

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL MEETINGS

### EXTRACTS FROM MINUTES OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCILS RELATING TO THE PETERBOROUGH CORE STRATEGY

**South 1 Neighbourhood Council (Stanground, Fletton and Woodston Wards) held on Monday, 12 October, 2009 at 7.00pm at the Stanground Sports Centre, Stanground College, Peterborough**

The Council's Head of Delivery gave a presentation on the development of the Core Strategy with particular reference to Stanground, Fletton and Woodston. It was explained that the core strategy was an important planning policy document that would identify the proposed areas of development for the city up until 2026. Significant consultation had been undertaken already but the Neighbourhood Council meetings provided a further opportunity for local people to become involved in the process prior to a final decision being taken at the meeting of the full Council on Wednesday, 2 December, 2009.

The primary areas for growth for the city were Great Haddon, the City Centre, Norwood/Paston and Stanground with some additional limited growth in rural areas. The proposal in respect of the Rail Freight Interchange at Magna Park was explained in particular detail as it was within the area of the Neighbourhood Council.

A number of comments arose out of the discussion of the Core Strategy as follows:

1. Councillor Rush made a statement to the meeting as follows:

"In the consultation document it is recommended that the bulk of new development takes part in the South of the City. There are developments already started at Hampton, Kingston Park and Stanground South new ones planned at Alwalton Hill, Great Haddon and Magna Park. With all the extra traffic involved the new Stanground by-pass and Fletton Parkway will grind to a halt and they will become the new A14. Why is South of the City bearing the brunt of all these developments, Stanground was once a small village why isn't it being given the same protection as the villages to the North and North west of the city.

#### **Magna Park**

The proposed Magna Park development is probably the largest single industrial development ever to be proposed in Peterborough. It will be 4,000,000 sq. ft of warehousing covering 135 Hectares of land (approx 135 football pitches) and are proposed to be built on an Environment Agency designated flood plain. Does building on this flood plain comply with Government Planning Policy PPG25? Climate change is a big issue at the moment. The risk of flooding resulting from both run-off and the reduction of open space for soaking up rain fall as a result of flood plain encroachment is growing. The nearby Stanground Meadows already suffer from flooding in the winter. With all this extra water flowing into the Kings Dyke flood risk will be increased not only in Stanground but elsewhere, householders bordering this waterway will face higher insurance premium rates.

When residents bought their houses on Park Farm they were told this area of land would never be built on because it is a flood plain. What has changed, why was Red Brick Farm removed from the strategy because of flood risk concerns and not Magna Park?

This will be a 24/7 operation bringing noise, light and air pollution issues.

An article in the Harborough Mail newspaper reported that residents were complaining that night time is being wiped out by light pollution from a Magna Park near them.

Increased pollution to the area from extra traffic (cars, lorries, trains). Freight lorries moving containers both in and out of the site allied with service delivery trucks and light vans. Car journeys and the increased freight train traffic will cause the Kings Dyke level crossing to be closed for longer exacerbating the major delays that already occur at the moment.

This development will have a big impact on Biodiversity. It is close to the Nene washes a SSSI site and a Ramsar site, a European Court of Justice Conservation Regulations "Habitats Regulations Assessment" site of nature conservation where vast numbers of birds live and breed on what is one of the most important areas of lowland wet grassland in Britain it will also destroy unique natural habitats for a wide variety of flora and fauna. Street lighting can also have detrimental effects on wildlife. When the Stanground by-pass was in the planning stage a proposal was put forward for an alternative route across this land but was turned down because it would go over a SSSI site, if it was unsuitable then why is it now ok to build on this land?

The core strategy does not rely on this proposal for jobs. In the papers it says, in the event of the scheme not proceeding the core strategy would still work, as it is capable of delivering the minimum job requirements of the East of England plan.

### **Summing up**

This site will be in unacceptably close proximity to established residential communities with resulting pollution from HGV traffic along with noise and light pollution. Traffic taken off the A14 would be a real advantage for the Eastern Region. Peterborough should not pay the price for the failings of this road link.

Encroachment on a flood plain when public awareness of the risk of flooding due to climate change is at a high.

Destruction of unique natural habitats used by a wide range of birds, animals, flora and fauna.

Desecration of a Greenfield site.

It will not protect and enhance the area's existing Environment assets, the Nene Washes and a Ramsar site, it will destroy them.

It will not help Peterborough's aspiration to become the Environment capital of the UK, reduce the Environment impacts of transport and reduce transport related pollution, give better air quality, protect the existing Environment assets and reduce the effects of climate change. The effects of the development will be felt far and wide and for generations to come.

Cllr. Irene Walsh and myself propose that this Neighbourhood Council recommends that the Magna Park proposal should be removed from the Core Strategy and this is endorsed by our MP Shailesh Vara."

2. Councillor Lee said that he could not endorse the removal of Magna Park from the strategy and as confirmed by the Solicitor to the Council, who was present at the meeting, suggested that the removal of the scheme would not prevent a developer coming forward with a planning application. Local concerns had to be considered along with the potential for in excess of 5,000 new jobs for the city. Overall however, he stressed that he had not made up his mind regarding the proposals for the Gazeley's site.

3. In response to comments made at the meeting about the value of the Core Strategy, the Head of Delivery suggested that the benefit of having major areas of development in the Core Strategy was that it would be easier to define the parameters for development and seek Section 106 funding for infrastructural development.

4. A member of the public commented upon the lack of progress with proposals for development of the city for example, the Elliott's site behind the football ground which had been identified as a low energy site over 5 years ago but no development had taken place and similarly, it was understood that 3 planning applications in respect of Magna Park had all been withdrawn.

Councillor Lee suggested that this had been frustrating but that it was in part due to government requirements for meeting high environmental standards for new development. A full written response would be provided to the questioner about these matters (Mr Kirby).

5. A member of the public commented upon the need for schools, GP surgeries, health care services for the elderly and education facilities to accompany large scale commercial development.

6. In response to points made by members of the public about the timescale for receiving representations, the Head of Delivery replied that by law, the Council had to develop a planning policy on how the city would grow. The Core Strategy would not have the affect of setting the areas for growth without possibility for modification or change and certainly would not commit the Council to approving particular planning applications. Any further delay in the process would cause problems for the Council and developers. Further details about the Core Strategy could be found on the Council's website at [www.peterborough.gov.uk/democracy](http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/democracy) and further representations could be received after the Neighbourhood Council meeting if people wished to comment.

7. In response to some confusion over the Core Strategy and Fletton study, Councillor Cereste clarified that the draft Core Strategy had been reported to Cabinet that morning and needed to be approved by Council in December but that he had indeed, given an undertaking that there would be ample opportunity to consider fully the representations about the Fletton study, which was separate from the Core Strategy and modify the proposals if there was strong public support for doing so.

8. In response to a question, the Head of Delivery responded that the anticipated 5,500 jobs to be created at Magna Park would be across a wide range of employment sectors (and details could be provided after the meeting). It was also suggested by the questioner that once noise and traffic pollution became apparent there was little that could be done about it. Councillor Cereste stated that development did have potential challenges that had to be addressed but that it also brought major opportunities for the area such as the £40 million contract that was about to go out to tender for the erection of a new Stanground College by 2014.

9. A member of the public spoke in support of the earlier comments made by Councillor Rush and sought confirmation that all representations made about the Core Strategy would be considered. The Head of Delivery stated that all the representations from the 7 Neighbourhood Council meetings would be submitted to the full Council.

In concluding the discussion, the Chair thanked everyone for their views about the Core Strategy.

It was agreed that all the views expressed at the meeting be submitted to the full Council meeting on Wednesday, 2 December, 2009 as part of the item on the Core Strategy.

**South 2 Neighbourhood Council (Orton with Hampton, Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville Wards) held on Tuesday, 20 October, 2009 at The Bushfield Sports Centre, Orton Centre, Peterborough**

The Council's Planning Policy Manager gave a presentation on the development of the Core Strategy with particular reference to Orton with Hampton, Orton Longueville and Orton Waterville. It was explained that the core strategy was an important planning policy document that would identify the proposed areas of development for the city to 2026. Significant consultation had been undertaken already but the Neighbourhood Council meetings provided a further opportunity for local people to become involved in the process prior to a final decision being taken at the meeting of the full Council on Wednesday, 2 December, 2009. The strategy would then be published for formal public consultation in January/February and then referred to the Planning Inspector; any further representations received would be considered at a public inquiry.

The primary growth locations for the city were Great Haddon, the City Centre, Norwood/Paston, Stanground, Hampton and some additional limited growth in rural areas. The specific proposals relating to the area covered by the Neighbourhood Council were the urban extension of Great Haddon, retail provision in Orton District Centre (Phase 2) and regeneration of existing communities.

A number of comments arose out of the discussion on the Core Strategy which were as follows:

1. Councillor Scott referred to the concentration of development in the south of the city with 40% of the proposed 25,500 additional homes due to be built in that area. This would impose significant pressure on the local infrastructure and was bound to have an impact on existing communities such as at Orton Longueville. It was important that the views of local people were taken into account regarding the traveller's site to the south of the river, the recycling centre on the edge of Great Haddon and the wider implications for the city of the concentration of growth in the south.
2. In response to a question from a member of the public about the need for growth, the Planning Policy Manager stated that this question had been addressed at the regional tier of government where it had been decided to respond to population growth through concentration of development in the cities of the region.
3. A local resident expressed concern about the potential impact of the huge scale of development proposed for the south of the city and referred to the apparent scarcity of proposals in the core strategy for the regeneration of existing communities.
4. Another resident was concerned that the pressure on the road network would be overwhelming and commented on the need to ensure that the road network was developed in conjunction with any additional housing development. In response to these comments, the Planning Policy Manager said that work had been undertaken with colleagues specialising in transport and the need for investment in new roads and increased use of public transport had been identified.
5. A member of the public commented on the need to provide clear maps of the neighbourhood for local people and Parish Councils to understand the potential shape and impact of the proposals. The Chair agreed with the need to make the proposals as clear as possible and responded that there would be further opportunities to make representations after the meeting.
6. A member of the public commented upon the need for health facilities to be provided to support the proposed development and suggested that a standing invitation be extended to a health professional to attend meetings of the Neighbourhood Council. In response, it was identified that there had been liaison with NHS Peterborough and that organisation would be invited to appoint a representative to attend future meetings of the Neighbourhood Council.
7. Councillor Murphy suggested that it was difficult for the public to make representations at the right time and in the right manner as they did not necessarily understand the process and decision route.

In concluding the discussion, the Chair thanked everyone for their views about the Core Strategy.

It was agreed that all the views expressed at the meeting be submitted to the full Council meeting on Wednesday, 2 December, 2009 as part of the item on the Core Strategy.

**North & West 1 Neighbourhood Council (Northborough, Barnack, Glinton & Wittering, Newborough, and Eye & Thorney Wards) held on Monday 19 October 2009 at Northborough Primary School**

Elected members and the public received a presentation on the Core Strategy from the Planning Policy Manager. It was explained that the core strategy was an important planning policy document that would identify the proposed areas of development for the city up until 2026. Significant consultation had been undertaken already but the Neighbourhood Council meetings provided a further opportunity for local people to become involved in the process prior to a final decision being taken at the meeting of the full Council on Wednesday, 2 December 2009.

The Chairman invited members of the public and elected members to raise any matters affecting their communities. The main issues raised during this part of the meeting are summarised as follows:

- The number of proposed houses for villages
- Why expand current villages?
- Why not build new villages?
- Urban and rural character distinctiveness
- Policy on affordable housing, should be a 50/50 split, not 30/70
- Parking and transportation problems
- Roads become rat runs especially at weekends – transportation should be a big issue in the core strategy
- Investment from private sector
- Village design statements
- Protection of the green wedge

The Planning Policy Manager and members responded to the above issues:

The proposed number of housing contained in the core strategy was approximately 600 for Eye, Eye Green and Thorney, 450 across the limited growth villages and 50 across all smaller villages. The option was open to develop new villages should members want to take that route, however, delivery of the proposals would be easier to achieve from existing villages.

The core strategy clearly defined rural areas and countryside and preserved distinctiveness. Glinton would remain a limited growth village. The core strategy contained a policy and set the criteria for the local authority to grant planning permission for residential schemes of affordable housing. Flexibility was built into the strategy to enable negotiation of the ratio of affordable housing.

Landowners had been invited to suggest sites for development, there had been many put forward around Northborough and not all sites would be required to deliver the 450 houses across the villages. Many sites would not be suitable. There was no particular strategy for any single village including Northborough.

The local authority must make plans and provision for development and investment from the private sector, it was not an option to stand still due to growth, it was estimated that there would be approximately 30,000 births by 2020 and 6,000 deaths.

Village design statements (VDS), although a material planning consideration in planning terms it was difficult to ascertain the precise weight to be attached when considering planning applications. It would be appropriate for the local planning authority to use the VDS to encourage better design, but actually quote planning policies from the Local Plan when making decisions, not the VDS.

The core strategy did not make provision for development in the Werrington/Glinton green wedge, which was still part of the local planning policy.

The Neighbourhood Manager said that she would speak to the resident about the transportation issue after the meeting.

**North & West 2 Neighbourhood Council (Werrington North, Werrington South, Paston & Walton Wards) held on Thursday 15 October 2009 at Ken Stimpson School, Werrington**

Elected members and the public received a presentation on the Core Strategy from the Planning Policy Manager. It was explained that the core strategy was an important planning policy document that would identify the proposed areas of development for the city up until 2026. Significant consultation had been undertaken already but the Neighbourhood Council meetings provided a further opportunity for local people to become involved in the process prior to a final decision being taken at the meeting of the full Council on Wednesday, 2 December, 2009. Attention was drawn to the Paston Reserve.

Members of the public and elected members asked questions and made comments in relation to:

- Not all councillors supported high housing targets
- It was more important to build sustainable communities
- In the current poor economic climate where would funding come from?
- More housing can lead to more flooding and food shortages
- How would the public be made aware of the outcome of consultation
- Would any data be adjusted in the core strategy as this was a 20 year vision started 3 years ago?
- How long would the plans for the Sue Ryder development take?

The Planning Policy Manager responded:

- We were now in recession but most development would be funded by the private sector
- The core strategy was a long term view and vital to assist the authority to bid for S106 funding
- The statutory consultation would start in the New Year
- Everyone who had written in at the preferred option stage would be contacted, along with councillors and parish councils
- Information would be put into Libraries, on the Website and via the media
- Other suggestions put forward relating to publicity would be considered
- People must say specifically what they like about the strategy or what they would like changed and must refer to the item in the document.
- There would be a form available online
- The core strategy would be submitted along with comments to the government for a decision to be made about the document, this would be binding on the council
- Adoption of the strategy would take approximately 12 months
- The document is an overall 20 year strategy with a long term vision, and the data on which it is based is as up to date as possible.
- Peterborough City Council could grant planning permission for the Sue Ryder Home development, but it would be up to the developer when it was started

**North & West 3 Neighbourhood Council (Bretton North, Bretton South, West and Ravensthorpe Wards) held on Wednesday 21 October 2009 at Jack Hunt School, Netherton**

Elected members and the public received a presentation on the Core Strategy from the Head of Delivery. It was explained that the core strategy was an important planning policy document that would identify the proposed areas of development for the city up until 2026. Significant consultation had been undertaken already but the Neighbourhood Council meetings provided a further opportunity for local people to become involved in the process prior to a final decision being taken at the meeting of the full Council on Wednesday, 2 December, 2009. Attention was drawn to growth locations including Great Haddon, the city centre, Norwood/Paston reserve, Stanground and limited growth in more rural settlements.

There were no major allocations but more housing was planned in and around the Bretton Centre. Areas for regeneration and change included the hospital and railway station areas, and any contributions from new development via S106 would bring wider benefits to the area.

The core strategy was available in full to view on the Council's Website under the Democracy section.

Members of the public asked questions and made comments in relation to:

- The ratio of new housing compared to new jobs
- Plans for South Bank
- Proposed development of Grange allotments, access/egress
- Demolition of Bretton Woods school, lack of secondary school places
- Traffic lights at Thorpe Wood roundabout
- Regeneration/S106 funding

The Head of Delivery and the neighbourhood manager responded (in summary):

- There was no direct correlation between the housing and job figures, the figures were assessed regionally and some housing had already been built and delivered
- There were now solid plans in place for the South Bank and the council was working to unblock sites for development
- The neighbourhood council would be consulted on the specific planning application for the Grange allotments. In response to a comment that public objections had not been listened to at planning committee, the neighbourhood manager said that the new neighbourhood services would do whatever possible to ensure information was fed back to the public
- Bretton Woods School had been demolished as part of the secondary school review, however, there had been an influx of new arrivals in the city since the review which had impacted on school places
- The neighbourhood manager would find out what was happening with the traffic lights at Thorpe Wood roundabout and feed back
- S106 money was calculated on the funding needed to provide infrastructure to support new developments. Some S106 money would be pooled to use for regeneration throughout the city.

### **Central & East 1 Neighbourhood Council (Central & North Wards) held on Tuesday 13 October 2009 at the John Clare Theatre, Peterborough**

Elected members and the public received a presentation on the Core Strategy from the Strategic Planning Manager. It was explained that the core strategy was an important planning policy document that would identify the proposed areas of development for the city up until 2026. Significant consultation had been undertaken already but the Neighbourhood Council meetings provided a further opportunity for local people to become involved in the process prior to a final decision being taken at the meeting of the full Council on Wednesday, 2 December, 2009.

Members of the public and elected members asked questions in relation to:

- The regeneration of Peterborough
- S106 monies must be spent in a fair and equitable manner
- There was no development taking place in Central & North wards and, therefore, no S106 money for development
- Provision of open space
- Inclusion of the city centre could distort statistical information
- 4,500 dwellings in the city centre provided a challenge to the ratio between jobs and housing
- Castor should have been included in the core strategy

The Strategic Planning Manager responded:

- There was a specific policy for neighbourhood regeneration
- S106 money was a condition of planning permission and a commitment to finance or provide resources needed by the community as a result of development
- S106 monies would be placed into three pools that the council would agree spending on:
  1. site related infrastructure
  2. neighbourhood area
  3. strategic infrastructure, i.e. schools
- Neighbourhood councils would be able to bid for funding
- Open space would be protected and created through development when possible
- 4,300 dwellings would be built across the wider city centre area e.g. South Bank, Fletton and the hospital site
- Provision of jobs would be challenging but Peterborough was a commuting centre

Cllr Seaton, Cabinet Member for Resources, who was present at the meeting agreed that city centre information should not be included in statistics and encouraged Neighbourhood Councils to bid for S106 money, this would also be a good way to make local views heard by Cabinet.

### **Central & East 2 Neighbourhood Council (Park, Dogsthorpe and East Wards) held on Tuesday 3 November 2009 at Newark Hill School, Peterborough**

The Council's Strategic Planning Manager presented details of the Core Strategy. He outlined proposals showing how Peterborough would grow during the next 20 years and how issues such as housing, the local economy and the environment would be affected. It was noted that the main areas for growth were Great Haddon, the City Centre, Norwood/Paston Reserve and Stanground and that more rural settlements would see limited growth.

Members of the public were advised that the views of all Neighbourhood Councils were sought, prior to the presentation of the Core Strategy to the meeting of full Council on 2 December. The Chairman then invited queries or comments on the proposals. The following questions (and subsequent responses) were raised and noted:

- i) Will more facilities be provided in this area, for example a cinema or swimming pool and will central government help with making provision for the extra people coming to the area?

*In response to this question, the Strategic Planning Manager advised that developers would be expected to make a contribution to any new facilities and that central Government would also contribute.*

- ii) With the city's Environment Capital aspirations in mind, what efforts would be made to improve shops and supermarkets in the area and return vacant shops to use?

*The Strategic Planning Manager stated that the focus in respect of retail would be in the city centre.*

- iii) What plans will be made for the increase in numbers of people of retirement age?

*The Strategic Planning Manager explained that issue of adaptable 'lifetime homes' was a nationwide problem and one which was currently on the national agenda. Developers were required to include 30% affordable homes within new developments, which the Council considered a viable target.*

- iv) Will the road infrastructure be improved to avoid exacerbating the problem of traffic congestion?



*The Strategic Planning Manager stated that if this matter comes through in individual Neighbourhood Plan, evidence will be gathered with a view to seeking improvements.*

- v) We have an Ikea distribution centre in the city but no retail outlet. Why can the Council not stipulate that distribution centres such as this are also accompanied by a retail outlet? There is also a lack of public conveniences in the city centre – will this issue be addressed?

*It was emphasised that Neighbourhood Councils had been established to engage with local communities and address such issues*

- vi) Can consideration be given to holding Neighbourhood Council meetings at different times and also providing transport to enable people to attend?

*The Chairman indicated that she would be prepared to consider arranging meetings at different times.*

- vii) Councillor Miners requested that full consideration be given to ensuring that the Bluebell allotment site, which was currently earmarked for disposal, was retained as allotment land and not sold as planned.

*The Strategic Planning Manager confirmed that that this matter would be considered at a future meeting (possibly March 2010) when site specific documents were available.*

- viii) What plans will be made to cater for young people and to deal with anti-social behaviour?

*It was explained that these matters would be considered as part of the whole Strategy and input from other agencies and services would be sought. He added that residents were able to make their views known on planning applications, should they feel that plans for new development did not address potential anti-social behaviour issues.*

- iv) How will rural areas be affected by the Strategy and why does the Strategy not include plans to develop the Castor area which already has an appropriate road infrastructure in place? Also, as people often live close to their place of work, will there be enough jobs for people moving to the area?

*The Strategic Planning Manager advised that developers would be required to provide basic facilities and amenities when developing in rural areas and the Council could influence what these would be. With regard to Castor, it was felt that Great Haddon was a more appropriate area to focus upon but Castor may be looked at in the future if appropriate. In respect of housing provision, this query will be referred to a colleague, Anne Keogh for response. With regard to jobs, as a rule we work on the basis that for every one house created we will need one job and it is hoped that the majority of people moving into the area will also work in the area.*

- x) What assurances can be given that any future developments will be designed to deter crime and vandalism?

*In response, the Strategic Planning Manager explained that there were a number of ways of addressing such concerns, including planting, avoiding the creation of 'blind alleys, etc.*

In concluding the discussion, the Chair thanked everyone for their comments. It was noted that elected Members would be made aware of the views expressed at the Neighbourhood Council meeting when the Core Strategy was considered at full Council on 2 December 2009.

This page is intentionally left blank