

Application Ref: 13/01627/OUT

Proposal: Erection of 14 dwellings

Site: Unit 2, 61 Station Road, Thorney, Peterborough
Applicant: RM and CT Harlock

Agent: John Dickie Associates

Referred by: Cllr D Sanders
Reason: The land has the potential to accommodate residential development

Site visit: 12 December 2013

Case officer: Mike Roberts
Telephone No. 01733-454410
E-Mail: mike.roberts@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: REFUSE

1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

Proposal

The proposal is an outline planning application for the erection of 14 ‘live-work’ dwellings which means each dwelling having a room that could be used for employment purposes. Such employment uses could be expected to include uses within class B1 (offices and light industrial uses) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2010.

The details of the layout, scale, access, landscaping and appearance of the development, i.e. the reserved matters, are not for consideration at this stage. An indicative housing layout has been submitted.

The residential development would be partly upon land that is allocated for employment use as well land currently in commercial use with the remaining housing located on a grassed area within the southernmost part of the site.

The existing vehicular access to the site, from Station Road, would serve the proposed development although access to the site is a reserved matter.

Site and Surroundings

The site is located towards the north of the village of Thorney within a site that has been principally in commercial use for a number of years. There is one two storey building located in the north-western area of the site which is used wholly for employment purposes that includes a business that specializes in providing stages for public events. This business involves the use of long heavy goods vehicles that are parked within the site when not in use. A large part of the site comprises a turning area for the HGV’s. The vehicle access to the site is off Station Road to the north west. This access road runs parallel with the access road to a development comprising a terrace of 6 one and a half/two storey industrial units located to north of the site, four of which are occupied. At least four of these buildings are in general industrial use. The larger of the buildings, located at the

western end of the row, is occupied by a metal engineering company that undertakes shot blasting work. Noise from that occupier is audible over the entire application site. All of these buildings have tall and wide openings in their south facing elevations which face towards the application site.

To the south of the application site is a substantially sized detached dwelling set back from the site boundary. There is a two storey high light industrial unit just beyond the south east of the site which has a vehicle access route through the application site to Station Road. This light industrial business is owned by one of the two applicants.

To the west, the boundary of the site is shared with the rear garden fences of the residential properties on the east side of Station Road. To the east of the site lies open countryside and allotments.

The whole site area falls within Flood Zone 3 of the Environment Agency Maps.

2 Planning History

Within the application site the following applications were submitted

06/02002/FUL – Residential development of 83 dwellings – **NOT DETERMINED**

92/P0087 – Industrial development – **APPROVED** - 5.11.1992

P0777/88 – Residential development – **REFUSED** – 20.10.1988

On land immediately to the south of the application site there have been the following applications

98/00314/FUL – Extension to light industrial unit – **APPROVED** – 20.5.1998

92/P0088 – Erection of a house and garage – **APPROVED** – 5.11.1992

92/P0086 – Erection of house garage – **APPROVED** – 3.11.1994

3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 4 – Assessment of Transport Implications

Development which generates a significant amount of traffic should be supported by a Transport Statement/Transport Assessment. It should be located to minimise the need to travel/to maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel and be supported by a Travel Plan. Large scale developments should include a mix of uses. A safe and suitable access should be provided and the transport network improved to mitigate the impact of the development.

Section 6 – Delivery of a wide choice of high quality homes

Housing applications should be considered in this context. Policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if a 5 year supply of sites cannot be demonstrated. There should be a wide choice of high quality housing, widening opportunities for home ownership and sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities should be created.

Section 7 - Good Design

Development should add to the overall quality of the area; establish a strong sense of place; optimise the site potential; create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses; support local facilities

and transport networks; respond to local character and history while not discouraging appropriate innovation; create safe and accessible environments which are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Planning permission should be refused for development of poor design.

Section 10 - Development and Flood Risk

New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the impacts of climate change. Inappropriate development in areas of flood risk should be avoided by directing it away from areas at higher risk. Where development is necessary it shall be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Applications should be supported as appropriate by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, a Sequential Test and, if required, the Exception Test.

Section 11 - Re-use of Previously Developed Land

Should be encouraged provided that it is not of high environmental value.

Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS02 – Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

Provision will be made for an additional 25,500 dwellings from April 2009 to March 2026 in strategic areas/allocations.

CS08 – Meeting Housing Needs

Promotes a mix of housing the provision of 30% affordable on sites of 15 or more dwellings (70% social rented and 30% intermediate housing), 20% life time homes and 2% wheelchair housing.

CS10 – Environment Capital

Development should make a clear contribution towards the Council's aspiration to become Environment Capital of the UK.

CS11 – Renewable Energy

Opportunities to deliver on site or decentralised renewable or low carbon energy systems will be supported on appropriate sites where there are no unacceptable impacts.

CS12 – Infrastructure

Planning permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is or will be sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all of the requirements arising from the proposed development and mitigate the impact of that development on existing community interests with environmental limits. Conditions or a planning obligation are likely to be required for many proposals to ensure that new development meets this principle

CS13 – Development Contributions to Infrastructure Provision

Contributions should be secured in accordance with the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD (POIS).

CS14 – Transport

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

CS16 – Urban Design and the Public Realm

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

CS17 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non-scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

CS19 - Open Space and Green Infrastructure

New residential development should make provision for/improve public green space, sports and play facilities. Loss of open space will only be permitted if no deficiency would result.

CS21 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Development should conserve and enhance biodiversity/ geological interests unless no alternative sites are available and there are demonstrable reasons for the development.

CS22 - Flood Risk

Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted if specific criteria are met. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012)

Over half of the application site area, ref:- SA14.3 is allocated in the Site Allocations Document for Employment Uses only. The remainder already being in employment use. The Planning Inspector considered that the overall approach taken by the Council in allocating some land for employment development in Flood Zone 3A was consistent both with the relevant national planning advice and the Peterborough Core Strategy. Further the employment land allocations were considered to be justified and deliverable and the results were soundly based.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

PP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Applications which accord with policies in the Local Plan and other Development Plan Documents will be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A positive approach will be taken that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

PP02 - Design Quality

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

PP03 - Impacts of New Development

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

PP04 - Amenity Provision in New Residential Development

Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents

PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access to and from a proposed development by all user groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

PP13 - Parking Standards

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with the adopted standards.

PP14 – Open Space Standards

Residential development (within Use Classes C3 and C4) will be required to provide open space in accordance with the minimum standards. The type of on-site provision will depend on the nature and location of the development and the needs of the local area.

PP15 – Heritage Assets

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

PP20 - Development on Land affected by Contamination

Development must take into account the potential environmental impacts arising from the development itself and any former use of the site. If it cannot be established that the site can be safely developed with no significant future impacts on users or ground/surface waters, permission will be refused.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010

Planning Obligations

Requests for planning obligations whether CIL is in place or not are only lawful where they meet the following tests:-

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In addition obligations should be:

- (i) relevant to planning;
- (ii) reasonable in all other respects.

Planning permissions may not be bought or sold. Unacceptable development cannot be permitted because of benefits/inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Neither can obligations be used purely as a means of securing for the local community a share in the profits of development.

4 Consultations/Representations

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 35

Total number of responses:2

Total number of objections: 1

Total number in support: 1

Peterborough City Council Drainage Team - No objection in principle to the proposed development. Details of the design of the drainage systems, specification of the drainage elements, calculations of the attenuation requirements, ownership/maintenance details and overland drainage flow routes in the event of exceedance to demonstrate that neighbouring

properties would not be affected. The development would also need to take into account the PCC sustainable drainage (SuDS) responsibilities.

The Environment Agency - No objection to the application. and the development must be carried out in accordance with mitigation measures within the details submitted in the Flood Risk Assessment ASSOC, dated August 2013, and the following mitigation measures detailed:-

1. Finished floor levels of the dwellings must be set at 500 mm above existing ground levels with flood resilient construction incorporated.
2. Future occupants will be advised to sign up to flood warnings direct.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

The Environment Agency has advised that it is the role of the Local Planning Authority to review the submitted Sequential Test to assess its appropriateness.

PCC Highways Team – No objections in principle subject to -

- Access details being agreed to take into account HGV movements within the site.
- No third party land should form a part of the access arrangements
- 2m wide footpaths are required at least as far as the turning head
- The road layout should make provisions to accommodate a 10.5m long refuse vehicles
- Shared surfaces may be acceptable
- Each dwelling is to have a minimum of two parking spaces and cycle parking at a standard of 1 stand per bedroom. Visitor parking is to be in accordance with policy PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.
- Vehicle to vehicle visibility splays of 2.4m x 25m are required at the road junction. These can be achieved within the public highway, for a development comprising of 14 dwellings.
- Vehicle to pedestrian visibility splays are to be 2m x 2m on both sides of any access serving more than 1 dwelling. At single plot accesses this can be reduced to 1.5m x 1.5m.
- All visibility splays are to be kept free from obstruction over 600mm in height
- Forward visibility splays of a minimum of 20m will be required at bends within the site
- The roads must be designed to restrain vehicle speeds to a maximum of 20mph on carriageways and 10-15mph on shared surfaces

The North Level Drainage Board

- The development will reduce the impermeable area of the land but Greenfield water run-off rate 1.4litres per second per hectare will be acceptable
- There is concern with regards to the raising of the floor levels by 500mm. The site should not be raised as a whole as it would impact upon the properties that the site borders onto.

Environmental Health Pollution Control

Contamination

This Section does not concur with the conclusion of the Phase 1. There are a number of potential contaminative areas on site including buildings in a poor state of repair potentially containing asbestos, a spoil heap of unknown content, evidence across the site of waste disposal by burning,

stored materials, previous uses, and made ground that require further consideration and investigation by a suitably competent person.

Noise

During a site visit the sound of shot blasting from the adjacent industrial unit was pervasive across the whole site. Additionally it is noted that metal engineering takes place on that site, and associated impact noise was noted. This activity represents a significant restraint to the development of the site.

In this instance the potential for complaint is not associated with one specific noise source, but the characteristics of industrial behaviour. The conduct of such industrial processes in close proximity to residential development is unlikely to be successful. The ancillary activities (deliveries, loading/unloading of steel, manoeuvring of materials across the premises, fork lift truck usage, and work conducted outside the building envelope) are equally as likely to result in complaint as the principal work activities, should the development proceed.

The characteristics of many of these processes is that they are not continuous, are of short duration, and produce short-term, high energy impact noise. Such events are unpredictable, sudden in nature and consequently result in a startle effect that would be particularly annoying.

Furthermore such noise is difficult to assess and control, but would be from sources essential to the routine conduct of the business. It is unlikely that a scheme for the development will adequately mitigate against all potential work activities associated with the site, and these activities cannot be adequately controlled by the operator of the industrial premises. Proceeding with development is likely to result in an ongoing, onerous enforcement liability to the Council.

Thorney Parish Council

The Parish Council has advised that it has always considered this as their preferred development site in the village for the following reasons:-

- It is a Brownfield site which it believes should always be given preference over other sites
- As a previously developed site within the village envelope it does not extend development into the surrounding countryside and thereby encroach upon the rural setting of the village
- The site is tucked away behind the existing dwellings on the Station Road frontage and, as a consequence, will have little or no visual impact on the village
- It is easily accessible from the Thorney By-pass and is, therefore, unlikely to generate much traffic through the village
- We have never had any objections to the site being changed from employment use to residential use
- We believe that due the site's close proximity to the sewage works it will not generate the drainage/sewage infrastructure problems that are of concern in other parts of the village
- As there seems to be no long-term prospects of the site continuing for employment use the Parish Council welcome these proposals for its use for residential accommodation
- The Parish Council also welcome the proposals for the larger 4/5 bedroom houses with work at home facilities as we have long thought this to be a dwelling type much needed in the village
- The Parish Council understand there are some matters of drainage that concern residents adjacent to the site and assume full account of these will be taken into account as the project is developed in more detail
- The Parish Council has no objections to these proposals and would recommend approval being granted to this application

- The Parish Council would like to request that a share of any S106 monies arising from this project are allocated to a community project in the village. The particular project we have in mind is the extension of existing footpaths in Thorney Park to improve access across areas of the park which become waterlogged and boggy.

Waste Management Team

The development shall provide funding for the future waste and recycling needs of the City Council, as a result of the residential development, by way of a section 106 agreement.

Architectural Liaison Officer

The submitted indicative plans and supporting D&A statement, contains full and comprehensive indication of the applicants intentions, which if adhered to, should provide an acceptable scheme which will adequately address vulnerability to crime for this site.

Bereavement Services

The proposed development will potentially impact upon the service provided by Bereavement Services and will be subject to a S106 contribution towards the provision of a new cemetery as existing facilities are nearing exhaustion. The capital budget for the new cemetery is set at £1.158M to provide 15,000 graves. The S106 contribution per person is, therefore, £77.20.

(14 x 1 bed) x77.20 = £1080.80

Building Control

The development would require Building Regulations approval at the reserved matters stage.

Archaeological and Historic Background to the Site

The proposed development site contains no known designated or undesignated heritage assets. Archaeological work carried out between 2004 and 2005 during the construction of Thorney by-pass encountered no archaeological features, although it revealed a sequence of fen marine, alluvial and peat deposits, probably dating from the Mesolithic period onwards. The stratigraphic sequence suggests that this area was subjected to episodes of inundations and wet by the Bronze Age period.

The site has been developed and used as a brownfield since the late 1940s. As a result, parts of the site are likely to have been truncated.

The site has limited potential for the existence of archaeological remains; in addition, part of it has been truncated during the construction of the industrial unit. However, a gravel outcrop likely to represent the location of a Bronze Age barrow was recorded during the construction of the Thorney by-pass. Although presently unknown, similar gravel islands/outcrops may survive further to the west within the proposed development site.

It is recommend that a programme of archaeological fieldwork is secured to include the following:-

A desk-based assessment of the site, borehole survey/geotechnical data to be read and interpreted by a palaeo-environmentalist and on site work in accordance with a programme of archaeological work which would include an evaluation by trial trenching.

Mr Stewart Jackson MP

Fully supportive of the proposal and surprised that the recommendation is for one of refusal given

the high quality of houses that are proposed which it is felt would be to the benefit of Thorney.

49 Station Road, Thorney

Due to living directly in front of one of the new dwellings the occupiers are concerned that they would be overlooked. The field to the back of no.49, where the house is proposed to be built on the current plan, will be in a field which is regularly flooded when there is any decent amount of rain. There is concern that flooding may come into their garden.

Also they understand that at no.55 Station Road, the applicant has a pump, which has to be used every time there is heavy rain, to clear the flood water from the property of nos.53 and no.55. This is evidence that shows that there is a flooding issue.

There is concern about the standard of the pavement running down Station Road and the fact that there will be a lot more people using the path once the properties have been sold. There are regular power cuts at no.49 and there is concern that the extra properties will only make this worse. This also applies to the sewage system.

When the properties are in the process of being built all the heavy vehicles coming into the village should be from the bypass and not along Station Road, as there are already problems with the road outside no.49 as it has dropped, causing a problem to the traffic.

Senior Planning Obligations Officer

As the application is seeking outline planning permission only and the number of bedrooms in each dwelling is not known, were planning permission to be granted in accordance with the Planning Obligation Implementation Strategy infrastructure payments would be required. The contribution would be calculated based on a formula that sets out the infrastructure payment depending upon the number of bedrooms per dwelling as submitted at the reserved matters stage should planning permission be granted at the outline stage. There could be a need to secure an off-site contribution towards Public Open Space.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- a) **Principle of development and flood risk**
- b) **Live-work residential properties.**
- c) **Neighbouring land uses/Residential amenity**
- d) **Contamination Implications**
- e) **Highways Issues**
- f) **Impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the area**
- g) **Archaeology**
- h) **Planning Obligation Implementation Strategy**

a) Principle of development and flood risk

Part of the site has been allocated for employment uses in the previous development plan of the Authority that was the Peterborough Local Plan, First Replacement, 2005. The boundaries of the

allocation and site area were identical to that of the current adopted Site Allocations DPD.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 2, makes it clear that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise. The Local Planning Authority's development plan was prepared with a presumption in favour of sustainable development and is therefore compliant with the NPPF. It was approved by an independent Planning Inspector and adopted in 2012. The proposal is therefore contrary to the land use allocation in the Local Development Framework and there are no other material considerations to allow the Local Planning Authority to form a different view. The principle of the residential development is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

At the examination of the Councils Site Allocations Plans DPD the sites suitability was examined for both housing and employment use.

With respect to the housing potential it was considered that the Councils Strategic Flood Risk Sequential Test demonstrated that sufficient, reasonably available housing sites could be allocated to meet the housing requirements set out in the Peterborough Core Strategy without the need to allocate any housing development land in Flood Zones 2 and 3.

The Sequential Test submitted with the application was thorough. It did highlight, however, that there are allocated sites within the district that are available for residential development with no flood risk implications without having to rely upon residential development being located in Flood Risk areas, which the application site is.

The overall approach taken by the Council in allocating some land for employment development in Flood Zone 3A is consistent both with national planning (NPPF) advice and with the Peterborough Core Strategy because the use is less vulnerable to harm were flooding of the land to take place. Further there is a need to provide land within the larger villages for employment use. Policy SA14 of the Site Allocations DPD (2012) has allocated employment land in the village of Thorney that is a Key Service Centre by definition, to assist in diversifying the rural economy but being of a modest scale.

The employment land allocations in the Site Allocations Development Plan 2012 were considered, by the Inspector, to be justified and deliverable even though a longstanding allocation, and the results were soundly based. The loss of employment land was not acceptable.

Exception Test

An Exception Test was also undertaken, the conclusions of which were submitted with the application. This test is a requirement, as set out in the NPPF, is to assess whether a development would be acceptable on a site, designated as being within Flood Zone 2 and 3 where there are no suitable sites available in areas with no flood risk issues. This has to be a development that is 'needed' by the Authority. In this case the Exception Test fails on the grounds that the residential development of the site is not needed by the Authority as there are sufficient allocated residential sites in the district on land, not at risk from flooding, to satisfy the required increase in housing numbers until 2026.

The Environment Agency have not objected to the proposal. It has only assessed the proposal on safety grounds to minimise the potential for harm, in this case, of the future residents of the development. To achieve this they have advised that the ground floors of the dwelling should be raised by 500mm so the development could be mitigated from the risk of flooding. It has also advised that it is for the Authority to determine whether the development would satisfy the Sequential and Exception Tests which are stated in this Committee Report.

b) Live-work residential properties.

The proposed dwellings are to combine living accommodation with employment use. If taken up this type of property would be more sustainable than the typical dwelling house because of the potential for less vehicle movements during the day. Such a use could be for B1 (office or light industrial) use. Examples of the layout of the ground floor of the dwellings show a large room that would be available for a business use as an office, for example, for the residents to use. However, the use of the 'office' room would not be possible to control so it may be that the room would be used as a part of the residential use of the dwelling.

There is no specific need for residential 'live work' accommodation as proposed and the work element does not make the proposals acceptable.

c) Neighbouring land uses/Residential amenity

To the north of the application site is a terraced row of buildings, four of which are in general industrial use. The activity of the uses are noisy with one business undertaking shot blasting. Given the proximity of the proposed residential properties to the general industrial uses the occupiers of the dwellings would have a poor environment where noise impacts would be a constant disturbance to residential amenity. The noises generated from the industrial units to the north of the site are of a level that would be audible from across the whole of the proposed residential development area. Such noises cannot readily be controlled by the development or within the curtilages of the industrial units. Therefore the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the industrial units would result in an unacceptable level of amenity to the residential development. The Environmental Health Officer has advised that the application should be refused on noise grounds.

There would also be a constraint to the proposal from the operation of the light industrial unit to the south east of the site. Currently traffic generated by that business accesses to and from Station Road through the industrial land to the immediate north i.e. the application site area. However the proposal would result in the vehicular access to the business being through the application site. This would be detrimental to highway safety and the residential amenity.

d) Contamination Implications

Whilst a contamination report accompanied the planning application the Environmental Health Officer has advised that there are a number matters that have not been adequately dealt with the report. Whilst this is the case, were planning permission to be granted a condition(s) could require a comprehensive contaminated land investigation report be submitted to and approved by the Authority. The development of the site would thereafter have to be wholly in accordance with the agreed programme of works to remove contamination from the site.

e) Highways Issues

The Highways Officer has concerns, on highway safety grounds, with regards to the vehicles generated by the light industrial use (class B1) building, to the south east of the site, having to travel to and from Station Road through the proposed residential development. Such vehicles generated by the light industrial unit would be large in size and there would be a danger to residential safety and amenity.

f) The impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area

The density of the development would provide for a spacious residential development, which could be accommodated without detriment to the character and appearance of the immediate area. The site is in a position that is tucked away from the general street.

At the proposed density of development there would be scope for landscaping, to include tree planting, along the boundaries of the site, that would enable the character and appearance of the development to relate in a satisfactory way to the open countryside and the boundaries to

surrounding residential and industrial properties.

The submitted indicative scheme is not for approval but gives an idea as to how the development could proceed.

g) Archaeology

The construction of the Thorney by-pass revealed that there was a Bronze Age barrow in the vicinity and there may be more within the immediate area, including within the application site. A programme of archaeology investigation would be required prior to the implementation of the development were planning permission to be granted.

h) Planning Obligation Implementation Strategy

The Strategy requires that, as a result of the development, there would be a need to fund infrastructure and facilities. No such legal agreement has been secured.

6 Conclusions

Taking all matters into consideration Officers conclude that the residential use of the site would be contrary to the sites allocation as there is no need for the dwellings given that sufficient land has been allocated by the Authority for the growth in residential development until 2026 and that the proposal has failed both the Sequential Test and the Exception Test which had to be undertaken given the sites location within Flood Zone3. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies CS2 and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy, policy SA14.3 of the Peterborough Site Allocations Document, policies PP3 and PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and Section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7 Recommendation

The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services recommends that planning permission is **REFUSED for the following reasons:-**

- 1.** The application site has, in part, been allocated for employment uses in the adopted Peterborough Site Allocation Document (2012). Its loss to residential use would undermine the Local Planning Authority's aims to retain employment land in rural areas and provide mixed and diverse rural economies. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policy CS3 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and policy SA14.3 of the Peterborough Site Allocation Document (2012)
- 2.** The Local Planning Authority has sufficient land allocated for residential development which, if developed upon, would satisfy its target requirement for housing numbers until 2026, as set in the Peterborough Site Allocation Document (2012). A Sequential Test and an Exception Test was undertaken and submitted with the application. The results of the Sequential Test found that there were suitable allocated sites available for residential development within the district located in non-flood risk areas, i.e. Flood Zone 1, that could meet the housing target in the Peterborough Core Strategy. The Exception Test failed on the grounds that there is no need for the residential development in areas of a high flood risk potential. Therefore the proposal is contrary to policies CS2 and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy and Section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3.** To the north of the application site is a row of general industrial units. The noise generated from the activities at those units is audible from across the whole of the proposed residential development site. This would be to the detriment of residential amenity. Therefore the proposal is contrary to policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.
- 4.** There is a light industrial unit to the south east of the application site. Access to this unit would

Through the proposed housing development. The vehicles going to and from this unit could have an adverse impact upon highway safety and residential amenity. Therefore the proposal is contrary to policies PP3 and PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

5. The development proposal was not accompanied with a section 106 document to secure a contribution towards the infrastructure implications of the proposal and is therefore considered to be contrary to policies CS12 and CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Copy to Councillors D A Sanders, D McKean

This page is intentionally left blank