

Application Ref: 18/00377/REM

Proposal: Reserved matters approval relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 80 dwellings with associated landscaping, public open space, surface water drainage and access pursuant to outline planning permission reference APP/J0540/W/16/3153303

Site: Land To The West Of, Uffington Road, Barnack, Stamford
Applicant: Miss Georgina McCrae
 Linden Homes

Referred by: Head of Planning – Peterborough and Fenland
Reason: Significant level of public interest

Site visit: 21.03.18

Case officer: Mrs Louise Simmonds
Telephone No. 01733 45(01733) 454439
E-Mail: louise.simmonds@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** Reserved Matters Consent subject to conditions

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

Site and Surroundings

The application site extends to an area of approximately 4.28 hectares and is located outside the identified settlement boundary of Barnack – a Limited Growth Village. Accordingly, the site is located within the open countryside.

At present, the site is set over as arable agricultural land. The site is bound to the east by a 41-dwelling residential development of Paynes Field (a former allocated housing site) and to the south by older residential dwellings along Bainton Road. To the north and west the site is bound by further agricultural land, with the open countryside extending beyond.

Proposal

The application seeks reserved matters consent relating to appearance, access, landscaping, layout and scale for 80 dwellings and associated parking, internal access roads and public open space pursuant to outline planning permission 15/01840/OUT which was allowed on appeal.

The application has been subject to a number of minor amendments at the request of Officers and the Local Highway Authority, taking into account the comments of other professional/technical consultees and the objections received from members of the public.

In addition to the above, the application is seeking to discharge a number of conditions imposed on the parent, outline permission which required submission alongside the reserved matters application. These conditions are as follows:

- C14 Ecological Management Plan (or similar) for the approved Wildlife Area and associated green spaces
- C15 Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan
- C16 Landscape management plan (or similar)
- C17 Details of 1.7 hectares of green infrastructure, public open space, play and ecological buffer/wildlife areas
- C18 Lifetime and wheelchair homes

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
15/01840/OUT	Outline planning permission for up to 80 residential dwellings (including up to 30% affordable housing), introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access from Uffington Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access	Allowed at Appeal	27/03/2017

3 Planning Policy

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

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 72 - General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.

The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the Conservation Area or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

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 8 - Safe and Accessible Environments

Development should aim to promote mixed use developments, the creation of strong neighbouring centres and active frontages; provide safe and accessible environments with clear and legible pedestrian routes and high quality public space.

Section 11 - Biodiversity

Development resulting in significant harm to biodiversity or in the loss of/deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused if the impact cannot be adequately mitigated, or compensated. Proposals to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted and opportunities to incorporate biodiversity into new development encouraged.

Development within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest or other specified sites should not normally be permitted where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely. An exception should only be made where the benefits clearly outweigh the impacts.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring Appropriate Assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered or determined.

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.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

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.

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.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)

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.

PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access 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 standards.

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.

PP17 - 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.

PP19 - Habitats and Species of Principal Importance

Permission will not be granted for development which would cause demonstrable harm to a habitat or species unless the need for, and benefits of it, outweigh the harm. Development likely to have an impact should include measures to maintain and, if possible, enhance the status of the habitat or species.

Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages SPD (2011)

Chapter 6 - Barnack and Pilsgate

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Submission)

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan took place in January and February 2018. The Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 26 March 2018 who will appoint a Planning Inspector to examine the Local Plan to establish whether it is 'sound', taking all the representations into consideration.

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in an emerging plan according to:

- the stage of the Plan (the more advanced the plan, the more weight which can be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the policies; and
- the degree of consistency between emerging policies and the framework.

The policies can be used alongside adopted policies in the decision making process, especially where the plan contains new policies. The amount of weight to be given to the emerging plan policies is a matter for the decision maker. At this final stage the weight to be given to the emerging plan is more substantial than at the earlier stages although the 'starting point' for decision making remains the adopted Local Plan.

LP13 - Transport

a) New development should ensure that appropriate provision is made for the transport needs that it will create including reducing the need to travel by car, prioritisation of bus use, improved walking and cycling routes and facilities.

b) The Transport Implications of Development - Permission will only be granted where appropriate provision has been made for safe access for all user groups and subject to appropriate mitigation.

c) Parking Standards - Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Development proposals would contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area. They should make effective and efficient use of land and buildings, be durable and flexible, use appropriate high quality materials, maximise pedestrian permeability and legibility, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, and be accessible to all.

LP17 - Amenity Provision

a) Amenity of Existing Occupiers - 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.

b) Amenity of Future Occupiers - Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

LP19 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance where appropriate the local character and distinctiveness of the area particularly in areas of high heritage value.

Unless it is explicitly demonstrated that a proposal meets the tests of the NPPF permission will only be granted for development affecting a designated heritage asset where the impact would not lead to substantial loss or harm. Where a proposal would result in less than substantial harm this harm will be weighed against the public benefit.

Proposals which fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a designated heritage asset will not be supported.

LP28 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Part 1: Designated Site

International Sites - The highest level of protection will be afforded to these sites. Proposals which would have an adverse impact on the integrity of such areas and which cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where there are no suitable alternatives, overriding public interest and subject to appropriate compensation.

National Sites- Proposals within or outside a SSSI likely to have an adverse effect will not normally be permitted unless the benefits outweigh the adverse impacts.

Habitats and Species of Principal Importance - Development proposals will be considered in the context of the duty to promote and protect species and habitats. Development which would have an adverse impact will only be permitted where the need and benefit clearly outweigh the impact. Appropriate mitigation or compensation will be required.

Part 2: Habitats and Geodiversity in Development

All proposals should conserve and enhance avoiding a negative impact on biodiversity and geodiversity.

Part 3: Mitigation of Potential Adverse Impacts of Development

Development should avoid adverse impact as the first principle. Where such impacts are unavoidable they must be adequately and appropriately mitigated. Compensation will be required as a last resort.

LP29 - Trees and Woodland

Proposals should be prepared based upon the overriding principle that existing tree and woodland cover is maintained. Opportunities for expanding woodland should be actively considered.

Proposals which would result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland and or the loss of veteran trees will be refused unless there are exceptional benefits which outweigh the loss. Where a proposal would result in the loss or deterioration of a tree covered by a Tree Preservation Order permission will be refused unless there is no net loss of amenity value or the need for and benefits of the development outweigh the loss. Where appropriate mitigation planting will be required.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Peterborough Highways Services (12.06.18)

No objections – The revised scheme has addressed all previous comments made. The LHA is disappointed that the submitted drawings do not show the footpath link from the development to Bainton Road which is considered essential to the effective connectivity of the development. The LHA would strongly resist the removal of this link.

PCC Conservation Officer (01.06.18)

Objection – Although the design and materials of the proposal are considered to be sympathetic to

the Barnack Conservation Area, the lack of an appropriate buffer to the western edge of development is concerning. This should incorporate greater screening, preferably in the form of trees, to reduce the visibility of the development and ensure that rural views are maintained to the greatest extent possible.

PCC Wildlife Officer (30.05.18)

No objections – Pleased to note that an updated Ecological Impact Assessment Report and associated Management Plan have been submitted and the mitigation measures contained therein (in relation to nesting birds, bats, reptiles and badgers) appear acceptable. This includes minimising light levels however no lighting scheme appears to have been submitted. Request that full lighting details are submitted for approval.

Satisfied that the Site layout Drawing and associated Open Space Plan and Detailed Planting Plans indicate a satisfactory level of open space and ecological buffer habitat areas, along with ‘mock-limestone’ features as required by the appeal decision. Species selections also appear acceptable.

Details set out in the Landscape Management Plan including the establishment (using either green hay or an approved native wild-flower seed mix) and subsequent management of the calcareous grass meadows and “hills and holes” area appear acceptable.

Recommend that an ecological landscape management group or similar is established to regularly review progress on site etc. to ensure that the habitats are establishing adequately and address any issues that may arise.

Note that Natural England’s comments regarding removal of Beech and Whitebeam from the planting plan, along with a reduction in the area of scrub/ substitution with additional “hills and holes” habitats do not appear to have been taken account of in the revised plans. This should be revised if possible by the applicant.

In addition, no details regarding bat roosting/bird nesting features have yet been provided. This detail should be submitted for approval at this stage.

PCC Tree Officer (15.06.18)

Objection – The application is supported by an Arboricultural Method Statement and the comments/recommendations contained therein are accepted except for the footpath link to the south-eastern corner of the site (to Uffington Road). The proposed line of this footpath would require the removal of multiple young trees however an alternative route, further to the south, would require the removal of less. Whilst this would be within the root protection area of a group of protected trees, a no dig construction could be utilised. Subject to relocation of this footpath, there would be no arboricultural objections.

Lead Local Drainage Authority (30.05.18 and 4.04.18)

Objection – As SuDS (sustainable drainage systems) were put forward as part of the outline application, would expect to see the above ground infrastructure shown on the submitted drawings. The open space plan only appears to show the proposed detention basin which should in fact be an infiltration basin (not permanently wet). We would expect to see the proposed swales shown on the drawings currently submitted, along with any other drainage infrastructure to demonstrate that SuDS has been given consideration as part of the overall site design.

PCC Landscape Technician (30.05.18)

Objection – Whilst it is understood that much of the application has already been determined at the outline/appeal stage, revisions are requested to the submitted landscape/public open space layout.

PCC S106 Planning Obligations Officer (15.05.18)

The proposed development is CIL liable. A CIL Liability Notice will be issued should consent be granted.

PCC Minerals and Waste Officer (Policy) (31.05.18)

No objections – The Minerals Safeguarding Area issue has been satisfactorily dealt with under the previous outline permission (15/01840/OUT).

Archaeological Officer (21.05.18)

No objections – The archaeology has been dealt with through a programme of investigations which have been reported. The proposal does not appear to have any additional archaeological implications.

Building Control Manager

No comments received.

PCC Pollution Team

No comments received.

PCC Travel Choice (25.05.18)

Objection – No Travel Plan has been submitted with the application.

PCC Strategic Housing (4.04.18)

No objections – We would expect a contribution of 30% on this site of 80 dwellings. The total number of dwellings we require would be 24. The affordable housing mix proposed for the scheme is 2 x 2 bed bungalows, 6 x 1 bed apartments, 9 x 2 bed houses, 6 x 3 bed houses and 1 x 4 bed house which is supported.

The current tenure split we would expect to see is 70% affordable rented tenure and 30% intermediate tenure. This would equate to the delivery of 17 affordable rented homes and 7 intermediate tenure in this instance.

In accordance with the Policy CS8 of the Peterborough Core Strategy, 20% of units should meet Building Regulations Part M (Volume 1), Category 2 (the lifetime homes standard) which equates to 5 dwellings in this instance. Additionally 2% of units on schemes with 50 dwellings and over should meet Building Regulations Part M (Volume 1) with regards to wheelchair housing. This equates to 1 dwelling in this instance.

PCC Waste Officer (14.06.18)

Objection – Although some vehicle tracking has been provided, it has not been done for the whole development. This must be provided to ensure that we can access the site with ease.

Natural England (30.05.18)

No objections – The proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on Barnack Hills and Holes Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and National Nature Reserve (NNR) subject to the following:

- The submitted updated Ecological Impact Assessment should be amended to reflect the financial contribution (already secured by S106 agreement) towards the implementation of management measures at the SAC;
- The submitted Landscape Management Plan should be amended to include a programme to monitor the establishment/management of the calcareous grassland for at least 5 years following creation, and identify the need for further measures/management if needed;
- The submitted Landscape Management Plan includes more scrub planting than discussed at pre-application stage. This will be almost impossible to prevent encroachment onto the chalk grassland and consideration should be given to its replacement with chalk grassland;
- In the event that a suitable donor site for green hay cannot be found and 'Wild Flowers for Chalk and Limestone soils – EM6F by Emorsgate' is used, the Plan should stipulate that only local provenance seeds will be used; and
- Beech and Whitebeam are not native species to the local area and should therefore be replaced on the planting schedule.

Peterborough Cycling Forum (31.05.18 and 3.04.18)

No objections – Request that the condition requiring a footpath link between the development and Bainton is not removed as not only is it convenient, but also essential on grounds of safety. Whilst the Parish Council believes that cycling should be prohibited on the paths to Bainton Road and Uffington Road, the Cycle Forum is firmly of the opinion that they should be designated for shared use by pedestrians and cyclists (with a width of no less than 2 metres) on the basis of safety.

Health and Safety Executive (14.03.18)

No objections – Do not advise against the granting of planning permission in this case.

Historic England (18.05.18)

No comments – Suggest you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisors.

Environment Agency (18.05.18 and 28.03.18)

No objections – Request a condition that secures a scheme for the provision of mains foul sewage infrastructure prior to the erection of any building.

Cadent Gas / National Grid (20.03.18 and 3.04.18)

No objections – Request that an informative be placed on the decision to advise the Developer to make contact as soon as possible.

GeoPeterborough (Sites Of Interest)

No comments received.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) (18.05.18)

No objections – If built to this revised plan, the development should mitigate against vulnerability to crime and disorder. Please impose a condition regarding external lighting.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service

No comments received.

Barnack Parish Council

The Parish Council has submitted 4no. separate letters of representation throughout the period of this application. The most recent, received on 31 May 2018, is set out below:

1. Access footpaths

a) Path to Bainton Road

We gather that the proposed footpath to Bainton Road would be the subject of a separate application, so this path is not marked on the latest plan. Barnack Parish Council wishes to clarify its position: our preference is that plans for any right of way from Bainton Road to the new development are withdrawn. However, if the proposal is not withdrawn and the access path is approved in principle by Peterborough City Council: i) the exit onto Bainton Road should be moved further west, to avoid the neighbour's sewerage system; ii) cycling should be prohibited; iii) a gate or barrier should be installed at the exit; and iv) there should be consultation with the Parish Council over lighting.

b) Path to Uffington Road

Barnack Parish Council's Vice-Chair has visited the site with PCC's Tree Officer. We are happy for the Tree Officer's guidance on necessary felling and possible replanting to be followed. We are opposed to use of this path for cyclists and request that litter bins, dog waste bins and lighting are installed.

2. Screening and privacy

a) Western edge of the development

The Parish Council is pleased to see that in the revised plan, numerous trees have been added along this boundary to screen and soften the edge of the development.

b) Privacy of neighbours in Paynes Field, Bainton Road and Linden Close

Residents of neighbouring properties are distressed at the loss of privacy and views that will result from the new development. The general opinion is in favour of a close-boarded fence on the edge of the new development to allow some measure of privacy, but this structure will be intrusive and will need softening with vegetation.

The Parish Council is disappointed that no attempt has been made by Linden Homes to reduce the height of the new houses overlooking the western and northern sides of Paynes Field. We request that the plans are reviewed again with this in mind.

3. LEAP

We note that the location of the LEAP is unchanged in the new plan. Barnack Parish Council requests discussions with Peterborough City Council and Linden Homes on the layout of the LEAP and the type of equipment to be installed. We note that the plan for landscaping the open green space adjacent to the LEAP has been modified to create a level surface rather than an area of 'mock Hills and Holes'. We have no objection to this as long as the remaining area of 'mock Hills and Holes' on the site amounts to at least 0.41 hectares of ecological wildlife habitat, as laid down in the conditions.

4. Local housing need

Barnack Parish Council is pleased to see that the number of affordable homes in the revised plan remains at 24, as laid down in paragraph 76 of the Appeal Inspector's Report. We note that the location of the six flats has changed, but we have no objections to this.

5. Parking

Although we are told that the allocation of parking spaces is relatively generous, we are still concerned that in a rural situation, with little public transport available, the provision is insufficient. In particular, we note that the number of visitor car parking spaces has been reduced from six to five in the new plan. We urge Peterborough City Council to insist on the provision of many more visitor parking spaces.

6. Roads

a) Uffington Road

Linden Homes intends to carry out an initial condition survey of Uffington Road and make good any damage to the road caused as a direct result of the development. Barnack Parish Council requests that at the conclusion of the development, Linden Homes improves the road surface up to the junction with Bainton Road.

b) Access roads within the development

We are pleased to see that 2m-wide kerbed footpaths have been extended along much of the main north-south road within the development. However, we would like to see this separation of pedestrians and motorised traffic on all internal roads and are disappointed that the access road in the south of the development has been narrowed.

7. Roofing materials

We understand that all the new houses are to have 'mock Collyweston slate' roofs and that the garages will have pantile roofs. We seek assurance that the 'mock Collyweston slates' will be a high quality product and will graduate in size from the top to the bottom of the roof, in the traditional manner. Barnack Parish Council requests further details of these materials.

8. Detailed plans not yet available

Barnack Parish Council wishes to see and comment on the following plans, which are not yet available: the Construction Management Plan, the Drainage and Flood Alleviation Plan, the Lighting Plan and the Travel Plan.'

With regards to the other letters received, the following are matters which were raised but not included/amended in the representation above.

- A number of Paynes Field residents will put forward ideas for their boundaries to PCC as a 1.8m close boarded fence is not what any of them want at the end of their garden. Their representative has contacted the Tree Officer for advice on planting and the Parish Council support the idea of planting hedgerows as boundaries.
- A wildlife corridor along the back of the properties on Bainton Road, to the south of the development, should be left – it's an area well-used by wildlife.
- BCP wishes to suggest that, as a goodwill gesture, Linden Homes offers all neighbouring householders in Paynes Field, Bainton Road and Linden Close funds for planting in their gardens with a view to softening the appearance of the board fence on the boundary of the development site.
- BCP would like Linden Homes to put more thought into the design and orientation of the new houses, in order to protect the privacy of neighbouring homes. In particular, there appear to be 5/6 new houses overlooking the garden of No.23 Paynes Field. Could consideration be given to building more single storey houses, angling new houses so that the windows are not opposite those of neighbours, using skylights etc. in order to reduce invasion of privacy?
- The Parish Council is very much against situating the LEAP on the detention basin, as suggested by Michael Britton [PCC Landscape Technician]. The detention basin provides an extensive flat area ideal for older children to use for ball games. This age group would miss out on a leisure facility if the area were to be reserved exclusively for young children.
- BCP is pleased to see a wide variety of home sizes in the plan. However over half of the houses are 4- or 5-bedroomed. We would prefer the ratio of smaller to larger houses be reversed, with over 50% being 1-, 2- or 3-bedroomed.
- BCP has concerns over the management of the 'mock Hills and Holes'. We endorse the Wildlife Officer's proposal for a working group to oversee the ecological and landscape management plans, and request that the Parish Council is represented on this group.
- The development is over-crowded and out of character of a Conservation Village. We suggest, for instance, that including more terraced houses might create space for larger gardens and produce a more spacious feel.
- The Inspector wished to ensure that there is a 'soft edge' to the development but did not state that all the green space had to be contiguous. Can Linden Homes re-design their proposal to distribute some of the open space to the eastern side of the development?
- Please provide details of what options are available for lighting, and what street lighting will be installed within the development.
- Reading through the Community Consultation document put together by Newgate Communications after the Village Exhibition, it appears that not all comments have been included.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 104

Total number of responses: 34

Total number of objections: 31

Total number in support: 0

Two rounds of public consultation have taken place during consideration of this application – the first relating to the original submission, and the second following receipt of revised drawings.

First Round

During the first round of public consultation, a total of 26no. objection letters were received (some objectors having submitted multiple letters) raising the following:

Access/highway implications

- There is only one access from Uffington Road, which will be seriously congested particularly in the morning 'rush hour'. There is no road access from the existing houses on the west side of Uffington Road. Instead of being integrated with the rest of the village, the new estate risks being an isolated ghetto.
- The roads within the estate are very narrow and lack footways so will be hazardous for

pedestrians.

- The provision of garages and car parking spaces is inadequate for a rural location where there are no services or facilities. Even owners of the smaller homes will need to have at least 2 cars because the public transport service is limited to one bus an hour.
- How are the elderly, disabled, young families expected to get to the shops?
- Where are delivery vans and visitors expected to park?
- The extra traffic from this development will make it dangerous to cycle or walk in the village.
- The proposed footpath onto Bainton Road, directly connecting the proposed children's play area, has not taken into account the safeguarding of children. Children could wander down this path onto the main road and anybody can access it.
- Do not agree with the proposed main road going through the estate. This should be an access road for new residents only unless the Developers have eyes on the next field for developing.
- Strongly object to the proposed footpath from the development onto the B1443 (Bainton Road). This will be a dangerous access onto a very busy road, where traffic speeds down the hill from Pilsgate into Barnack.
- If the Bainton Road footpath is accepted, it must be fenced on both sides to prevent any users from straying from the path onto the adjoining agricultural field and the small piece of land where the pipe runs from our septic tank to our soakaway (The Lodge). The path must not curve towards the opening onto the B1443, but run in a straight line instead. Although this will result in a new opening within the Conservation wall, this could be replaced by closing up the existing opening. The present plan would run over where our pipe and soakaway area, damaging our sewage system. If this is not taken into account, the Developer must pay the cost for our house to be connected to the mains sewage system.
- Reducing the number of houses permitted in the development will reduce the traffic increase and level of danger. There are other ways to improve speed control, but am worried that the change of council ownership along it might hamper these along the whole road, and reducing the number of houses on the development will help.
- The lack of parking provided will impact on Paynes Field which has an already stretched capacity.
- The widening of Uffington Road must be carried out all the way from the Bainton Road junction to the Uffington Bridge.
- Double yellow lines need to be put in all the way long Uffington Road.
- Extra traffic calming measures are needed throughout the village to help with the safety of residents.
- The highways issues must be sorted out prior to construction work beginning, as large vehicles will cause damage and disruption.
- Wherever the footpaths are, they should not be illuminated after 10pm in order to minimise light pollution, disturbance to nearby properties, to reduce impact on wildlife and reduce energy consumption.
- There are no dedicated footpaths and limited additional parking. This, when combined with the fact that most families have a minimum of 2 cars, poses a danger to residents and especially children.

Layout/design/density/visual amenity

- The land to the north-eastern corner of the site should be used for a leisure facility of some kind. There is no guarantee that the basin will only be flooded once in a hundred years, these probabilities are notoriously unreliable. It could be made into an attractive water feature and nature reserve.
- The housing density may be suitable for an inner city development, but it is inappropriate in an old stone village such as Barnack.
- The soft entrance to the village is disrupted by Plots 33, 32 and 37. The houses need to be rejected or moved down in line with the other plots.
- The garage and gardens in the plan infringe on the nature walkway. This walkway should remain and not be used as garden by the developers.
- There are too many houses for the size of plot. Paynes Field is cramped, but you can see on the plans the proposed houses are greater in number along the same space.
- The appearance of the new houses is very important. We do not want to see an estate 'sticking

out like a sore thumb' as we see at Helpston, that has no bearing on the village. The new houses should be made to blend in with the houses in the village e.g. buff coloured bricks and artificial collyweston slate roofs as with Paynes Field. What would be sad is if, in years to come, people visiting our village and saying "who on earth allowed this blot on the landscape".

- The proposed footpath onto Bainton Road will have impacts on the security of homes in Paynes Field and Bainton Road, giving quick access to the rear of many properties to burglars.
- Whilst the planning argument for the housing has already been lost, I (resident of Paynes Field) wonder if there is any remaining argument to reduce the number of dwellings? Assume that the number results from financial returns of the Developer but a reduction would help a lot of the concerns of local villagers. In addition, the Council already have plans to meet their housing requirements so a reduction would not adversely affect housing supply.
- No mention has been made of the almost universal agreement that the green belt should be behind existing properties, raised at the pre-application event held by the Developer.
- Why can't the houses be built of stone and the cost passed on? It would be more attractive if they looked nicer, would be more in keeping with Barnack and consequently would sell easier.
- The submitted Community Engagement document boasts that villagers were pleased that a buff brick would be used. This is disingenuous. I (resident of Bainton Road) am happier with buff than red, but not happy that brick is to be used at all. Barnack is a stone village and this should be maintained not just at the edge of the development.
- The Developer is building as cheaply as possible, this is a mistake.
- The facing materials towards existing properties should be in keeping with those existing properties, ideally stone.
- Ideally, the more densely populated affordable housing should be located north and west of the development, rather than south and east.
- The opinion of people driving into the village is taking priority over existing residents of Paynes Field and Bainton Road.
- The houses that back onto Paynes Field should be removed altogether.
- The total number of houses needs to be reduced by at least 20%.
- The Developer plans to use utilitarian designs for the houses they will build. They are to be cheaply built and have no architectural merit. The Inspector called the homes on Paynes Field stark and the proposal has not learnt from this.
- The Developer has been lazy and put little thought into the plans. They seem to have copied the majority of the plans they had for their development in Helpston, with a disrespect for our village. A unique village like ours needs a unique development to provide our own identity. It needs to add flavour and value, not turn a beautiful rural village into something more accustomed to Hampton.
- Driving into the development, one of the first things you see is a block of 1-bedroomed apartments straight in front of you. Not really a thing rural villages are designed for.

Amenity

- The existing properties need their privacy respected, a good distance from their boundary and adequate fencing to hide the greenbelt destruction.
- The current proposal seeks to erect a wooden fence at the end of existing/new gardens. This is not 'soft' and is not a pleasant replacement for the existing settlement boundary. A soft option would be the planting of bushes, shrubbery and trees.
- No.23 Paynes Field will have nearly 10% of the new houses bordering their garden and every aspect of the home will be overlooked.
- Why has the Developer planned the houses to be within such close proximity to Paynes Field? The whole area could be pushed back allowing more privacy and retention of some views that occupants have enjoyed since moving in there. If this can't be changed, surely the angle of the houses should be changed to prevent them directly overlooking the existing?
- We (residents of Main Street) hope that the Developer will respect neighbouring residents and not work before 08:30 or after 17:00 hours Monday to Friday with no weekend working.
- Construction working should be kept to a normal working week - 09:00 to 17:00. If there is work that must be carried out outside these hours, then no machinery should be used. At all times, the conduct of workers should be orderly and in consideration of existing residents.
- The buffer to existing residents must be in place during construction to reduce stress, loss of

- privacy and noise/light pollution to residents.
- Concern that heavy groundworks could affect the foundations of existing homes and owners have no recourse to claim compensation from the Developers.
- A blank wall of a double garage will face the end of our garden (No.22 Bainton Road). To retain our privacy, would like to own the land that abuts that garage and for the garage wall to be built of stone to match our own house. If this is not achieved, we would face the additional cost of building a blank wall.
- The proposed houses are building built only the minimum distance from existing properties. The site has to include much open space, why can't some be sued to enable the new dwellings to be further away? The Inspector did not specify how all of the space should be used.
- I (resident of No.22 Bainton Road) do not want to look onto basic quality houses at the immediate end of the garden. They should be made more attractive. The design should be more in keeping with house designs in the centre of the village or recent developments on Kettering Road, Stamford or near the A1.
- The design of Payne's Field was a mistake, and Linden Homes should not be allowed to copy the same mistakes again. The site is too cramped, there is not enough parking, it is inappropriate for a village.
- In the 24 years living here (No.22 Bainton Road), I have never been overlooked. I will now have 2no. 3-bed houses at the end of my garden. A 1.8 metre high fence is inadequate. If the houses were further away, this would provide more acceptable privacy.
- Our property (No.25 Paynes Field) will be considerably impacted by the proposal through loss of view, privacy and light to our garden.
- The City Council should be taking steps to protect Paynes Field residents' views which will be obliterated if the current proposal is accepted. We (residents of Paynes Field) do not feel that the Developer has been sympathetic to our needs and have made no effort to preserve our current views or aesthetics.
- We (residents of No.6 Paynes Field) are particularly concerned about the proposed walkway that will run along the bottom of our garden. Whilst a fence of some description is proposed, we do not feel this is sufficient. Something more robust, such as a brick wall, should be considered.
- Concerned that the green space directly outside No.12 will increase noise and lack of privacy to existing residents.
- Would like to know how the noise and disturbance will be managed from the public open space behind Nos.7-35 Paynes Field when it becomes a hangout venue for teenagers.
- There is no proposal for a substantial fence or trees to the rear of our property (No.18 Bainton Road) which are needed to maintain privacy.
- Windows on the houses that overlook Paynes Field need to be adjusted to keep the privacy of existing residents. As the site is on a slope, the existing residents are extremely exposed. The windows should be obscured or textured glass, and the window size reduced.
- Consideration should be given to sinking the path to Uffington Road to provide further privacy to neighbouring occupants. Any fencing to this path should be gated so that neighbouring residents can maintain the area.
- A minimum specification should be set out for the boundary between Paynes Field and the footpath to Uffington Road. This should cut out noise, provide security and provide privacy for neighbouring occupants. It should be in keeping with the local area and the limestone used throughout Barnack.
- Our property (No.18 Paynes Field) has 1.8 metre high fencing at each side of the rear garden. A further wooden fence at the back would convert it into a 'wooden box'. Whilst considerable landscaping is proposed for the west side of the site, nothing has been proposed for the boundary with Paynes Field.
- The proximity of the proposal to Paynes Field would have an overbearing impact.
- All of the main living areas and bedrooms are at the back of our home (No.23 Paynes Field). All of the houses planned will have a direct view into our living space and main bedrooms. This reduced privacy and renders our home an unacceptable place to live. The proximity will also increase shadowing to our garden, rendering it unusable.

Public Open Space

- The linear layout would favour a small children's playground at one end but would not provide

- enough space for older children to kick a football.
- There needs to be a space for dog walking and the whole strip would have to be managed to create an area of short grass.
- Who will be responsible for the upkeep of the green area? Who will clear the dog mess, bottles, cigarette ends and used condoms (all of which are regularly discarded in the Hills and Holes car park)?
- What are the plans for addressing congregating points for teenagers?
- Dog litter bins are needed.
- The proposed planting of *Cornus sanguinea* is a low level shrub, this should be replaced with a substantial tree. The hatch area noted in the submitted landscape drawing suggests that there is an existing area of trees which is misleading. There are no trees at the west end of this hatched area [within the Uffington Road footpath link area] and the planting of 2no. Substantial trees or more trees of narrower spread is needed.

Ecology

- It is an impossible aspiration to create an area which would take some of the pressure of the Hills and Holes. Apart from the attraction of the unique landscape, the wild flowers will not grow on former farmland – they require shallow infertile soils. Without the flowers there will be no butterflies, bees and other insects.
- There should be increased green space at the top of the plot to ensure an area for social wellbeing and wildlife (a badger set is here).
- The 2 metre wildlife buffer behind Paynes Field should not be disturbed in any way once construction works begin.
- The planting of the wildlife corridor / boundary buffer / green space must have indigenous plants, trees and hedgerows as well as a mixture of mature, semi-mature and saplings.
- Where possible, all existing trees / hedgerows must be left in place.
- The building site office must not be placed near the badger set.
- Provision needs to be made for bat roosts.
- Hedgehog holes and borders of the site to help them need to be provided.
- Keep the existing trees at the location of the footpath linking Uffington Road and create a meandering nature footpath. Bat boxes, bird boxes and wildlife hotels should be added.
- Previous developments have subsumed wildlife areas into domestic gardens and the loss of the wildlife buffer should be guarded against as it significantly degrades the local environment.
- No consideration has been given to the wildlife that exist in the spinney [leading to Uffington Road] including squirrels, deer and hedgehogs. There is no exit route for these animals.

Infrastructure

- The surface water run-off from the site should be piped into the sewage works, which is already overloaded. The Developer should be made to upgrade the sewage works.
- Numbers will increase at the rural village school but there are no plans for extra classrooms or teachers, therefore class numbers will rise.
- At the public meeting, residents were advised that the development would only result in 27 additional children at the school. This seems completely unrealistic.
- A shop should be built either in the development or village itself. There are not enough amenities for the local residents as it is, let alone with adding more homes.

Other matters

- What are the Council going to do to ensure that the developer complies with any plans passed and creates a more intelligent housing development?
- Why has the Developer not built the required number of affordable homes in Helpston? The same will happen here.
- Trees to the rear of my property (No.22 Bainton Road) must be kept to preserve amenity.
- The Developer undertook a Community Engagement exercise but the plans submitted have changed little, if anything, since then. Why carry out a superficial exercise with no intention of putting findings into place?
- The Developer has been contacted but no response received.
- I would like to take the wildlife corridor into my garden (No.22 Bainton Road) just as the

- residents of Paynes Field have. This could then be used to provide screening.
- In the past, the Council's Planning Officers have acted on a 'presumption to build' and have insufficiently taken on the views of neighbouring residents. I (resident of No.22 Bainton Road) have little confidence in the ability of the Case Officer to do so now, given the additional costs of the appeal against the building has already generated for the Council. I seek reassurance.
 - As the Council has been hoodwinked and outmanoeuvred by a better-backed Developer, as the initial rejection on 7 counts was dismissed at appeal, this application is a chance to ensure that the development has the true force of the Council and Barnack people behind it. It should be an opportunity to develop something special for the long-term and benefit the village rather than the Developer.
 - Require assurances that the drainage of the new development will not detrimentally impact the Paynes Field development.
 - The Developer has merely paid lip service to the affordable housing element. By incorporating these properties close to the existing affordable housing on Paynes Field, you are making a statement that is divisive and judgmental. The housing should be integrated into the heart of the proposed new development.
 - An indexed compensation scheme should be made to residents on the border of Paynes Field and Bainton Road, based on the net devaluation of homes. They should be valued prior to construction and again after, with the difference paid to homeowners.
 - We were all very disappointed and upset when the Planning Committee's decision was overturned by the Planning Inspectorate, but have since reluctantly accepted the verdict and were hopeful of trying to embrace the new development as much as we can. However, having seen the submitted proposal, this acceptance has quickly turned to anger, disappointment and complete frustration. The plans are appalling, thoughtless, lazy and completely inappropriate for this beautiful village we live in. As a local community, we needed to have a proper input into the plans and actually be listened to.
 - Concerned at the need to clear a 5 metre strip for the footpath to Uffington Road. Most paths are not 5 metres wide and it is suspected that they will not be as wide as this on the new development.
 - Pleased that consideration has been given to the water drainage challenges that 80 new houses presents. However it is concerning that a 1 in 30 year event has been planned for and assumed that drains will be kept clear of debris. The latter is an ongoing challenge for drainage in the area and deeply concerned that there will be insufficient drainage that could have a significant impact on the Paynes Field estate which is at a lower level.
 - Request (occupant of No.5 Paynes Field) that existing residents are included in membership of the management company so that we can influence and particularly in the activities that take place to keep the area managed and maintained.

1 no. neutral representation (neither objecting or supporting the proposal) was also received raising the following points:

- The open space is welcomed and will protect wildlife in the hedgerows. However, this is a greenfield site and the density and massing of housing is very high for an edge of village location. The village should have lower density housing on the fringe and higher density in the centre.
- Uffington Road is already too narrow for current traffic, particularly if cars are parked on the road. With the increase in traffic, this will be a major issue.
- It is hoped that the City Council will put together a robust housing strategy for future development to stop overdevelopment of the villages as it is only a matter of time until we get another application. If nothing is done, the villages will look like any other housing estate and slowly merge together.
- I (resident of Allerton Close) understand that the previous development on Uffington Road was to provide a play area for children. We are still waiting.

Councillor Over raised the following objection:

'The fence proposed between the new estate and houses in Paynes Field will mean that the 20 gardens will be surrounded by wooden fences. Paynes Field should have a nature strip along the back gardens. PCC did not enforce it and I suggest that this could be addressed at this stage.'

Second Round

Following receipt of revised drawings, a further 9no. letters of objection were received (many from residents who had previously submitted objections). Those objections raised which were not previously made are as follows:

- The revised drawings do not address the proximity of the new houses to No.23 Paynes Field. Moving one house slightly further away is simply insulting. The whole layout needs addressing.
- Screening of the close boarded fence that will run along the houses which back onto Paynes Field has still not been secured.
- Whilst not a formal planning issue, we (resident of No.18 Paynes Field) will be approaching the Developer with a view to them providing planting to reduce the intrusive effect of the wooden fence.
- I (resident of 1 Linden Close) have not managed to uncover any commitment that mitigates the risk to the TPO woodland area during the development process.
- The proposed pathway to Uffington Road runs close to major TPO trees. Can this route have minor adjustments so that the distance from the tree roots and any low canopy is maximised to ensure no accidental damage occurs? This would also mitigate the risk to future residents from the trees when using the pathway.
- That we've been defeated in the outline application being approved, should ensure that this development is monitored carefully in order to fit in with the village and current aesthetics. This does not appear to be the case and PCC do appear to have 'rolled over', thereby allowing the Developer carte blanche.
- The Council's Planning Officers do not appear to be challenging the Developer sufficiently because they appear to be frightened of losing any decisions made at appeal due to being unwisely over-mindful of the costs incurred by the original appeal against Gladman Ltd. Consequently there is little hope of the best possible development being achieved. This is exacerbated by the assignment of a temporary Planning Officer, meaning a consistent approach cannot be taken to such a build.
- PCC Planners seem overwhelmed by the applications they are dealing with across Peterborough and are giving insufficient attention to this application. Consequently the application to build bog-standard housing as cheaply as possible looks likely to success with only the most minor revisions.
- There has been little consultation with current residents - PCC should be fighting our corner.
- Very disappointed at the 'revised plans' submitted. The Developer has still not listened to any of the concerns of local neighbours and community, and is proposing a cheap and lazy development in one of the areas most unique and beautiful villages.
- In a development already lacking parking, it is intended to cut this number down. Pavements will become parking spaces causing hazards for children, prams and the elderly. The whole area will look more like inner city Hampton than a beautiful country village.
- All of the green open space is to be managed by a local committee from the development. Short-term this may work if you get enough volunteers. However mid- to long-term this is just not sustainable and will become a complete mess. This space needs managing by a proper organisation.
- In making the decision, the Council should remember that all parties apart from the landowner and Inspector were wholly against the development. This includes the Council, Barnack Parish Council, the local Councillor, the MP and others. It is incumbent upon PCC and its Planning Department to now ensure the best possible build is secured, and that profit is not the driving motive behind all decisions taken.
- Neither the Developer or Planning Officers are sufficiently or properly engaging with residents. This is totally unacceptable and if the build goes ahead as planned, will remain so and remain the cause of resentment amongst local residents.
- Why are other house designs, such as terraces, not considered to reduce the density?
- It is not clear why anyone will want to buy a re-sale property on the development in future years.
- The revised drawing cannot be understood with regards to the siting of Plot 33. It is unclear as to whether this has been altered position or to ensure that no upstairs windows intrude onto the neighbouring bungalow.
- Local housing needs require 2- and 2-bedroomed properties. 5-bedroomed houses are not

required.

1no. neutral representation was received as follows:

- The open spaces to the boundary should be protected to stop further future development on adjoining land and protect this amenity.
- The open spaces should be gifted to Barnack Parish Council to preserve this amenity.

Councillor Over has also raised the following additional objections:

- Houses are generally large family houses based on no evidence of housing need for the village.
- Affordable housing can mean anything. Houses for rent are needed and smaller housing for downsizing.
- Nothing is planned to improve Broadwheel Road.
- The development is an 'off-the-shelf' suburban development and not related to a village environment in any way.
- No attention has been made to the village environment.
- Who will be responsible for the leisure areas and large drainage area?
- Parking provision is inadequate.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Compliance with the outline permission
- Density and housing provision
- Layout and design
- Access, parking and highway implications
- Public Open Space and ecology
- Amenity
- Heritage impacts
- Trees

a) Compliance with the outline permission

The outline planning permission (reference 15/01840/OUT) permitted a maximum of 80 residential dwellings across the site (of which 30% must be affordable housing) alongside structural planting and landscaping, informal open space and children's play area, surface water management / attenuation, vehicular access from Uffington Road and associated ancillary works.

The outline permission contains a number of conditions which are required to be complied with. Some conditions relate to matters which must accompany a reserved matters application, and others which require details either prior to commencement of development or prior to first occupation of the dwellings. For clarity, those conditions which require details to be submitted at reserved matters stage are set out in Section 1 above.

Each of these matters will be discussed in the relevant sections below, however it is considered that the current submission accords with the requirements of those conditions and therefore, the current proposal fully complies with the requirements of the parent outline planning permission.

b) Density and housing provision

Density

It is acknowledged that many of the objections received from local residents relate to the density of the proposal and in particular, the consideration that the 80 dwellings proposed represents a far too dense form of development for the edge of a rural village. However, the impact of the number of dwellings proposed, alongside the resultant density on the site, was a matter dealt with by the Inspector in allowing the parent outline planning permission.

The Inspector concluded (paragraph 37 of the appeal decision attached to this report at Appendix 1): *'I accept that the layout is likely to be at a higher density than elsewhere on the periphery of*

Barnack... However, I do not consider it will be particularly uncharacteristic in the immediate context of the Payne's Field development, and the scheme includes considerable elements of landscaping, which can help to assimilate the development and create a better edge to the settlement.'

Taking into account the above, Officers consider that the matter of density for the 80 dwellings proposed is not one which can be reconsidered or used as a reason for which the current application should be resisted.

Housing provision

In terms of housing provision, the outline planning permission and S106 Agreement attached thereto, requires that 30% of all residential dwellings on the site be affordable homes. The proposal seeks to provide a total of 24no. affordable dwellings which fully accords with this requirement. In terms of the dwelling size mix, the proposal seeks to provide the following affordable units: 2 x 2-bed bungalows, 6 x 1-bed apartments, 9 x 2-bed houses, 6 x 3-bed houses and 1 x 4-bed house. The City Council's Strategic Housing Officer has advised that this mix is supported and it is considered that it would meet the housing needs of the village. With regards to tenure mix, this matter is already secured within the signed legal agreement and therefore does not need to be dealt with during this application.

In addition to affordable housing, the outline permission also requires that a certain provision of lifetime and wheelchair homes be provided within the development. Turning first to lifetime homes, 20% of all residential units must be to Building Regulations Part M (Volume 1) Category 2 standard. With regards to wheelchair housing, 2% of all residential units must be to Building Regulations Part M (Volume 1) Category 3 standard. The Applicant has confirmed that this requirement will be met, and all drawings received relating to affordable housing demonstrate compliance with both of the standards with the relevant requirements clearly shown (i.e. wheelchair turning circles and future adaptations for hoists and lifts etc.).

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would make adequate provision for a range of housing that would meet the future needs of residents and accords with the requirements of condition C18 of the parent outline planning permission. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CS8 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and emerging Policy LP08 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time.

c) **Layout and design**

As with density above, it is noted that a large number of the objections received relate to the overall layout of the development proposed. In particular, the Parish Council and objectors consider that the layout does not adequately respond to the constraints of the site in terms of the relationship to existing dwellings and many feel that the proposed Public Open Space (POS) should be split to provide POS to both the outer edge of the development (to the north and west) as well as the southern and eastern edges (which bound Bainton Road and Paynes Field respectively). Whilst these comments are noted, Officers consider that the layout submitted responds appropriately to the site and mitigates, as far as possible, the landscape impacts arising from the development.

The broad layout of the development follows the indicative framework plan submitted with the parent outline planning application. This indicated that the main built form of the development would follow the 'L-shape' of the site, and be sited closest to the eastern and southern boundaries. Beyond this, the POS would be to the northern and western boundaries, forming a significant landscape buffer to the open countryside beyond. Indeed, this POS and landscaping was given significant weight by the Inspector who concluded that the current boundary of the village along Paynes Field was stark and that the development of this site could secure a more successful boundary, particular through the planting of native trees to create a partial screen.

Notwithstanding this, there are certain positions in which some of the POS must be sited – namely the wildlife buffer which must be located to the eastern boundary given existing ecological features that require protection, and the detention basin which can only be located to the north-eastern corner of the site. This therefore leaves only the position of the 1.125 hectares of natural green space and 0.04 hectares of POS for use as a play area. This natural green space must be designed as ‘mock hills and holes’ in order to reduce recreational pressure on the nearby Barnack hills and Holes SAC, SSSI and NNR. It is noted that the position of this within the site was not secured at outline stage however, officers consider that the most appropriate position for this area is adjacent to the eastern/northern boundaries whereby it can not only add to the extent of the buffer to the open countryside, but also be left to ‘breathe’ in terms of establishment without being situated between two hard built forms (the development and Paynes Field). In light of this, Officers consider that the general layout of the development is appropriate and do not believe that an alternative layout could be acceptably achieved.

In terms of the design, it is considered that the elevation treatment of the dwellings/apartments proposed is sympathetic to the setting of Barnack. The proposal seeks to use a mixture of buff brick and stone, with the latter being the treatment to those principal elevations which face outwards from the site (i.e. those which would be visible from the surrounding area) as well as mock Collyweston slates to the main roofs of the dwellings with clay pantiles to the secondary garage roofs. These materials are considered wholly appropriate and will ensure that the development does not appear unduly alien or incongruous in its setting. It is noted that the Parish Council wishes to see the highest quality of materials used, and Officers agree on this point, however at this time to be prescriptive in the material make would not be reasonable. As such, a condition requiring samples of the materials to be submitted is considered more appropriate.

With regards to the dwelling form/design, it is considered that the proposal is sufficiently sympathetic to the setting of the site and the context within which it is sited. Whilst the dwellings will undoubtedly appear modern, the proposal has sought to introduce architectural features which are appropriate to a village setting and therefore reduce, as far as is possible, a suburban feel.

On this basis, it is considered that the layout and design of the development would not result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area and is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time.

d) Access, parking and highway implications

The position of the vehicular access into the site was secured at outline stage and will be taken from the north-eastern corner of the site from Uffington Road. The exact design details of this access are secured by virtue of condition C5 of the outline parent permission and are not required at reserved matters stage (they are pre-commencement details however). Notwithstanding this, the width of the carriageway and footway into and within the site are matters for consideration at this stage.

The proposal seeks to provide a carriageway of between 5 and 5.5 metres in width, with a dedicated footway to the southern side only initially to reflect that the development is at the edge of the settlement with no existing footpath along Uffington Road to the north. Within the site, this footway will then extend to both sides of the road. For certain spurs off the main road, and to the southern-most section of the development, the road design will alter to become a shared surface of no less than 5.5 metres in width (a surface whereby vehicles and pedestrians share the space with no dedicated footways). Such an approach to road design is not uncommon and the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has raised no objections to this overall design. Whilst it is noted that the Parish Council would like to see dedicated footways throughout the entire development, this is not considered necessary in safety terms and would detract from the overall design of the development through the introduction of a wholly suburban street form.

It is noted that the Council's Waste Officer has requested that tracking be provided throughout the development. However, the LHA has raised no objections to the proposal and sought to ensure that, whilst it is proposed for all of the roads within the development to be un-adopted, they are to an adoptable specification (in the event that in the future adoption is pursued). In seeking this, the roads are designed to accommodate standard refuse vehicles and accordingly, further tracking is not considered necessary.

With regards to parking provision, it is noted that many objectors have raised concern that the proposal would provide insufficient parking. However, each dwelling proposed would provide the correct level of parking to accord with the Council's minimum adopted parking standards. The proposed 1-bed apartments would have 1no. parking space each and any dwellings with more bedrooms would have a minimum of 2no. parking spaces. Indeed, the larger dwellings would be provided with between 3 and 4no. parking spaces. Officers and the LHA consider that where dwellings over-provide from the minimum standards, visitor parking is accommodated as visitors can park on the driveways. Therefore, dedicated visitor spaces are only required for those dwellings whereby the minimum is just met. The proposed visitor parking would meet with the minimum standards the Council has adopted, and are located within areas where they are needed. Accordingly, sufficient resident and visitor parking is provided by the proposal.

It is noted that some objections have raised concerns with regards to the impact of the proposal upon the surrounding public highway network, and the Parish Council has requested that Uffington Road be resurfaced by the Developer. The matter of wider highway implications has already been considered and accepted at the outline application stage and therefore cannot be revisited through the current reserved matters application. Off-site highway works in the form of widening of the carriageway to Uffington Road and provision of a footway have already been found sufficient mitigation to accommodate the development and secured by virtue of condition C5 of the parent outline permission. With regards to surfacing, this cannot be secured through the current application however the LHA, through the Highways Act, will secure whatever resurfacing is considered needed alongside the off-site highway works (albeit this is unlikely to extend to the crossroads as requested).

With regards to the pedestrian connections of the development, considerable comments have been received in respect of both footpaths secured on the outline development – to Bainton Road and Uffington Road. Turning first to Bainton Road, this footpath link passes to the west of No.25 Bainton Road through land which is presently open field. The exact route of this link, along with its width and design is secured by virtue of condition C21 of the parent outline permission. The details are not required at reserved matters stage and therefore have not been provided with the current application. It is noted that the LHA has raised concerns with this, and set out the need for such a footpath to improve connectivity to the village. However the current proposal does not need to show this link, only that the layout proposed could accommodate it. It is considered that this is achieved through the layout proposed. However, there have been numerous requests for the removal of this footpath, both from the Parish Council and local residents. Whilst Officers consider that this link is required to improve connectivity to the village (a view shared with the LHA), it is acknowledged that it poses some harm through crime/anti-social behaviour risk owing to lack of natural surveillance. Given that the feeling of local residents/the Parish Council is very mixed on this matter, Officers are requesting that Members determine whether or not this link is retained.

Notwithstanding the above, there is also debate as to whether both links are for use by solely pedestrians, or shared with cyclists also. As the links are proposed to remain private, neither the Local Planning Authority nor LHA can restrict the use to pedestrians only. There are no mechanisms through either the Highway Act or planning conditions that could explicitly preclude or include cyclists from using these links. Therefore, Officers have sought to ensure that the link to Uffington Road (which is to be designed at this time) has a width sufficient to accommodate wheelchair users and pushchairs, whilst allowing someone else to pass at the same time. It is not considered use by cyclists would pose an unacceptable danger, and the detail of the link with the existing adopted highway would be fully considered by the LHA through the separate license application under the Highways Act (this would also be true of the link to Bainton Road if/when it

comes forward). Furthermore, it is proposed for this link to be lit (the details of which are to be secured by condition) to ensure usability and safety.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the proposal would provide adequate parking to meet the needs of the development, and would ensure safe access for all users. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time.

e) **Public Open Space and ecology**

Public Open Space

Turning first to the public open space provision, the amount proposed fully accords with the requirements set out in the parent outline planning permission. The proposal seeks to provide 1.24 hectares of natural green space (of which 0.9744 hectares is to be 'mock hills and holes' landscaping), 0.41 hectares of wildlife habitat/buffer, 0.125 hectares of drainage detention basin and a 0.04 hectare LEAP (play area).

The layout of this public open space (POS) in terms of its siting within the development is already discussed above. In terms of the design of this POS, the clear intention set for these areas by the Inspector at appeal, related to: i) providing a sufficient buffer to the open countryside beyond the site (to the north and west); and ii) securing adequate ecological mitigation for the impacts arising from the development. However any POS provided within a development must also function to meet the needs of the population of the development in terms of providing suitable amenity.

In terms of the function as a landscape buffer, it is considered that the proposed POS would provide a suitable soft transition from the hard built form of the development to the open countryside beyond. The proposal would be suitably landscaped and would provide a less harsh appearance than the current boundary to Paynes Field.

Turning to the ecological mitigation, neither the City Council's Wildlife Officer nor Natural England (who were the statutory consultee in respect of the parent outline permission) have raised any objections to the proposed POS design/landscaping. The proposed wildlife buffer would achieve adequate protection/enhancement of the ecological habitat features already present within the site. Similarly, the proposed 'mock hills and holes' is considered to be suitably designed with acceptable species to ensure that it would sufficient act as an alternative to the nearby Barnack hills and Holes (as was required by the parent outline planning permission). It is noted that Natural England has requested that consideration be given to changing the 'scrub' land (wildlife buffer) to a calcareous grassland as encroachment and maintenance may be an issue in the future. This request is noted however to alter the appearance/planting of this area would remove the treed buffer to the western boundary of the site which the Inspector considered was essential to mitigating the wider landscaping impacts. Given that the comments made by Natural England only request that consideration be given to this, it is not considered to be essential to the effective operation of the POS for ecology purposes and any limited potential harm through landscape management is outweighed by the benefits of improved protection of long-term landscape views.

With regards to functionality for future occupants, it is noted that the City Council's Landscape Technician has raised objections to the proposal on a number of grounds. These primarily relate to an alternative layout which the Officer considers would result in a more usable area of POS. One of the key changes the Technician is seeking would result in the complete removal of the wildlife buffer to a shelterbelt of trees, creating a more dense landscaped boundary to the site. In addition, the Technician is seeking the relocation of the play area (LEAP) to the north-eastern corner of the development, in place of the surface water detention basin. However, this would fail to secure the mitigation that was considered necessary during determination of the outline parent permission and would go against the views of the Wildlife Officer, Natural England and City Council's Drainage Engineer. It is considered that the ecological mitigation and effective surface water drainage are of far greater importance to the overall impacts of the development and

therefore, the suggested amendments are not possible. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposal would provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants, providing a range of POS to meet their needs. Whilst there would be more formal 'mock hills and holes' and wildlife buffer, there are also areas of flat open grassed space (such as the detention basin) for general recreation and the planting is considered to offer an acceptable visual amenity. Accordingly, amendments are not considered appropriate or necessary in this instance.

On this basis, it is considered that the level of public open space proposed is acceptable, and would afford future occupants with an acceptable level of amenity as well as achieving the required ecological mitigation/enhancements.

Ecology

Notwithstanding the assessment set out above, the outline parent permission also requires that the reserved matters application be accompanied by both an Ecological Management Plan or similar (condition C14 refers) and Landscape Management Plan or similar (condition C16 refers). The application has been accompanied by such documents which both Natural England and the City Council's Wildlife Officer are accepting of. The measures contained therein are considered appropriate, and will ensure that long-term mitigation and enhancement of ecological features and the POS are secured.

It is noted that Natural England have made some requests for amendments/additional provisions within the landscape management plan as a basis on which they raise no objections. Save for the amendment set out above, this includes: a programme of monitoring of the calcareous grassland for a period of 5 years following planting; assurance regarding the local provenance of seeds; and removal of Beech and Whitebeam trees with more appropriate locally native species. At the time of producing this report, the Applicant is making these requested changes and an update will be provide to Members.

It is anticipated that these changes will fully address the requests of Natural England an subject to this, the proposal would fully accord with the provisions of C14 and C16 of the parent outline planning permission, and ensure that the ecological impacts arising from the development are fully addressed. On this basis, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP16 and PP19 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time.

In addition to the above, the Wildlife Officer has requested that an ecological landscape management group be secured to regularly review progress on site, agree the source of "green hay" and/ or additional seeding, ensure that wildflower grassland (and other) habitats are establishing adequately and address any issues that may arise, particularly during the initial five year phase. This is noted, however the detail of such should have been secured as part of the outline parent permission and does not form a request of Natural England, the statutory body in this regard. Accordingly, whilst such a body would be beneficial, it is considered to be mitigation that is unnecessary, given that other management measures have been found to be acceptable.

With regards to the request of the Wildlife Officer for details of bat roost and bird nesting boxes to be provided at this time, this matter is already secured by virtue of condition C13 of the parent outline planning permission. The details are not required as part of a reserved matters application but instead, prior to first occupation of any dwelling. Accordingly, the details cannot be required at this time.

It is noted that several objectors have raised concerns with regards to the management of the on-site POS. The submitted Landscape Management PPlan identifies that the areas of POS will be managed by a Residential Management Company funded by a charge to the residents. That is not to say that residents will be maintain the POS themselves, but instead a dedicated company will be appointed. This is not uncommon throughout the City or indeed country, and is considered sufficient to ensure that the long-term maintenance of the POS is secured.

f) **Amenity**

Neighbouring occupants

It is noted that the application has been subject to considerable objection from local residents, predominantly those who bound the site and live in Paynes Field, along Bainton Road and Linden Close.

Turning first to Paynes Field, it is acknowledged that occupants to the northern and western edges of this development current benefit from unobstructed views towards the open countryside and all have low boundary heights to the application site. The proposal would introduce a hard built form in place of these views and this would detract from the enjoyment of residents homes. However, the loss of views is not a material planning consideration and the Inspector, in allowing the development, dealt with this issue. Accordingly, the loss of views is not one that can be revisited through this current application.

The proposal seeks for new residential dwellings to back onto Paynes Field, with building heights at two storeys. The proposed dwellings along the boundary with Paynes Field would have a minimum garden depth of 10 metres, and would ensure that a minimum window-to-window separation distance of 20 metres. Whilst it is noted that many residents do not consider that this level of separation is sufficient, it is a level which is generally considered acceptable. Officers consider that such levels of separation (which are the minimum and no applicable to the entire layout) would ensure that no undue overlooking towards primary habitable neighbouring rooms results, and that no unacceptable degree of overbearing or overshadowing would result.

With regards to No.23 Paynes Field, it is acknowledged that this would be subject to the greatest impact, given the corner position and number of dwellings which surrounds it (4no. with an immediately adjoining boundary and 1no. further dwelling in close proximity). However all of the proposed dwellings meet with the above minimum separation distances and it is not considered that such a degree of harm would result to those occupants as to represent a reason for which the current proposal could be resisted.

It is also noted that many residents have expressed concerns with regards to the likely boundary treatment separating Paynes Field to the development. Whilst not proposed at this time (this is to be secured by condition), Officers consider that the only appropriate treatment would be a 1.8-2 metre high close boarded fence. This would ensure privacy for both neighbouring and future occupants. Local residents have requested that instead, a soft boundary be secured or mitigating planting. However Officers do not considered that this would be appropriate as landscaping would take a considerable time to establish (during which open views would be possible between properties) and landscaping once established is no longer controlled by the planning system. Therefore, soft landscaping to this boundary is not considered appropriate or workable.

Turning next to Bainton Road, with the exception of No.25, the garden depths to these existing residential dwellings are considerable (at least 30 metres) and therefore the impact of the residential development is somewhat lessened. Nonetheless, the proposal seeks to ensure that garden depths along the southern boundary of the site are no less than 9 metres (to the 2no. bungalows) which would ensure that even the far ends of neighbouring gardens are not subject to undue overlooking or overbearing impact. With regards to No.25 Bainton Road, this single storey dwelling is set further back into its site and therefore closer to the proposed dwellings. However this dwelling has been designed (at the request of Officers) to have no facing first floor windows and be set a minimum of 12 metres from the shared boundary. This would ensure that no overlooking was possible, and no undue overbearing impact would result.

With regards to Linden Close, the main impact arising to occupants would be from the footpath link through to Uffington Road. This would be in close proximity to the shared boundary with No.1 Linden Close as well as dwellings on Paynes Field. However subject to securing appropriately

designed lighting and fencing, it is not considered that unacceptable harm would result either through loss of privacy, light intrusion or noise/general disturbance.

Taking into account the above, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable degree of harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants and is therefore in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time.

Future occupant amenity

In terms of the amenity of future occupants, it is considered that the proposal would provide an acceptable quality of life and liveability. The proposed dwellings would all be of adequate internal size, accommodating the storage needs of occupants. Furthermore, all would be subject to adequate levels of sunlight/natural daylight and set at distances to ensure sufficient window-to-window and window-to-dwelling relationships. There would be no undue levels of overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing impact between the dwellings proposed, and all gardens are considered to be of a size commensurate with the scale of the dwelling that they serve. On this basis, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

g) **Heritage impacts**

The principal impact of the development upon the adjacent Barnack Conservation Area (CA) has already been dealt with through the granting of the parent outline planning permission. In allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded that '*...the appearance of the development would not be materially harmful to the setting of the CA, particularly when contrasted with the currently rather stark and unscreened appearance of the Paynes Field development.*' In addition, he concluded that there was an opportunity to secure a better landscaped edge to the development during determination of a further reserved matters application. Accordingly, the principle of harm to the setting of the CA is not a matter that can be revisited at this time.

Nonetheless, the layout and design of the current proposal must be considered in terms of impact to this designated heritage asset and the statutory duty to ensure that the development preserves or enhances its special features apply. Historic England have deferred to the Council's own specialist advice and therefore, the views of the City Council's Conservation Officer are of key importance in this regard.

The Conservation Officer has raised no objections to the overall design and style of the proposed development. It is considered that the design of the dwellings and materials to be used are sympathetic and in keeping with the historic village of Barnack. Overall, the Conservation Officer considers that the proposals are modest in scale, and include architectural details which are representative of the local vernacular.

However, the Conservation Officer has raised concerns with regards to the proposed western edge of the development which, in his view, has the greatest impact upon the setting of the CA. The Officer considers that the proposed planting would not provide adequate screening to the development, instead allowing clear views of the proposed estate. On this basis, he has requested that the planting be enhanced. It is considered that additional tree planting would be necessary in this case, to strengthen the boundary of the village and create a more dense verdant edge. The additional landscaping may be secured by condition and subject to this, it is considered that the proposal would preserve the setting of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time.

h) **Trees**

Condition C15 of the parent outline planning permission requires that the reserved matters consent application be accompanied by an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

These have been submitted alongside this current application and, broadly, the details contained therein are accepted by the City Council's Tree Officer. However, concern has been raised with regards to the proposed footpath link within the south-eastern corner of the site to Uffington Road. This footpath is located within an area of young woodland subject to Tree Preservation order 08/2013.

The proposal seeks for the footpath to be equidistant from the northern and southern boundaries however this would require the removal of several young trees which is not supported by the Tree Officer. Instead, he wishes to see the footpath move closer to the southern boundary, where a relatively clear line already naturally exists. Moving the footpath in this way would require the removal of less trees within the protected group and minimise the harm to the visual amenity of the locality. Subject to the use of a 'no dig' construction of the footpath, the Tree Officer is confident that the impact to protected trees would be minimal.

The Applicant is currently reviewing this layout and is due to submit a revised proposal to reflect the comments of the Tree Officer (including a revised Arboricultural Method Statement/Tree Protection Plan). An update will be provided to Members within the Briefing Update Report however subject to receipt of the requested amendment, it is considered that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to trees of key amenity value and is therefore in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time.

i) **Other matters**

In response to those matters raised by technical consultees/objectors that are not discussed above:

- **Foul water drainage strategy** – It is noted that the Environment Agency has requested a condition securing a foul water drainage strategy. However this matter is already secured by virtue of condition C10 of the parent outline planning permission and therefore does not need to be re-secured.
- **Lack of travel plan** – It is noted that the City Council's Travelchoice team have raised objections to the proposal as no travel plan has been submitted. This is secured by virtue of condition C6 of the parent outline planning permission and does not need to be submitted at reserved matters stage.
- **Surface water drainage** – It is noted that the Lead Local Flood Authority has objected to the current proposal as it fails to show how SuDS will be integrated into the development. Whilst normally the design of SuDS should be secured at reserved matters stage, the Inspector in granting outline permission did not require this. Instead, the details of the surface water drainage scheme were secured by way of a pre-commencement condition (condition C9 of the parent outline planning permission refers). Therefore, Officers do not consider that the lack of information at this time could be used as a reason for withholding consent at this time. Notwithstanding this, suitable drainage could be achieved through the use of permeable highway paving as opposed to swales which were only shown indicatively as a potential method of collecting/transporting run-off.
- **Wildlife corridor** - Several objectors have made reference to the existing wildlife corridor which was created to the rear of the Paynes Field development, and requested that this be retained and enhanced. Several years ago, it was brought to the attention of Officers that this corridor had been incorrectly planted by the Paynes Field developer and therefore had been incorporated into several residential gardens. As enforcement action rests with the landowner, the decision was taken at the time to not pursue enforcement action or require that the wildlife corridor be re-planted. It is not considered that the submission of this application should alter that situation.

- **Construction hours** - Some representations have requested that the hours of construction be tightly controlled and only permitted during 'normal working hours'. Construction activities are to be controlled by virtue of a Construction Management Plan, which is a condition imposed upon the outline permission. It is therefore not for consideration at this time. However generally accepted construction hours across the City are 08:00 to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday, and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays.
- **Damage from groundworks/loss of property value** - These are not material planning considerations.
- **Lack of affordable housing provision on other sites by the Developer** - This is not a material planning consideration and the proposal seeks to provide the required 30% affordable housing figure.

6 Conclusions

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

- the density of the development has previously been found acceptable and is therefore not a matter which can be re-considered at this time;
- the proposal would make adequate provision for a range of housing that would meet the future needs of residents and accords with the requirements of condition C18 of the parent outline planning permission. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policy CS8 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and emerging Policy LP08 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the layout and design of the development would not result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;
- the proposal would provide adequate parking to meet the needs of the development, and would ensure safe access for all users, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the level of public open space proposed is acceptable and accords with the provisions of condition C 17 of the parent outline permission. It would also afford future occupants with an acceptable level of amenity as well as achieving the required ecological mitigation/enhancements, in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP3, PP4 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policies LP17 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the proposal would not result in an unacceptable degree of harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;
- the proposed development would afford future occupants with an acceptable level of amenity, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;
- additional planting to the western boundary would ensure that the setting of the Barnack Conservation Area was preserved, in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time; and

- adequate protection would be afforded to existing trees of amenity value to the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time.

7 Recommendation

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Reserved Matters is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

C 1 The development hereby consented shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

- Location Plan (drawing number 408-LP-01)
- Planning Site Layout (drawing number 408-SK-01 Revision D)
- Planning Site Layout (coloured) (drawing number 408-SK-02 Revision D)
- Storey Height Plan (drawing number 408-SK-03 Revision D)
- Affordable Plan (drawing number 408-SK-04 Revision D)
- House Type Plan (drawing number 408-SK-05 Revision D)
- Open Space Plan (drawing number 408-SK-06 Revision D)
- Materials Plan (drawing number 408-SK-07 Revision D)

- Detailed Planting - Residential (Sheet 1 of 2) (drawing number B18016.401 Revision A)
- Detailed Planting - Residential (Sheet 2 of 2) (drawing number B18016.402 Revision A)
- Detailed Planting - Open Space (drawing number B18016.403 Revision A)

- Affordable House Type A23 (drawing number HT.A23.pe3)
- Affordable House Type A24 (drawing number HT.A24.pe3)
- Affordable House Type A26 (drawing number A26v1.pe3)
- Affordable House Type A32 (drawing number HT.A32.pe3)
- Affordable House Type A36 (drawing number HT.A36.pe3 Revision A)
- Affordable House Type A40 (drawing number HT.A40.pe3)
- Flat Type F02 Elevations (drawing number F02x6v2.e5 Revision A)
- Flat Type F02 Ground Floor Plan (drawing number F02x6v2.p1)
- Flat Type F02 First Floor Plan (drawing number F02x6v2.p2)

- The Attingham Floor Plans and Elevations - Stone and Brick (drawing number ATT.pe5)
- The Attingham Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number ATT.pe6)
- Byrne Stone and Brick Elevations (drawing number BYR.e5)
- Byrne Plans (drawing number BYR.p1)
- The Cottingham Floor Plans and Elevations - Stone and Brick (drawing number COT.pe5)
- The Cottingham Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number COT.pe6)
- The Elliot Floor Plans and Elevations - Stone and Brick (drawing number ELL.pe5)
- The Elliot Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number ELL.pe6)
- The Grainger Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number GRA.pe5)
- The Kempthorne Floor Plans and Elevations - Stone and Brick (drawing number KEM.pe5)
- The Kempthorne Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number KEM.pe6)
- The Lutyens Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number LUT.pe6)
- The Mountford Floor Plans and Elevations - Stone and Brick (drawing number MOU.pe5)
- The Mountford Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number MOU.pe6)
- The Mylne Floor Plans and Elevations - Stone and Brick (drawing number MYL.pe5)
- The Mylne Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number MYL.pe6)
- The Mountford Plot 23 Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number MOUp23.pe6)
- The Mountford Plot 33 Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number MOUp33.pe5)
- The Pembroke Floor Plans and Elevations - Stone and Brick (drawing number PEM.pe5)
- The Pembroke Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number PEM.pe6)

- Single Garage (drawing number SH-G104 Revision D)
- Double Garage (drawing number G213.pe1)
- Double Garage (drawing number SH-G209 Revision A)
- Shared Double Garage (drawing number G212.pe1)
- Shared Double Garage (drawing number SH-G208 Revision C)
- Sales Area Layout (drawing number LHM161-SalesArea-01)
- Sales Area Extended Double Garage (drawing number EXD 600-601)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to accord with the provisions of conditions C1 and C2 of outline planning permission reference APP/J0540/W/16/3153303.

C 2 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place until samples/details of the following external materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Walling (samples);
- Roofing (samples) including dormer window cheeks;
- Windows and doors (details);
- Garage doors (details);
- Porches and canopies (details);
- Cills and lintels (details); and
- Rainwater goods (details).

The samples/details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number, and the samples shall be made available for inspection by the Local Planning Authority on site. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance and to preserve the setting of the Barnack Conservation Area, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

C 3 Notwithstanding the submitted drawings and prior to the occupation of any dwelling, a hard landscaping scheme for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The hard landscaping scheme shall include, but not limited to:

- Boundary treatments;
- Bin collection points to serve Plots 54, 55, 67 and 68 which must be clear of the private driveways serving the dwellings;
- Refuse store to serve Plots 73-78;
- External lighting;
- Surfacing and demarcation of all parking areas;
- Surfacing of all highways and footways, including pedestrian connections to the dwellings;
- and
- Refuse and dog waste bins within the areas of Public Open Space.

The boundary treatments, bin collection points, refuse store, external lighting and surfacing/demarcation shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and prior to first occupation of the dwelling to which they relate. The refuse and dog waste bins shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and prior to first use of the areas of Public Open Space to which they relate.

Reason: In the interests of neighbour and future occupant amenity, the visual amenity of the development, crime reduction and highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2, PP3, PP4 and PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policies LP13, LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

- C 4 No dwelling shall be occupied until the areas relating to that dwelling for the parking (including garages) and turning of vehicles, as shown on drawing number 408-SK-01 Revision D 'Planning Site Layout', have been provided. Thereafter, those areas shall be retained solely for the parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the dwelling to which they relate in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure adequate parking provision in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

- C 5 The highways, footways, footpaths and private driveways shown on drawing number 408-SK-01 Revision D 'Planning Site Layout' shall be completed/finished to top course level in accordance with the surfacing details secured under the provisions of condition C3 above no later than one month following occupation of the last dwelling.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of future occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP4 and PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policies LP13 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

- C 6 Prior to first use of the driveways/parking spaces to which they relate, vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays of 1.5 metres x 1.5 metres (measured from and along the back edge of the highway boundary, including footways) shall be provided to both sides of the driveway/parking spaces. Thereafter, those visibility splays shall be kept clear of any obstruction above a height of 600mm in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

- C 7 Notwithstanding the submitted drawings and prior to first occupation of Plots 73-78, secure and covered cycle parking at a rate of 1 space per unit shall be provided in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the cycle parking shall be retained solely for the parking of cycles in connection with the residential units in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to promote more sustainable methods of travel to/from the site, in accordance with Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

- C 8 Notwithstanding the submitted landscaping scheme and prior to the commencement of development, details of additional buffer tree planting to the western edge of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The additional tree planting shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the 'Landscape

Implementation and Management Programme' detailed within the submitted 'Landscape Management Plan' (dated February 2018).

Reason: In order to preserve the setting of the Barnack Conservation Area, in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version). This is a pre-commencement condition as implementation of the landscaping is due to take place during the early stages of construction of the development.

- C 9 Prior to the occupation of any dwelling, details (including a timetable for implementation) of the children's play area/LEAP, as shown on drawing number 408-SK-01 Revision D 'Planning Site Layout', shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include, but not limited to:

- Equipment specification;
- Boundary treatments;
- Hard surfacing; and
- Associated furniture, e.g. benches.

The children's play area/LEAP shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details, including the timetable for implementation.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of future occupants and the surrounding area, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS18 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP3 and PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policies LP16, LP17 and LP21 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

- C10 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no fences, gates, walls or means of enclosure shall be erected within the site unless expressly authorised by conditions C3 and C9 above or any future planning permission.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area and in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP2 and PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policies LP13 and LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

- C11 Notwithstanding the details shown on the drawings hereby permitted and prior to first occupation of the dwelling to which the window relates, the following first floor windows shall be obscurely glazed to a minimum of Level 3 obscurity and restricted to 100mm maximum opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened fully are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed:

- any side elevation to Plots 2, 4, 8, 15, 54, 63, 68 and 69;
- the northern elevations to Plots 7, 16, 23, 33, 51, 59, 60, 70 and 72;
- the eastern elevation to Plot 26;
- the southern elevations to Plots 34, 42, 50, 53, 57, 61, 62 and 67; and
- the western elevations to Plots 3, 24, 26, 27, 28, 32, 35, 41, 49, 65, 66 and 79.

Thereafter, those windows shall be retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of future occupiers, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

- C12 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 Classes A, B and C of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows shall be inserted at first floor into the southern elevation of Plot 33 other than those expressly authorised by any future planning permission.

Reason: In order protect the amenity of the adjoining occupiers, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

- C13 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 3 Class L of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the residential units hereby consented shall be residential dwellings within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) only.

Reason: The site is not capable of providing the necessary parking or access requirements for small-scale houses in multiple occupation, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

The Director of Growth and Regeneration also recommends that the footpath link from the development onto Bainton Road (to the south-western corner of the development) is retained as secured by condition C21 of the parent outline planning permission.

This page is intentionally left blank