

P & EP Committee 13 October 2015

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	15/01059/WCMM	Eyebury Quarry Eyebury Road Eye Peterborough , Variation of conditions C1, C10 and C21 of planning permission 11/02052/WCMM - Variation of conditions 1, 19, 21 and 31 of planning permission 08/01562/WCMM to allow the acceptance of asbestos in dedicated cells and to increase the catchment area for asbestos

No Further Comments

2.	15/01086/R4FUL	Sports Ground Fulbridge Road Peterborough , Creation of a new external sports pitch (3G Artificial Grass Pitch) with perimeter ball-stop fencing, floodlights (artificial lighting), access and outdoor storage for maintenance equipment and onsite vehicular parking Refurbishment and extension of pavilion to form new changing rooms accommodation with administration facilities.
----	----------------	---

Correction

Page 10 of the Committee Report incorrectly states that Councillor Lane has submitted a representation in support of the proposal. This is an error and should read Councillor Sharp.

Councillor Lane has never submitted any representations in respect of this planning application.

Revised Consultee Comments**Sport England (01.10.15)**

No objections to the proposed layout of the facility or the proposed wording for the hours of use condition. The FA has indicated that 9.30pm on weekdays is the very earliest closure time for the facility that they are prepared to support in terms of part-funding.

Further Representations

Initial consultations: 79

Total number of responses: 390

Total number of objections: 216

Total number in support: 165

Objections

From publication of the Committee Report to date, 183 additional objections have been received. This includes 7 individual representations and a petition of 202 signatories (not all signatories have been counted in the total above as some addresses were incomplete, one person has requested that their name be removed, and some signatories have previously submitted their own individual representations).

In addition, 7 objectors who previously made representations have submitted further comments.

The additional individual objections can be found at Appendix A.

Werrington Neighbourhood Council continues to object to this application.

Although the modifications to the bund have made it continuous, the pitch has been moved even closer to the properties. Some of the properties appear to be faced with a 3.5 (12 ft.) fence at the bottom or side of the property, others with a 3m (10ft) fence. The majority of the properties have a 3m bund rising up directly next to their back garden giving very reasonable concerns about overlooking and reduced security, quite apart from the noise from people gaining access to the bund.

Although the revised noise study seeks to show that noise levels will be accepted in the gardens and properties, the modelling for this does not in our view attach sufficient weight to the existing very low ambient noise levels, nor to the disturbing nature of crowd, player and vehicle manoeuvring noise. Furthermore it seems to be based on measurements at head height without proper assessment of the impact on first floor rear bedroom windows.

The level of use, activity and coming and going from this site is very significant with the Business Plan suggesting it will rise to nearly 40,000 visitors p.a. (BCFP Business Plan July 2014 p.43) most of which will need to come by car or coach because of the proposed catchment area.

It appears that this site has been chosen to be the launch pad for further facilities across the City and is therefore going to be the focus of a great deal of activity to raise income, not all of it from football. This has the potential without proper time restrictions to cause further loss of local amenity outside the playing times.

The long hours of use proposed for the site with high level floodlighting (15m/50ft) will introduce night time light disturbance. However well directed, lighting from this height will produce scatted light in moist conditions very common during the football season.

This site is very unsuitable for this level of usage, as it seems extremely likely to severely reduce the amenity and quality of life of those who live in the 30 plus surround properties as well as those who live on the other side of Brookside.

It seems to us that for these reasons proper consideration should be given to alternative sites where these problems do not arise. We think there is more than one alternative site where the constraints and restrictions on this site do not apply to the same degree and where access and parking provision is far better.

One example would be playing fields near the Werrington Centre. We have not seen any evidence of a proper assessment of the best available site.

As there are very significant objections on proper planning grounds we would urge the Planning Officers to require such a study and if recommendation is for consent Members refuse the application or defer it until such a study has been completed and appraised.

We understand that another 3G pitch situated off Candy St, Sugar Way, Oundle Road, has time restriction of 8pm finish and lights out. What is striking about this is that it is much further from any residential property than this proposal and is bordered by other open space and industrial property. It also has in the order of 40 parking spaces. Another pitch off Thorpe Park Road Netherton is again much further from any residential property with open space on three sides. It also has over 100 car parking spaces that can be used. As far as we are aware the intensity of use of these two sites is not as great as proposed in this application.

This application should be refused because of the impact on residents.

Peterborough Green Party

I am writing in support of local residents near the proposed sports ground on Fulbridge Road, Peterborough on behalf of the Peterborough Green Party and its 129 members. We would like to object to the development on the grounds of it not being appropriate for this area as it is too close to residential properties which will suffer an unacceptable loss of amenity in their own houses and gardens that back onto the site through noise and light pollution. We also find the use of astro turf as an unwelcome

degradation of the natural environment with the potential to increase the flood water pressure on the local drainage system and reduce grass habitat available for birds to feed.

The Peterborough Green Party support the development of appropriate sports facilities for the wellbeing of Peterborough residents providing they are appropriate for the area which in this case they are clearly not based on the comments of potentially affected residents. It is most notable that the majority of support for the development is from outside the Ward and indeed a councillor who lives in North Werrington. The council should take note of the considered view of the Werrington Neighbourhood Council that represents the majority of Werrington residents and reject this proposal with a view to finding a more suitable venue.

Support

From publication of the Committee Report to date, 21 additional letters of support have been received which includes a petition of 15 signatories. The comments raised are as follows:

- A very much needed sports facility for the area and Peterborough.
- The best idea since Christmas.
- Brilliant idea!
- What a marvellous idea for many people who would benefit from such an amazing resource.
- The kids need somewhere productive and dedicated to play.
- Excellent use of waste ground – the opportunity to provide a focus for the energies and potential skills of local young people.
- Good for promotion of sport and football to the area and City, especially with upgraded facilities.
- Existing facilities in the area are lacking, so this is a much needed development for Werrington, Walton and Gunthorpe. This would revitalise a derelict area and provide a safe place for leisure activities from child to pensioner. This would also boost the economy for local shops and pubs etc..
- Will result in a positive use of the area that supports the local schools and sports clubs.
- Having a football pitch would revitalise a derelict area. It would bring state of the art football facilities to northern part of Peterborough. Bring the community together. Provides leisure to all ages in this current obesity crisis. Resulting in positive physical and mental health improvements.
- As a 25 year old man I feel this is a very good idea for the local community and surrounding areas. I attended Walton Community School as a child and spent many of my days attending PE lessons and playing football matches at Brookside, this was quite a few years ago and it was rundown even at this time. The redevelopment of the site would be not just a relief for the community but great opportunities and a safe environment for young people to enjoy sport. I sincerely hope this development goes ahead as I would certainly use the facilities.
- As a Governor at the Voyager Academy I would like to voice my full support of this application especially as most of the cost is being provided by Sport England and the football foundation. They would only be prepared to subsidise this 3G football pitch if they knew there was a need. This would provide a wonderful opportunity for the young people in that area, both boys and girls to become involved and grow in skills and confidence. So often people are prepared to complain about the behaviour of young people when what they need is somewhere to go and use all their energy. The facility would also be so useful for the Voyager Academy to make use of during the day supporting the curriculum in a variety of ways. I trust that this planning application would be looked upon favourably as it makes absolute sense in every way.
- Brings our national game into the community and it's about time we had state of the art football facilities to the northern Peterborough area. It would be a fitting home for organized football activities from high level Saturday leagues to social Walking Football.
- As a resident in the locality of Brookside (No.27 Brookside), I fully support the redevelopment of the derelict sight of Brookside Playing Fields and the abandoned changing rooms on the site. Sport England is providing more than 80% of the funding of approximately £¾ million to bring football, our national game, into the community of Peterborough. Peterborough from my nearly 60 years of living here is a city which so desperately needs revitalising and energising especially in the area of sport, wellbeing, health and fitness for all. The project is providing, at very little expense to the Council, state of the art football facilities to the northern Peterborough area. In particular, as a parent of a student who attended previously Walton now The Voyager Academy, I am wholly in favour of this exciting project which will enable not only youngsters but also members of the surrounding areas of all abilities and ages to participate in sport/ leisure activities and football at all levels. In fact I would imagine the new 3G pitches would create a beacon flagship and raise the profile of the Werrington, Walton and Gunthorpe areas. What I am keen to see is that the students at The Voyager Academy will have exceptional facilities at their hand during the school day promoting football and sport within

the curriculum. The 'dead' site at the moment is sad to see and can only fall into for the time being. Sport England with Peterborough and District Football League, I am confident will manage and promote the site in a better than existing manner. This will be a relief to me and my daughter as the abandonment of the site is much more of a concern from unsociable and destructive behaviour of disillusioned Toms, Dicks and Harrietts from the local area. My daughter is also excited by the prospect of being involved in the Brookside Management Committee. A wonderful opportunity for her to get involved / having a say in how the project will be run and what local residents and organisations can benefit from being part of the project. From what I understand, having attended both meetings and presentations from the sponsors in July, Sport England is funding this project because they truly believe that Peterborough City and in particular the north of the city will benefit enormously as a result. They recognise that there are no current facilities in the area and Brookside is a prime site. Yes, it will need careful consideration of light pollution, noise pollution and traffic, but I believe that any type of development of Brookside Playing Fields would need this thought as part of the planning process. I feel that this is the better option than any other if this does not succeed, it is an opportunity that residents in and around Brookside Playing Field should not miss out on.

Officer response to further representations

None of the additional/further representations received raise any new material planning considerations that have not been covered within the Committee Report.

3.	15/01129/FUL	Cranford Drive Boiler House Hartwell Court Westwood Peterborough , Erection of HMO providing 6 bedsitting rooms with shared kitchen and dining facilities
----	--------------	--

No Further Comments

4.	15/01198/FUL	500 Oundle Road Orton Longueville Peterborough PE2 7DF , Change of use from C3 to C2
----	--------------	---

Access and Parking

Further to receiving Highways comments Drwg SMEL/2013/04B has been submitted and accepted by the Local Highways Authority, which illustrates that 9 car parking spaces and a satisfactory access width and pedestrian visibility splays can be achieved. Accordingly Condition 2 shall be updated to reflect the receipt of 'Amendment B';

Prior to the use of the building hereby approved the parking and access arrangement shall be provided in accordance with Drwg SMEL/2013/04B and these spaces shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles.

Reason: In the interest of Highway safety and providing satisfactory parking, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Policies DPD (2012). This is a pre-commencement condition as the measures need to be in place at the outset of the use.

5.	15/01200/FUL	241 Park Road Peterborough PE1 2UT , Single storey extension to provide additional childcare spaces with restricted hours of operation from 9:30AM - 4:30PM - Resubmission
----	--------------	---

Further representations

Following publication of the Committee Report, Stewart Jackson MP has submitted the following objection:

I write to formally *OBJECT* to the above application on the following grounds:

- There is a lack of adequate parking within the site to meet current parking demand and this has led to vehicles parking on the near public footways and reversing from the shared access onto the carriageway. Any increase in the use of the site would exacerbate the situation causing further detriment to the users and safety of the public highway. The plans are contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS14.
- The proposed increase in the number of children attending the day nursery would represent a significant intensification of the use of the site.

Item 5 simply states that no common sense management of the tree would be refused by the LPA if requested. Item 6 relating to raised flagstones outlines that repairs to footpaths are possible although there is a balance between sustainable repairs and removal.

6. Email dated 4 August 2015 to Bryan Clary attaching press item

- Article illustrating the unusual event of a double decker bus with the roof having been ripped off by low tree branches.

Officer response: The pruning of trees over the Highway is exempt from requiring consent. Therefore, if Mr Ebrahim wished to prune over the road to prevent such an occurrence the presence of a TPO would not prevent the required pruning.

7. Two photos i) showing the suspected effect of root damage from the TPO tree on the whole of adjacent pavement area. ii) the number of pavement flags affected by cracking and the temporary remedial work being significantly greater than in adjoining areas.

- These photographs are included in the objection letter within the Case Officer Report.

APPENDIX A

15/01086/R4FUL – Additional/further objections



5th October 2015

Philippa Turvey
Senior Governance Officer
Chief Executive's Department
Democratic Services
Peterborough City Council
Town Hall
Bridge Street
Peterborough
PE11 HF

Dear Ms Turvey

Sports Ground Fulbridge Road Peterborough
Your Ref: 15/01086/R4FUL

I refer to letters of the 30th September and 2nd October received from Simon Machen, Director of Growth and Regeneration concerning the above application.

Further to my letter of the 2nd September which was sent by email and first class post, I have some additional representations to make and am sending them to you as I understand that you are the contact for late written submissions.

All my original objections still stand. I nevertheless felt that I needed to write to further as I am still extremely concerned at the proposals which effectively shoehorns a full commercial development into a quiet residential area with access off a road only meant to serve a quiet cul-de-sac.

The development is out of character with the location which is one of quiet residential housing. It will be visually intrusive and will generate unacceptable levels of light and noise pollution to the detriment of all residents of Brookside.

One of the main concerns is the intensity of use. What was a school playing field used occasionally is to be turned into a busy commercial enterprise in almost constant use. The site and its location are unsuitable for such an intensity of use all year round including weekends and Bank Holidays. There will be a detrimental effect on the quality of life of all residents of Brookside.

The proposed use will generate thousands of additional traffic movements to and from the site. In the past we have experienced problems with the parking along the access road into Brookside, both on the grass verge and pavement. With such increased use and the limited provision of parking on site, there is an increasing likelihood that overspill car parking along the access route to Brookside will occur causing inconvenience to residents and result in single file traffic movements either in or out of Brookside.

Fulbridge Road is already a busy road with the junction to Gunthorpe Road located nearby. A particular concern is the increased likelihood of cars parking on the pavement to the right and left of entrance to Brookside which has happened from time to time in the past. This in turn will make it dangerous for cars leaving Brookside. Safety issues generally will arise as a result of increased traffic flows to and from Brookside and a potential conflict with existing road users, cyclists and pedestrians not only from Brookside but other cyclists and pedestrians whose route takes them through Brookside. Little or no consideration seems to have been given to highway safety issues and whilst I hope I am wrong, I fear that there will be traffic accidents.

All of the comments above just reiterate my objections to the proposed development as being inappropriate for the existing residential area of Brookside, the hours of proposed use although modified slightly remain excessive and will have a severe detrimental effect and impact on residents' and the use of their houses and gardens.

Unfortunately I am not able to attend the Council's Planning and Environmental Protection Committee as I am on holiday and out of the country. Nevertheless I should be grateful if you would consider my further representations.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of John Munro.

John Munro

Customer Details**Name:** Mr Allan Pearson**Email:** [REDACTED]**Address:** [REDACTED]**Comments Details****Commenter Type:** Adjoining Neighbour**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application**Reasons for comment:****Comments:** If planning permission is given can the following conditions be attached.

1. The applicant has given details of the anticipated noise and light pollution levels. Can these be incorporated in the permission so action can be taken if the noise exceeds these levels e.g. unable to run events on the same weekday/time for a given number of weeks.

2. Parking is a major concern for Brookside residents. The applicant has stated that Voyager can be used as an overflow car park. Can you add a condition to the permission that they actively promote parking at Voyager school, and when it is reasonable to expect the onsite parking to be insufficient they have stewards at the entrance to Brookside directing people away from parking on Brookside.

3. The playing field is not level, Can we add a condition that they do not increase the height of the Southern side of the pitch to level it. If they did this it would invalidate their predicted noise and light levels.

Mr D Patel & Mrs A Patel



Date: 19/09/2015

Planning Services
Town Hall
Bridge Street
Peterborough
PE1 1HF

Ref 15/01086/R4FUL

Dear Miss Louis Lovegrove:

We are relatively new occupants to the Brookside area having moved in to the property above (33 Brookside) in July 2013. We decided to purchase the property based on a long search and found this to be both suitable in terms of noise and also the fact that it was a very quiet area with plenty of street parking and very low highway safety concerns. We are now deeply distressed about the impending decision in which to redevelop the sports field which after following up with the updates from Mr Steve Critchley (from 21 Brookside) seems like a big project which will affect all of the points above in terms of why we chose to move to this area.

Me and my wife have been married for 2 years now and are thinking of starting a family. Whilst the area prior to this would have been the ideal place for this, we are very much considering how the new development will affect our lives and we urge you to think about the many aspects that will change if this development does go ahead.

With our property on the corner of Brookside, it will be one of the most affected properties on the entire street. Not only will we get huge disruption of our daily life from the huge influx of traffic coming into the street, we also will be affected by the noise which seems from the proposed running times of the facility will be on for the majority of the day. We enjoy sitting in the garden, however with constant football matches going on we will be impacted a great deal on noise and visual pollution from the football matches and floodlights. We also have concerns with the amount of traffic that will be passing through the street as currently is a safe place for us with plenty of parking on and off street and I don't doubt that this will change and highway safety will also be affected considerably.

To summarise, we strongly oppose the development of football pitches opposite our house on the grounds of our quality of life being severely impacted as well as highway safety, visual and noise pollution and the proposed building of a 3m high acoustic wall which will greatly impact our currently scenic views. This is a long and well established community here in Brookside and we have been here for 2 years and we strongly value this feeling. I feel that not only us but everyone on the street will be deeply concerned and hope that this plan does not get approved.

Sincerely,

Mr Dipesh Patel
Mrs Aarti Patel

Customer Details

Name: Mr Robert Pilcher
Email: Robert.Pilcher@aphalon.com
Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Adjoining Neighbour
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: This development will impact the character of the neighbourhood in which it is proposed. Brookside is a tranquil residential street of just 33 houses that enjoys low environmental (traffic & noise) disruption after core transit times (early morning & evening).

The road of Brookside is designed to serve a residential street and the proposed development would significantly increase transit upon this roadway - exiting the street onto a staggered crossroad junction.

I would expect that the Highways Report on the proposed development would include the following, but to reinforce the specifics. TRL Report 185 prepared for Department of Transport regarding "Accidents at Urban Priority Crossroads" shows that for a staggered junction (as per one at the Brookside/Fulbridge Road/Gunthorpe

- * 2 teams (per side: 11 players, 2 subs and 1 manager)
= 28
- * Officials = 3 (1 referee & 2 assistants)
- * Spectators = 6
- * Total = 37 people

The supporting information suggests that the proposed development is targeted at local teams. Experience of playing team sports within Peterborough (and observing the regular 11-a-side football matches that were played on the field in its current configuration) suggests limited car sharing and that on average each car contains 2 people.

- # Team Cars = 19
- # Staff Cars = 2
- # Total spaces consumed = 21

This has been seen over many Sunday matches on this site over the years... it is a configuration with limited parking problems for one off matches.

The proposed development needs to generate significant revenue to support its long term maintenance needs and will have to run matches one after the other. As such, the teams, officials and supports for the next match will be arriving before the end of the current match. Therefore, the parking requirement doubles - instead of being 21 cars it would be 40.

The 40 required parking spaces is a deficit of 11 over the provision of the proposed development. This will inevitably lead to parking within Brookside - impacting the character of the neighbourhood that does not have significant on-road parking.

In a 7-a-side configuration - you would expect:

- * 4 teams (per side: 7 players, 2 subs and 1 manager) = 40
- * Officials = 2 (1 per pitch)
- * Total = 42 people

In this configuration - because the players are juniors there will be much higher density of cars to players... parents will have to bring their children to the venue. Therefore, car usage will be much higher... with the expectation being that three players will come in two cars. Note: spectators have not been specifically recorded here... they are the parent and the drivers of the cars.

- # Team Cars = 28 (24 from the players and 4 management)
- # Staff Cars = 2
- # Total spaces consumed = 30

In this configuration the parking requirement exceeds the available space and parking would be required outside of the proposed development. The pressures at changeover time (when one set of matches end and another starts) would further impact the residential neighbourhood.

The suggested mitigation to the parking problem in the proposal has been to use the Voyager Academy Site. This was cited as being available with prior arrangement, so by implication this is for extraordinary events not every day activities. The suggested location is 0.4 miles away (approx. 8 mins walk) so is an option that will not be favoured by visitors to the proposed development.

In summary the parking of the proposed development is insufficient for the likely use case and will impact the existing neighbourhood. The mitigation suggested by the proposers in no way addresses the problem.

I reserve the right to further add to these comments up until the planning meeting.

Gardner Lauraine

From: pauline critchley [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 September 2015 08:14
To: Plng Control Enquiries
Subject: Sports Ground Fulbridge Road, Peterborough. Objections to development.

Objections to the proposed redevelopment of the Brookside Sports Field.

Planning Application 15/01086/R4FUL re- consultation for amendments, dated 11 September 2015.

Dear Miss Lovegrove,

Further to your letter of the 11 September I detail below my objections to the amendments to the above proposed development. I have listed these in the order that the proposed amendments appear within the additional notes portion of the letter.

1. Object to the Repositioning of the pitch.

This has not helped and increases the overall negative impact that the overly close facility will have on the established residential amenity. It simply confirms that the site is too small for the proposed development and brings the pitch closer to houses so increasing the overall nuisance potential from spectators, litter as well as other major factors such as noise and light pollution. The overall scale of the development is out of place with the established character of the area leading to the loss of the right to enjoy a quiet and safe long established residential area.

2. Amended lighting layout.

This aspect is a multiple source of objection. The lighting columns at 50 feet are very intrusive with an adverse visual impact. The floodlighting will generate light pollution from overspill; create an intrusive night time sky glow and impact on the upper stories of properties which closely border the field on three sides. This intrusion is totally unacceptable and the amendments have done little to alleviate this problem.

Measurements as detailed in the lighting performance report submitted by Surfacing Standards Limited are insufficient to allow a proper assessment of the impact of any light overspill. This document also clearly states on its front cover that the values are based on calculations and are subject to variation.

Within the body of the report it details that measurements have been taken at a maximum of 1.75 m high to calculate the lighting impact on properties using modelling software. Considering that these are based on calculations and not actualities they cannot be taken as equivalent to actual as built performance values and equally cannot replicate the unique morphology of the site and its surroundings. No consideration has been given for local atmospheric affects such as autumn mist or fog and the light scattering affects these will have on light distribution.

There are no calculations offered for the effects of light overspill above this measured height. It does not take into consideration that the lighting columns will be 13.25m higher than the measurement point used to calculate the height of the bunding and other light pollution mitigation measures.

There are two suggested lighting scenarios using values of 120 and 200 lux. The former value indicates that at 1.75 m the modelled overspill will be controlled; however there are no values or overspill maps to show the situation above this height. This is unacceptable in that affected residents have no means of gauging what the pollution aspect will be and how this will impact on their properties and be unable to comment by way of objection from an informed position.

If the lighting is approved using the 120lux option there are no guarantees that this value will not be increased if the lighting levels are later deemed to pose a risk to players. I object to the use of floodlighting on the basis of the arguments detailed above.

3. Off-site highway works to the entrance.

These changes do not take into account the overall highway safety issues which exist at the staggered cross roads with Gunthorpe Road, Fulbridge Road and Brookside when subjected to the additional daily and peak traffic flows to access the proposed facility. The issues of pedestrian and cyclist safety remain unresolved as do the difficult sight lines for vehicle coming out of the main area of Brookside past the field entrance nor the difficulties posed by the inbuilt vehicle constriction point opposite the entrance to the field for vehicles entering Brookside from Fulbridge Road and passing this point.

Vehicles leaving the residential part of Brookside have no clear sight lines of vehicles already on Brookside at the point of accessing the field. Currently this choke point and poor sight line causes occasional difficulties with current levels of residential and delivery traffic and would be greatly increased with the expected level of vehicle usage with the proposed development.

Difficulties remain with respect to traffic leaving Brookside when vehicles are parked on the west side of Fulbridge Road either side of the entrance to Brookside or the use of the pavement by cyclists who often cross the entrance without considerations for vehicle leaving Brookside. Any problems with traffic exiting Brookside onto Fulbridge Road, particularly at peak times, will quickly back up vehicles leaving the facility as there is limited capacity on the exit portion of Brookside beyond the field access. Vehicles also entering Brookside from Fulbridge Road will cause additional congestion should access into the field be restricted by out coming traffic or vehicles backed up into the car parking access road/area.

I object that the issues of highway safety and vehicle congestion have not been adequately dealt with.

4. Alterations to the internal parking and turning layout.

Despite the suggested forecasts the internal parking facility is still inadequate. The expected use of the facility with a projected 30,000 visits increasing to 40,000 over a five year period would serve to illustrate this. Additionally the necessities for the facility to be used to the maximum, as an income generator by the Peterborough and District Football League, to enable it to take over and develop other Peterborough City Council pitches, will ensure that whatever statistically derived values have been estimated for vehicle use and the subsequent parking requirement, will be rendered meaningless.

Considering the details of the location of those clubs and organisations who are the target customers for the proposed facility (detailed in the Business Plan) the majority of whom are located outside the City and local area and in adjacent counties, will ensure that the chosen method of access to the location will be by private car or minibus. The facility is not well served by public transport and the distance teams, player and spectators are expected to travel to the location effectively prohibit the use of public transport.

There are other factors to be considered which will affect vehicle usage of the car park. We were assured at a public meeting in June 2015 by a Planning Consultant, that 30 vehicles will leave and then 30 more will arrive: perhaps in an ideal model situation, but this fails to take into account human nature and the propensity to not follow the rules. If there are queues to access the facility people will seek to park outside on local roads; spectators will also wish to park especially for the expected number of Cup Competitions to be played. There will be those who once parked onsite will want to remain for a number of games or use the onsite refreshment area and so on.

There remains an expected propensity for users of the proposed facility to park on the entrance road to Brookside which would restrict flow in and out of Brookside onto Fulbridge Road at busy times. The issue of on street parking is not within the gift of the proposed development to control as it would not be under their jurisdiction. Accordingly it would be regrettable if this portion or the estate were restricted by no- parking measures such as yellow lines. Since Brookside was built this area has provided overspill parking for Brookside residents due to the lack of adequate on street parking for visitors' and contractors' vehicles and so on when the development was designed and built. This would be another unacceptable impact on residents if such measures were adopted to deal with off-site parking issues from the facility.

I object that vehicle volumes and overspill parking at this proposed development have not been properly assessed and will adversely affect the quiet residential amenity of the area and subject residents to unacceptable levels of traffic nuisance, congestion and overspill parking in a restricted cul de sac development.

5. Reshaping of grassed bunds.

The redesign of the acoustic bunding has greatly increased the visual impact of the proposed development. The bunds are now closer to surrounding property boundaries on the south and western sides of the field and have been increased in height so that the full run of bunding on those sides exceeds the height of private property boundary fences. The proximity of the bunds to the revised location for the 3G pitch ensures that they will provide a ready spectator point with accompanying noise, litter and additional nuisance.

There is also a greater imposition on the privacy of adjacent private properties by allowing a good vantage point for overlooking and greater visual intrusion to both private gardens and into windows of houses. There is also the concern that these aspects will compromise the security of private gardens, storage areas and sheds.

The new areas of solid acoustic walls are too close to the boundaries of private properties and will only add to the overall negative visual impact of the development and cause further damage to the residential amenity of the area. The intrusive nature of these walls and particularly the one to be situated on the north east corner of the site is of concern. The latter is of sufficient height (3.4m) and

located on the south side of the property in Walnut Grove, to cause issues with shadowing of the garden and the property.

The bunds are an as yet untried mitigation feature for the noise generated by the proposed development. There are a number of flaws in the accompanying acoustic report which were covered in my objection letter dated the 14th August 2015. These include the use of a computer generated modelling of an expected scenario with respect to noise pollution, measuring points for noise, lack of mitigation of peak noise, skip and so on. Acoustic modelling can only ever achieve an expectation of the effects of noise and cannot be considered to be a substitute for the unique features of the actual site and the surrounding residential areas. It is a best guess snapshot.

There are no specific published guidelines for noise generation from facilities such as this and the use of objective measuring points and their associated modelling data are not satisfactorily robust to determine the proper design of mitigations features such as the earth bunding and acoustic walls. To recap from my previous objections to this aspect of the proposed development, the acoustic modelling is subject to disclaimers for factors outside the scope of the report. Its predictions are only based on current information (i.e. the design and access statement) and so are not a true reflection of the final as built scenario, nor can they take into account any peculiarities or unique features of the site and the local environment.

The report does not seek to establish existing noise levels of the site and its surroundings as a base line measure with which to compare the predicted noise levels. The many factor increase in noise levels will be a major contributor to the loss of the established quiet residential amenity value of the area and contributing to the overall nuisance level of the whole proposed development for nearby residents.

The noise generation height measurements remain the same in the revised report and so my objections previously made on this whole noise generation and mitigation attempts remain valid plus the additional objection points made above.

6. Other associated alterations.

The issue of flooding at the south western point of the field by surface runoff has seemingly been mitigated by the proposed installation of a French Drain along the western and southern boundaries. However such methods for surface water runoff management rely on the regular maintenance of the drain. This was previously a problem with the original field design and use as a detached school playing field, where the run off volumes of water far exceeded the capacity of the drain resulting in ponding and subsequently overtopped of the associated bunding. The lack of maintenance decreased its carrying capacity greatly.

The position of the proposed drain tight up against the acoustic bunding and adjacent boundary fence would make it a difficult facility to maintain. Additionally the fall along the southern boundary is of insufficient gradient to make the drain effective at times of high flow, especially if it exceeds the discharge capacity of the street sewer. The Highway and Drainage Control Team comments are relevant in these aspects.

Despite a number of unanswered enquiries made of the Agents for information on design details of the proposed development, there remains the height detail of the boundary fence to be resolved. The Design and Access statement is unclear on this issue. As a ball stop type fence it could be 4.5m in height, but as a boundary fence it may have some other specification. If the former then this fence will

greatly exceed the height of existing boundary fences of adjoining properties and add to the negative visual impact of the proposed development.

I object that the design of the French drain has not been done in a proper manner and that the boundary fence will add an extra unacceptable level of visual impact on the residential amenity of the area.

7. Additional comment to objections given in my letter dated 14th August 2015.

I would like to add a further objection concerning the proposed hours of use. This venue is to be the prime revenue provider for the Peterborough and District Football Leagues expansion plans; there is every expectation that the use of the proposed facility will be at maximum. Indeed comment from a Mr Betts of Surfacing Standards on the 28th August indicates that the "**planned programme of pitch use is almost full**". There is every expectation that because of the financial imperatives and stipulations made by Sport England in their response as statutory consultees, that the hours of use will be the maximum. Such intensive use is unwelcome and detrimental to the residential amenity of the area and I object in the strongest possible terms.

There is certainly a case for objection over the size of the proposed development squeezed onto an unsuitably sized area of land. This will impact upon an already well established residential area. This is not acceptable and the change of scale from a long established school sports field to one of a major high intensity use commercial sports facility is not acceptable. To this I strongly object.

There appears to be a perception from letters of support available to view that the field is considered to be derelict and not used. I feel I need to be perfectly clear on this matter and point out that the field was a detached playing field for Walton School and latterly the Voyager Academy and was used as such. The field was effectively gifted to Voyager by the City Council on a 125 year lease. It was Voyager that decided to abandon its use and sublet to a local football club who placed a second hand Portacabin on the field for use as a changing facility without the benefit of appropriate planning permission. Retrospective planning permission was applied for and withdrawn before it was due to be decided.

The cabin has remained on the field without planning permission for some time. Failure to remove it as requested by the Planning Department ensured that for a short time it attracted the attention of vandals. Whilst the field was mowed it was not used and once it was trenched to satisfy the archaeological conditions of the planning application it has been deliberately abandoned by Voyager.

This descent into dereliction was no doubt planned in the light of the ongoing discussions to redevelop the field as proposed. This has given a misleading impression to the casual visitor that the area is run down and derelict. It was not until Voyager deliberately chose to abandon their responsibility as leaseholder to maintain the field in a proper manner.

8. Failure to consult properly.

Equally unacceptable has been the lack of response from PDFL and the Agent to enquiries requesting the reasons why other seemingly more suitable areas within the north of Peterborough have been rejected in favour of a small sports field closely bounded by houses. Despite a number of enquiries this information has not been forthcoming and so it has made responding to this consultation difficult.

Whilst the applicant seeks to demonstrate that there is a demand for a 3G facility, mainly from clubs and organisations from outside Peterborough and the local area, they have failed to demonstrate why this particular location is superior to other potential sites in the City. No details have been provided to confirm that alternatives were considered in any robust manner. Residents consider that the chosen location is totally unsuitable for the projected use and I object most strongly that the site for the proposed development is totally inadequate for the purpose.

There were also a number of appendices, 39 in total, for the Business Plan submitted with the planning documents, which had been omitted. Enquiries to the Agents and the PDFL were not answered and until the intervention of the Planning Case Officer these were not available for examination. The difficulties in obtaining these documents (which are still incomplete) hindered my and other residents opportunities to respond more fully to the first and subsequent planning application consultation in the time made available.

I make objection that the residents were disadvantaged in their responses by the omission of documents relevant to the planning application and the lack of information as to why this site was superior to other more suitable locations within the area. The reluctance of the Agents to respond to residents enquiries for information has been notable.

In conclusion objections I have made to the re-consultation should be considered as supplementary to the objections I made to the first consultation in my letter dated the 14th August. I withdraw none of them in the light of the amendments detailed in your letter of the 11th September.

Yours Faithfully

S.R Critchley

Customer Details**Name:** Mr stephen critchley**Email:** [REDACTED]**Address:** [REDACTED]**Comments Details****Commenter Type:** Adjoining Neighbour**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application**Reasons for comment:****Comments:** I would like to add the following objection comment to my objection letter dated 30th September.


I am concerned that the refurbished and extended pavilion could be used for purposes and events not associated with sport such as hire as a function room. This would add to traffic volumes and general nuisance especially if there were an application made for a licenced bar.

Although there are no details specified the possibility for additional casual use is mentioned within the Business Plan. The Brookside Management Group (BMG) who will be separate from the development will also able to "enter into agreements with other persons or bodies to make the facilities available for their use outside core partners' times of use". All a little vague and could be

interpreted to mean use for weddings, birthday parties and other fee paying functions. Details of such use are given for the Netherton 3G pitch pavilion which is often quoted as an example of the type of development proposed for the Brookside sports field.

I strongly object to any use of the pavilion for non sport related functions.

However this and other objections including a petition of objection with 202 signatures delivered today seem to be pointless following the adding of the Planning and EP Committee report to the documents section of the planning application today which will take into account none of them. So much for a consultation period ending on the 2nd October.



30 September 2015

Miss Louise Lovegrove
Case Officer
Planning Services
Peterborough City Council
Town Hall
Bridge Street
Peterborough
PE1 1HF

Dear Madam

Planning Reference: 15/01086/R4FUL
Sports Ground Fulbridge Road Peterborough

I wish to object to the proposals to develop the sports ground at Brookside on the following grounds:

- Increased traffic on Brookside, which will cause congestion at its junction with Fulbridge Road, affecting all Brookside residents
- Visual intrusion from the proposed floodlighting
- Noise disturbance during matches and training
- The installation of high soil bunds and high, solid fences next to residents' rear gardens
- Reduction in value of all properties in Brookside and others bordering the site
- The proposed use of the site from 9 am to 10 pm, seven days a week, including bank holidays.

Yours faithfully



Mr Koon Lung Yip

Customer Details**Name:** Mr Neil Hunt**Email:** [REDACTED]**Address:** [REDACTED]**Comments Details****Commenter Type:** Adjoining Neighbour**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application**Reasons for comment:**

Comments: With an increasingly fast-paced road out the front (Fulbridge Road), our only sanctuary is our back garden: the main reason we set up our family home here. We are a young family that cherish our family time in the garden all year around. We would object to our privacy being severely invaded by the points outlined in this letter. We would lose all privacy with our garden being overlooked by spectators/users of the proposed facility.

We object to the proposed output of both light and noise contamination beyond reasonable times. We have a young family and if the development is to go ahead, it would be impossible to put a young child to bed at

normal times without disturbance. The 'projected' levels of sound output don't take into account the amplification of noise at first floor level: the bedroom level of our houses on this street. Our child's bedroom has to be on the back of the house: facing the proposed development, because the traffic noise on the front of our house is just too disruptive.

A simple traffic survey would show the already ridiculous speeds of traffic on this 30mph section of Fulbridge Road. The speed limit is not endorsed on any section and traffic very clearly flaunts this, often passing our house at speeds that must be close to double the speed restriction. We have objections to the plans as they will not only create even more traffic congestion but because the proposed location will overload the already dangerous staggered junction onto a very fast major road. The worry is that because the site is too small for the proposal, that parking will spill out onto the main road compromising private driveway access and creating 'blind' manoeuvring out onto the busy main road. This cannot be allowed to happen, especially with less aware younger people in abundance using the facility.

We feel that while the 'best guess' sound levels are objectionable, the worse fear for us is the nature of the noise pollution that will inevitably attract foul language from raised voices. With mostly families surrounding the site that is too small for this type of development, the language is far from suitable for young children that will clearly be able to hear everything. We object to the 'best guess' sound levels being only noted at head height as this is not only where it will be clearly heard. We object to the impending anti-social behaviour from this user demographic and the volume of the inevitable sound pollution.

With the above point in mind, we object to the proposed sound 'barrier' perimeter that is outlined in the plans. This is nowhere near high enough for an area surrounded by two-storey houses. We object to this proposed height that is at least half what it should be.

We feel - along with our neighbours - that the depreciation in surrounding property values will be a big reason to object to these plans. This site is far too cramped for the development to not invade our enjoyment of our property and the area. We won't receive any positives from this and even now, if we didn't feel we could tolerate the development, the damage has done with the plans already under consideration. Our houses will be slashed in value if this visual and audible development goes ahead.

Customer Details**Name:** Mrs maria robertson**Email:** [REDACTED]**Address:** [REDACTED]**Comments Details****Committer Type:** Public**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application**Reasons for comment:****Comments:** Good Morning,

I wanted to take the time to write to you after reviewing plans for the football pitch to be placed in the field behind Fulbridge Road.

I strongly object to these plans, after living on Fulbridge Road for many years, each year we have seen an increase in the level of traffic on this road. The level of car noise is disrupting as it is without increasing this. I also object as this development will be open until 10pm this will impact on the level of noise until at least 11pm at night, once people have cleared out of the football pitch.

I object due to the impact on safety. Anyone that has spent time in the area will know that the level of traffic, speed and the staggered junction makes this a dangerous road for pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed plans will only add to this.

We already have our fair share of problems on Fulbridge Road with anti social behaviour late at night with teenagers. They hang around near the shop, garages, fighting and shouting on the street, we have rubbish thrown in our garden, sit on the walls along Fulbridge Road, kick our bins over and place them in the middle of the road along with road work signs. It is very clear that with the football pitch being added this will have a huge negative knock on effect to the surrounding neighbourhood and it will be us that is left to live with this on a daily basis until 10pm at night and after.

After living on Fulbridge Road for a number of years we do not want to have to move but if this is installed this will effect our quality of life. Unfortunately this will also effect the house prices in the area so this is not offering any benefit to us or the neighbourhood.

Thank you for taking the time to read my objections.

Mrs Maria Robertson

Customer Details**Name:** Mr Darren Cull**Email:** [REDACTED]**Address:** [REDACTED]**Comments Details****Commenter Type:** Adjoining Neighbour**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application**Reasons for comment:****Comments:** I strongly object to these proposed changes to the use of the school field.

The early and late hours proposed are unacceptable and are not reasonable as the noise and light pollution will be high and the space is not big enough to stop the noise or light from polluting my property. This will have a big, negative impact on our way of life it is not acceptable or reasonable. The peak times of use are when most residents will be at home so the noise will be an issue. Additional cars and vehicles will descend on Brookside as the plans do not cater for enough parking spaces needed with such a proposal.

The junction going in to the field is dangerous and will cause an accident with lots more traffic, the extra traffic going on to Gunthorpe Road will be high at peak times

and this will cause delays.

I am also concerned that the proposed plans will have a negative impact on the value of my property.

The flood lights and high fencing will be an eyesore when I look out the back of my property.

I will find it difficult to go out in my garden. If this proposal goes ahead people in the field will be able to stand on the hump to see into my property and I am concerned about my privacy and security.

N.B. These comments have also been submitted (exactly) by 3 other residents of the same address.



30 September 2015

Miss Louise Lovegrove
Case Officer
Planning Services
Peterborough City Council
Town Hall
Bridge Street
Peterborough
PE1 1HF

Dear Madam

Planning Reference: 15/01086/R4FUL
Sports Ground Fulbridge Road Peterborough

As a frequent visitor to Brookside, I wish to object to the proposals to develop the sports ground on the following grounds:

- Increased traffic and reduction in safety of drivers, cyclists and pedestrians on Brookside, caused by congestion at its junction with Fulbridge Road.
- Noise disturbance during matches and training
- Visual intrusion from the proposed floodlighting
- The installation of high soil bunds and high, acoustic fences next to residents' rear gardens
- The proposed intensive use of the site until 10 pm, seven days a week, including bank holidays.

Yours faithfully



Mrs A E Hurst

Customer Details**Name:** Mr Brett Jenkinson**Email:** [REDACTED]**Address:** [REDACTED]**Comments Details****Commenter Type:** Adjoining Neighbour**Stance:** Customer objects to the Planning Application**Reasons for comment:****Comments:** Dear Sirs ,

Following my previous Objects during the original consultation the review of the amendments to the project , I am even more against the project as it appears to have come closer to my property . Giving me more concern about the obvious and previously stated concerns of Noise and Light pollution and loss of privacy , visual impact.

Loss of an established quiet residential amenity and the general impact / disruption of a high use commercial development.

As previously outlined in my last objection there will be a big increase in vehicle movement and I am VERY concerned about general highway safety at the

staggered Junction. To anyone who lives in the area they would know this is a very dangerous junction - as you have to look out for pedestrians crossing brookside entrance , people crossing the at the junction opposite. Cars left and right and coming out of the gunthorpe road junction and also any bicycles coming past on either side of the road - And you have to consider this all at the same .With the volume of traffic using this junction and pressure build up of vehicles - especially in peak periods - This is an Accident waiting to happen and I cannot believe there has been no Traffic Survey included in this planning application .

Please consider this point seriously.

There are better suited locations for such a commercial project ie the area at the Front of Voyager School would be more suited.

Thank you for considering my points in advance.

Brett Jenkinson

This page is intentionally left blank