

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 3 JULY 2018 AT 1.30PM

1. Procedure for Speaking
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak
3. Briefing Update

**UPDATE REPORT &
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC SPEAKING SCHEME - PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Procedural Notes

1. Planning Officer to introduce application.
2. Chairman to invite Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives to present their case.
3. Members' questions to Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives.
4. Chairman to invite objector(s) to present their case.
5. Members' questions to objectors.
6. Chairman to invite applicants, agent or any supporters to present their case.
7. Members' questions to applicants, agent or any supporters.
8. Officers to comment, if necessary, on any matters raised during stages 2 to 7 above.
9. Members to debate application and seek advice from Officers where appropriate.
10. Members to reach decision.

The total time for speeches from Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives shall not exceed ten minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

MPs will be permitted to address Committee when they have been asked to represent their constituents. The total time allowed for speeches for MPs will not be more than five minutes unless the Committee decide on the day of the meeting to extend the time allowed due to unusual or exceptional circumstances.

The total time for speeches in respect of each of the following groups of speakers shall not exceed five minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

1. Objectors.
2. Applicant or agent or supporters.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 3 JULY 2018 AT 1.30PM
LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK

Agenda Item	Application	Name	Ward Councillor / Parish Councillor / Objector / Applicant
5.1	18/00377/REM - Land To The West Of Uffington Road Barnack Stamford	Cllr David Over Harry Brassey St John Burkett Michael Paumber Georgina McCrae	Ward Councillor Parish Councillor Objector Objector Applicant
5.2	18/00766/FUL - Corbar First Drift Wothorpe Stamford	Rena Russell (Wothorpe Parish Council) Tom Dykes	Parish Councillor Agent

BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 3 July 2018

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1 .	18/00377/REM	Land To The West Of Uffington Road Barnack Stamford, 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

Revised drawings / documents

As set out within the main Committee Report, the Applicant has submitted revised layout drawings and a revised Landscape Management Plan in response to the comments made by Natural England and the City Council's Tree and Wildlife Officers.

Revised consultation has taken place with the Tree and Wildlife Officers which has resulted in the following revised comments:

PCC Tree Officer

I am much happier with the revised location of the path as the impact on trees to the TPO woodland would be minimised. Also happy with the updated tree protection information.

PCC Wildlife Officer

- Still awaiting external lighting details in relation to bats; given the timescales in wishing to take this to committee next week, this will need to be secured by condition.
- Still awaiting bird and bat box details; however I understand this is still required via the original application so can come via that condition.
- I note the commitment in the LMP to carry out five year programme of chalk grassland monitoring, however I would advise the wording is strengthened to state that an annual report to be submitted to the LPA identifying any remedial measures required and such measures to be agreed and implemented in consultation with the LPA.
- The detailed planting plan and LMP both still refer to planting of beech and whitebeam, contrary to the email below from Linden Homes, therefore these documents should be revised accordingly.
- Natural England's request for the area of scrub to be reduced and replaced with limestone grassland does not appear to have been incorporated into the revised drawings; I would advise you seek NE's view on the suitability of these new landscape drawings prior to determination, noting however that NE hadn't objected on this basis.

Officer response: The Wildlife Officer's comments in relation to external lighting, bat/bird boxes and Natural England's request for the area of scrub to be reduced/replaced have already been dealt with within the main Committee Report.

With regards to the inclusion of Whitebeam within the planting scheme, this is an error in the drawing as the Applicant has committed to removing this species. Accordingly, Officers request delegated authority to receive a further revised document/drawing to address this error and amend any conditions which refer to the document and drawing revision numbers.

In respect of the grassland monitoring, Officers agree that this should include the requirement to submit an annual report identifying any remedial measures required. Again, Officers request delegated authority to amend this document before a decision is issued.

Amended recommendation

Whilst Officers maintain their recommendation that reserved matters consent be granted subject to the conditions set out within the Committee Report, delegated authority is sought to receive revised drawings and a revised Landscape Management Plan to address the comments of the City Council's Wildlife Officer and amend any conditions which refer to drawing/document revisions which become superseded by this, ahead of issuing the decision.

Further public representations

St. John Burkett, a resident of Bainton Road, is registered to speak and has requested that his Appendix '*The ruining of a village*' (attached at the bottom of this Update Report) be considered alongside.

Michael Baumber, a resident of Paynes Field, who is registered to speak and has requested that Members consider the following in addition:

'Erection of fence along Eastern Boundary with Paynes Field

The report of the planning appeal included, under 'Visual Impact – The Inspector concluded that there was no reason why an acceptable design which improved the settlement of the edge could not be achieved.'

Considerable effort has been made to deal with the Western edge, but no effort has been made to alleviate the intrusion to be caused by the erection, by Linden Homes, of a 1.8 meter close-boarded fence along the Eastern edge of the development.

Suggestions regarding additional planting to screen the fence have not been met with any positive response from PCC or Linden Homes

A post and wire fence currently forms the Western boundary of the Paynes Field development.

It is vital that the erection of the wooden fence does not damage any existing planting along this boundary.

The Committee is asked to impose a condition that Linden Homes is required to consult personally, and separately, all residents of Paynes Field affected by the erection of the wooden fence along the Eastern boundary, to ensure the continued 'health' of the various plantings already in place.

No work that disturbs existing planting to be carried out until this consultation has taken place.

This should ensure that our individual situations can be discussed and that the fence will not be detrimental to existing planting.'

Officer response: Whilst the concern of residents along Paynes Field is noted, the above requested condition relates to matters which fall outside the planning system. The matter of damage to existing structures/planting is a civil matter and therefore cannot be subject to a condition on the reserved matters consent.

2 .	18/00766/FUL	Corbar First Drift Wothorpe Stamford , Construction of 2-storey 4-bed dwelling with integral garage and new access
-----	--------------	---

No Further Comments

This is a village, not a town or city

The ruining of a village



Tinwell Road, Stamford



Kettering Road, Stamford



School Road, Barnack

What we could have

Beautiful Homes

Linden Homes could build beautiful homes like these currently being or recently built.

Beauty in my Back Yard

<https://www.bimby.org.uk/>

What we're getting



'The Elliot' 3-bed in buff brick.
Cheaply-designed, cheaply-built, ugly

What we don't want



Payne's Field

Described by the inspector in his appeal judgement as 'stark'.
Crowded, little parking, no match to other village architecture, cheaply-built.

The sham of 'consultation'

We attended a meeting for over two hours. The Statement of Community Involvement does not represent the opinions heard there.

Linden Homes Uffington Road development, Barnack

St. John Burkett, Neighbour

This is a village, not a town or city

***This is an unwanted development, opposed by PCC, MP,
Councillor, residents and Parish Council***

What are we now looking for?

- **The best possible build**
- **Planning committee to make no decision, until Linden Homes have properly engaged with the community**
- **Planning committee makes no decision, until good advice and support is received from PCC planning officers**
- **Linden Homes come back with properly revised plans, taking into account the wishes of the existing community**

The issues

- Statement of Community Involvement represents what Linden Homes want, not what was said at the 'consultation'. There is no match with the resident's meeting held at my house.
- Planning officers have given poor and incorrect advice. For example, that objections can be made only on very limited grounds.
- Planning officers and Linden Homes have been unresponsive and uncommunicative
- Existing residents have not been properly supported in the process.

Concerns

- Materials being used – brick instead of stone, when Barnack is a known stone village with ancient stone quarries
- Loss of privacy. Not adequately addressed by Linden Homes, particularly at first floor level. Why should existing residents pay?
- Design and density of housing. Cheap and overly-dense. For small amounts of money, which could be added to the cost, better housing could be built.
- Why no terraced houses, which would create more open space?
- Distance from existing homes. Linden Homes says 'minimum distances maintained', a small claim indeed.
- Use of open space, specified in the appeal outcome, but not used for the benefit of existing or future residents by, for example, giving a little more space between existing and new homes.
- Infrastructure. Stress on roads, Hills and Holes, etc. What is compensation for existing residents?
- Wildlife strip. Why have some residents been allowed to take the wildlife strip into their gardens but not others?
- Existing screening. It is not clear that Linden Homes will maintain the existing trees, or cut them down.
- Linden Homes will not contemplate selling even a couple of metres of land to existing residents. No price has been given, despite requests.
- Revisions which have been made have been very minor, and residents' concerns and those of the parish council are dismissed.
- Linden Homes representative, Georgina Macrae, seemingly has a role to turn down every request, and no power to change any of the design.

Linden Homes Uffington Road development, Barnack

St.John Burkett, Neighbour

This page is intentionally left blank