential development, would be submitted prior to approval being given
- With regards to the issues highlighted in relation to longevity of the landscaping, condition C6, as detailed in the committee report requesting a landscape management plan, addressed these concerns
- The residents in the near vicinity had moved in after the construction of the school
- The replacement pitches located at the Bushfield Academy were not all weather pitches; however there was some all weather provision already located at the school

Following debate, Members commented that the school was a much needed educational facility and a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, subject to the additional conditions requested by the Landscape Officer, Highways Officers and Fire Service as detailed in the update report and the amendment to condition C18 as highlighted previously by the Planning Officer. The motion was carried unanimously.

Members further commented that an Informative was to be included with regards to wheel cleaning machinery being on site and actively being used each time construction vehicles egress onto Oundle Road.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C26 as detailed in the committee report
2. A revision to condition C18 to include reference to Zone E2 in relation to the threshold allowed for lighting levels on that part of the site
3. A revision to condition C21 to state 'in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority' instead of 'in accordance with approved plans'
4. An additional condition as requested by the Landscape Officer in relation to the provision of an arboricultural assessment and method statement, as detailed in the update report
5. The additional Highways conditions numbered 1 to 6 as detailed in the update report
6. An additional condition as requested by the Fire Service in relation to the provision of fire hydrants on the site
7. The provision of an informative outlining wheel cleaning provisions and procedures to be adopted by all construction vehicles coming out of the site onto Oundle Road

Reasons for decision:

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The siting, scale and design of the new buildings was considered to be appropriate and a visual enhancement to the site. This was in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy DPD 2011);
- The proposed buildings and layout of the site, including the new access road and relocated car parking, were not considered to unacceptably impact on the amenities of neighbouring sites. This was in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy DPD;
- The proposed car parking and access arrangements were considered to be sufficient for this reduced capacity replacement school, and there was a commitment from the applicant to work with both schools to find an improved access solution to address existing issues. The increased cycle parking and bus stop improvements were acceptable to encourage the increased use of more sustainable travel modes. This was in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy DPD 2011;
- The impact on existing trees and ecology was considered to be acceptable, and replacement trees and biodiversity/landscaping improvements were proposed. This was in accordance with Policies LNE9 and LNE10 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005 and Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy DPD 2011.

6.4 11/01345/FUL – Demolition of existing dwelling and the construction of 6 x 2 bed flats each with own garage and parking space at Pier Head, Peterborough Road, Wansford

The proposal was to erect two, three storey buildings to create six, two bedroom flats. The site would be accessed off Peterborough Road and proposed six car ports with spaces in front (12 spaces in total) and storage areas at rear with dedicated and shared amenity spaces.

There currently existed a 1970's two storey detached dwelling (Pier Head) of little to no architectural merit. Levels fell north from Peterborough Road South to the River Nene. A large hedgerow ran along the north and east of the site, with a mix of boundary treatments to the west.

There were residential properties on a similar building line to the house that were to be demolished, to the east and west, of varying roof heights, design and construction. No.23 to the immediate west had facing secondary windows.

There were trees on site that contributed to the street scene, some of which were highlighted as being lost.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the main issues for consideration, those being the policy context and principle of development, the design and visual amenity, the impact on neighbouring residents, the amenity of future occupiers and highways implications. The recommendation was one of approval.

Members were advised that the application was a resubmission of a previously refused scheme. The concerns previously highlighted had been addressed and were outlined to the Committee.

Due to the site changing level abruptly, the development was 'dug' into the hillside and therefore the 'basement' portion of the proposal was only visible from the back giving a two storey appearance from the front and a three storey appearance from the rear.

The proposal was located outside of the floodrisk area therefore there were no concerns highlighted by the Environment Agency.

The design of the proposal was in accordance with the streetscene and would not result in the loss of light or privacy of neighbouring properties and would provide open garden space and parking for the proposed residents.

As a verbal update to the report, the Tree Officer had requested the addition of a condition to secure an appropriate method of construction of the access in relation to the trees at the front of the site.

Mr Barry Nicholls, the Planning Consultant, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The application which had originally been submitted in consultation with the Conservation Officer and the Parish Council, of which neither had objections, had been substantially larger and had subsequently been rejected by the Planning Officer
- A smaller scheme had therefore been submitted and the Parish Council now had objections
- The roof pitch had not changed from the original design

Members sought clarification from the Planning Officer as to whether the roof pitch had been revised. Members were advised that looking at the scale of the drawings there did not appear to be much of a difference.

Following further brief comments, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, subject to an additional condition as requested by the Tree Officer. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The signing of the Section 106 agreement
2. The conditions numbered C1 to C15 as detailed in the committee report
3. An additional condition as requested by the Tree Officer in relation to secure an appropriate method of construction of the access in relation to the trees at the front of the site
4. The informatives numbered INF1 to IN10 as detailed in the committee report

Reasons for the decision:

By virtue of size, scale, design and layout the proposal was not considered to detract from the character or appearance of the street scene, nor was it considered to create an overbearing form of development that would detract neighbouring amenity by way of loss of light, outlook or privacy. Further, the proposal could accommodate sufficient private amenity space for the proposed development and satisfactory off street parking. The proposal was considered to be in accordance with the Policies CS1, CS2, CS8, CS13, CS14, CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

and Policies H16, and T10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005), Planning Policy Statement 1 (2005), Planning Policy Statement 3 (2010) and Planning Policy Statement 5 (2010).

6.5 11/01384/DISCHG – Discharge of conditions C2, C6 and C7 of planning permission 10/00990/FUL – Construction of 5 bedroom house (plot 5) at Huntly Lodge, The Village, Orton Longueville, Peterborough

Under application reference 10/00990/FUL, planning permission was granted by Members for the construction of a detached 5 bedroom dwelling on Plot 5 of the Huntly Lodge Development, Orton Longueville. The permission was subject to a number of conditions and three were the subject of the current application:

C2 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no development (other than foundation works) shall take place until samples of the following materials to be used in the construction of the dwelling have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) Walling and roofing materials
- b) Windows and external doors
- c) Rainwater goods
- d) Fencing and other boundary treatments
- e) Driveway surfacing

Development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with policy DA2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C6 If the dwelling has not been constructed to slab level by 2 November 2011 then development shall cease until a revised Ecological Mitigation Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the approved Strategy has been implemented.

Reason: To ensure survival and protection of important species (a feature of nature conservation importance) and those protected by legislation that could be affected adversely by the development, in accordance with policies LNE17 and LNE19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C7 Prior to first [*sic – the condition should read ‘The dwelling shall not be occupied’*] until a scheme for the landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; the landscaping scheme shall include the following detail (select those appropriate):

1. Means of enclosure (boundary treatment – fences, hedges etc).
2. Planting plans - written specification (including cultivation and other operations associated with tree, shrub, hedge or grass establishment). Full details of every tree, to be planted (including its proposed location, species, size, proposed numbers/densities and approximate date of planting). All tree, shrub and hedge planting shall be carried out in accordance with BS 3936 -1992 Part 1-Nursey Stock-Specifications for Trees and Shrubs and Part 4 1984-Specifications for Forestry Trees ; BS4043-1989 Transplanting Root-balled Trees; BS4428-1989 Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations.
3. An implementation programme.

Any trees, shrubs or hedges (including those shown as being retained) dying within 5 years shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the Developers, or their successors in title, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Any replacement trees or shrubs dying within 5 years shall themselves be replaced to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority

Reason: In order to improve the visual amenity of the areas, in accordance with Policies DA1, DA2, LNE9 and LNE10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

The application before the Committee was to partially discharge condition C2 in so far as the roofing and window materials; fully discharge condition C6; and partially discharge condition C7 in so far as approval was sought for the landscaping scheme which could then go on to be implemented.

The elements relating to walling materials, external doors, rainwater goods, boundary treatments and driveway surfacing (within the plot boundary) had already been discharged under application reference 10/00488/DISCHG.

The application site was formerly a Peterborough City Council education facility accessed from The Village through the neighbouring woodland. The site was enclosed by the Grade II listed wall which surrounded the 'kitchen garden' to Orton Hall, situated to the north east of the application site. There were a number of mature trees contained within the site and to the south was situated a woodland County Wildlife Site managed by the Woodland Trust.

Development had already commenced on Plots 2, 3 and 4 and these dwellings were nearing completion. At present, Plot 5 was currently under construction.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the application. The main issue for consideration was the impact of the proposed roof tiles on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the setting of a listed building. The recommendation was that condition C2 be partially discharged.

Members were advised that the case was broken down into a number of parts, the first being the materials. The applicant wished to use a power coated metal window frame and there were no concerns highlighted by Officers in terms of that material being used. In terms of the roofing material, the applicant wished to use a replica slate. Members were advised that in terms of the original planning approval given for the entire development at Huntly Lodge a materials scheme had been drawn up which specified that the houses should be made of stone with replica Collyweston slate being used. The plot under consideration had been constructed of brick, as per a previous Planning Committee decision.

Members were advised that Planning Officers were not happy with the replica slate as it had a shiny appearance to it and given the expanse of roof and the slender profile of the slate it would make it look very singular in appearance. Therefore it was recommended that the replica slate not be used as a material.

With regards to landscaping, this was broken down into two parts, the first being the shared areas for which a landscaping scheme had been submitted which was satisfactory and also for the on plot scheme, whilst the plan was acceptable, it was missing information with regards to the size of the plants to be put in and the number to be put in. Members were advised that that information had subsequently been received

and was satisfactory. The on plot scheme could now be approved and condition C7 could be fully discharged.

The final condition for consideration was in relation to ecology. There was a condition which stated that the development of plot 5 had to be completed to slab level before November 2011 and this had been achieved, therefore this condition could be discharged.

The Planning Officer summarised that the only issue that Officers were not content with was the issue of the use of the replica slate.

Mr Paul Sharman, the Agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- With regards to the impact of using replica slate on the building and its impact on the listed building, there were other buildings in the area with slate roofs adjoining properties using Collyweston in close proximity to the hotel
- The two materials sat comfortably together
- The two materials being in close proximity occurred near the care home at the bottom of Orton Longueville
- The use of replica slate would provide a unique and individual character to the building;
- There was a mix of roofs in Orton Longueville creating a pleasing environment and individuality
- The use of brick, and not stone, gave the option to create a more contemporary, individual and sharper feel than those adjacent
- The roof was large, but not complicated and was not overbearing from the front view
- Plot 3 was covered to the front with plain tiles and not Collyweston
- Over a number of years, the shiny appearance of the replica slate would become more in keeping with natural slate

Following questions to the Agent, Members commented both for and against the use of the replica slate. It was stated that the property was impressive and the nature of its build would mean that the use of mock Collyweston would look slightly out of place. However it was further commented that the slate would not look natural given its shiny lustre and the manufactured edges.

Following further debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to refuse officers recommendation in relation to the partial discharge of condition C2 (Materials), thus relieving the developer of their obligation to roof the development in faux Collyweston, in favour of the faux slate and therefore allowing condition C2 (Materials) to be fully discharged. The motion was carried by 7 votes, with 3 voting against.

RESOLVED: (7 for, 3 against) to refuse the partial discharge of condition C2, against officer recommendation, and to fully discharge the condition with the use of replica slate.

A further motion was put forward and seconded to approve officers recommendation in relation to the full discharge of conditions C6 (Ecology Mitigation) and C7 (Landscape Scheme) following the subsequent receipt of information relating to the on plot scheme. The Motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to approve the discharge of condition C6 (Ecology Mitigation) and condition C7 (Landscape Scheme), as per officer recommendation. and:

Reasons for decision:

a) Condition C2 (Materials)

The proposed window materials (Velfac powder coated to RAL colour 7015 Grey) were acceptable and although the proposed roofing material was considered wholly inappropriate by Officers, the Committee felt that the proposed roofing material would best suit the nature of the property. The applicant had proposed the use of Marley Eternit Rivendale faux slate which had previously been refused by Officers under delegated powers as part of application reference 11/00488/DISCHG.

b) Condition C6 (Ecological Mitigation Strategy)

It was accepted that the dwelling had been constructed to slab level and as such, the full discharge of the condition was supported.

c) Condition C7 (Landscaping Scheme)

Two separate drawings had been received in respect of the landscaping scheme for the approved dwelling as part of this application – one showing the communal turning head and access areas, and one showing the access to the individual dwelling. From the outset it had been critical that the landscaping to the communal areas of this development was cohesive to ensure that the development appeared whole and integrated into its sensitive setting. The planting for the communal and access areas had been informally agreed by Officers and all applicants on the Huntly Lodge site had agreed to use this as a basis on which to form the individual planting within their plots up to the boundary walls to the front. The second drawing which showed the planting proposed to the access of Plot 5, had originally failed to meet the criteria required under the details of Condition C7. The applicant had failed to specify a number of details, such as which fruit trees were to be planted, species size and planting density. This information had subsequently been provided and as such the full discharge of the condition was supported.

13.30 – 15.12
Chairman