

Agenda Annex

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

13 APRIL 2021 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.

LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK

Agenda Item	Application	Name	Ward Councillor / Parish Councillor / Objector / Applicant
4.1	20/01550/FUL - Lorac Lodge, 4 Turnpike Road, Hampton Vale, Peterborough	Cllr Cereste Darren Jayatilaka Shoaib Ali	Ward Councillor Objector Objector
4.2	21/00032/HHFUL - 21 Normangate, Ailsworth, Peterborough, PE5 7BF		

BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 13 April 2021

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	20/01550/FUL	Lorac Lodge 4 Turnpike Road Hampton Vale Peterborough, Change of use from C3 (single dwelling) to C2 (children's home) for up to 3 persons'


9x letters of representation have been received further to undertaking public re-consultation, raising the following concerns. The letters of representation have been provided in full at Appendix 1 of this Update Report, however a summary of concerns and Officer response has been provided.

- There is insufficient parking to serve the proposed business, whether this be for 5 children or 3 children. An independent Parking Survey was conducted on behalf of the Applicant, concluded that 88% parking space is occupied on turnpike road; that is, 12 out of 13 available spaces. The current on-street parking situation is stressed at best, and any increase in traffic would be problematic. There are a number of children who live and play within the area; there are concerns for access to emergency vehicles; the Councils Highway Engineers have objected to the proposal on numerous occasions, and you do not need 2 years to see the negative effects on highway safety.

Officer Response: Officers are mindful that the property could change its use from a C3 residential dwelling to a C4 House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) without the need for planning permission. Whilst Officers do consider that the parking and garage spaces do not meet current minimum parking space standards, there is a legitimate fall-back position whereby the property could be occupied by 6 unrelated persons, of which could all own cars, and generate independent trips such as post and online deliveries, trips to and from work, as well as visitors.

As expanded within the Committee Report, the submitted Parking Survey has illustrated that there is limited on street parking available within the immediate locality. However, on the basis that the business would cater for no more than three children, it is considered that there would be satisfactory off-street parking to serve the amount of activity proposed. That said, in the interest of ensuring the use would not result in an unacceptably adverse highway safety hazard, Officers are recommending a two year temporary consent.

- Officers should be mindful that the lines marked in yellow are existing double yellow lines, and the neighbourhood are seeking further double yellow lines in blue



Officer Response: As stated above, on the basis that the business would cater for no more than three children, it is considered that there would be satisfactory off-street parking to serve the amount of activity proposed. If additional parking restrictions were put in place on the highway, this would not reduce the amount of off-street parking available which serves the property.

- There have been numerous observations of people parking in unsafe locations within the public highway, including on areas with double yellow lines

Officer Response: This should be directed to the Police, who are responsible for enforcing such matters on the public highway. If the land is within private ownership, this should be directed to the landowner. For information, it is understood that Daisy Drive, part of Dukes Way and part of Turnpike Road, adjacent to the application site, are adopted highway, and the remainder is within private ownership.

- There have been issues whereby the refuse collection vehicle has made contact with houses on Daisy Drive and Turnpike Road

Officer Response: As set out above, this application seeks planning permission to use the building as a care home for three children. It is not considered the proposed use would exacerbate existing refuse collection vehicle movements over and above the existing situation.

- The proposed change of use to a business would result in activities out of keeping with that of a residential property, to the detriment of adjoining neighbours, and the address is not suitable to be used as anything other than a residential dwelling

Officer Response: As set out within the Committee Report, further to reducing the number of children which would reside within the property, it is not considered the amount of activity would be out of keeping with that of a residential dwelling. Each application is considered on its own merits.

- The site could result in issues of anti-social behaviour

Officer Response: As set out within the Committee Report, whilst it is accepted that children's care homes across the City do not operate without incident, there is no strong evidence to suggest that they generate levels of crime or anti-social behaviour (ASB) such that unacceptable harm to surrounding communities results. On this basis, in light of the lack of objection from the Police and without substantive evidence to the contrary, it is considered that the proposal would not result in significant increased crime or ASB risk.

- Residents have not seen any evidence that the business would be registered with OFSTED

Officer Response: The planning system cannot require or secure that the proposed children's home

register or be regulated by other bodies, including Ofsted.

- There are concerns that the business would not meet building regulations

Officer Response: Building regulations is sought separate to the planning application process.

- There are concerns with respect to the extent of public consultation, and Officers have not considered objections made by residents

Officer Response: Public consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. Any letters of representation received, which contain planning related concerns, have been summarised, considered and addressed within the Committee Report and this Update Report where applicable.

- The revised neighbour consultation period ends after the Planning Committee date (13.04.21)

Officer Response: The application has been recommended for approval by Officers subject to conditions and no new material planning matters being raised as part of the re-consultation process. If new material planning matters arose as a result of the consultation period (to close of business on 15th April 2021), the application would go back to Members for final determination.

2.	21/00032/HHFUL	21 Normangate Ailsworth Peterborough PE5 7BF , Proposed two storey rear extension and internal works
----	----------------	---

No Further Updates.

Appendix 1 – Letters/Emails of Representation Received

Address: 1 Dukes Way Hampton Vale Peterborough PE7 8JN

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Adjoining Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects

Comments: We would strongly object the the proposed change of use to number 4 Turpike road. The current parking situation is stressed at best and any increse to traffic and subsiquent parking would result in problamatic parking for current residents ans their visitors. Road saftey is also an issue as there are serveral families with young children in the area. It has been indicated that parking is an option in Dukes Way however cars parked in the locations indicated force cars out into the road and into the path of any oncomming cars comming from the lower part of Dukes Way.

Address: 9 Dukes way hampton vale PETERBOROUGH PE78JN

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Adjoining Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects

Comments: I completely object to this being used for anything other than a residential family home, the road is congested way to much already. Parking is a major issue, so much so that only last week I had to fold my car door mirrors in so that I could get down turnpike with cars parked on both sides of the road. Letting this house be used for any purpose greater than it is currently will increase the number of cars and make parking worse. The position is just not suitable, please do not let this happen.

Address: 2 Turnpike Road Hampton Vale Peterborough PE7 8JP

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Adjoining Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects

Comments: Even though the number of residents has been reduced from five to three children and/or young adults supported by a team of three staff at any one time, we still strongly object to the revised planning application for the Change of Use at 4 Turnpike Road, Hampton Vale, Peterborough, PE7 8JP, from Class C3 dwelling house to a residential children's home Class C2.

Reasons for Objection:

1. Loss of Amenity

The proposed site is in a predominantly residential area where occupiers could reasonably expect a level of amenity concurrent with the property. Our property borders the proposed residential children's home, and thus I and my neighbour at 6 Daisy Drive will be directly impacted by the increase in noise, disturbance and nuisance from essentially the change use from a residential to a business property. Not only will there be a continual coming & going of residents, staff, family, friends & support workers because of a business operating but also due to the unknown nature of the residents (other than complex and challenging needs) a high likelihood of an increased level of anti-social behaviour, which will impact of the enjoyment we gain from our garden, both enjoying the peace & quiet of the neighbourhood and for entertaining friends.

The adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of (among other factors) noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, etc and assuming a worst-case scenario with regard to the actual residents, this is a material grounds for refusal of planning permission.

2. Effect on the character of the neighbourhood

As mentioned, in my previous comment, the neighbourhood is predominantly made-up of families with younger children, which makes this an extremely pleasant area to reside, but having had previous personal experience of children with challenging behaviour, including violent behaviour, I know that it is possible that the property will incur regular visits from Police and other emergency services to deal with issues thus the proposed Change of Use will effect the character of the neighbourhood, again another material grounds for planning refusal.

3. Adequacy of Parking/Highway Safety

Peterborough's local planning policy states that planning permission will only be granted if the proposal makes appropriate and deliverable parking provision and given the 24-hour cover (ie. 1:1 care), this would suggest a need for 12 car parking spaces, based upon a typical 42-hour working week, and this does not include additional parking requirements for family/friends and support workers.

Given the already high density of on-road parking in the street, often leading to the road being reduced to a single width even a small increase in traffic will directly impact residents, as well as making it difficult for emergency services to access the area which is as per my earlier point highly probably.

Also, given the Council's own Highway Engineers have objected to the proposed planning due to concerns this would adversely affect highway safety and the convenience of current residents this is another material reason why the planning should be refused.

4. Adequacy of Service Provider/Property for Vulnerable Children

The Planning Application is supported by the Designing Crime Out Officer (Police) subject to the Children's Home being registered with OFSTED. However, we have been provided with no evidence that the property will be registered, and that the Service Provider has any experience of running a Children's Home. Also, we are concerned that the property is not suitable for vulnerable children of any age, given that it is a 3-Storey Building which has not been designed with fire escapes (to meet fire regulations) as initial use was classified as Residential.

Please note that I strongly object to the revised planning application for this Change of Use at 4 Turnpike Road, Hampton Vale, Peterborough, PE7 8JP.

Address: 29 Dukes way Peterborough PE7 8JN

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Adjoining Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects

Comments: It looks like the planning office has not considered or responded to any other objections made earlier, so I will skip those for now and focus on the parking hazard issue alone in this objection.

I am surprised to see that the application has not already been refused given 3 times refusal by LHA - this includes the recent refusal (29th March) for the changed application (3 person care home).

In addition to LHA's survey, an independent "Parking Survey" was conducted on behalf of the applicant (8th Feb
<http://plandocs.peterborough.gov.uk/NorthgatePublicDocs/01232160.pdf>) concluding:

- 88% parking space is occupied on turnpike road. That is, 12 out of 13 available spaces

LHA's survey dated 14/12/2020
(<http://plandocs.peterborough.gov.uk/NorthgatePublicDocs/01227758.pdf>) concluded that:

- Tandem parking is not ideal for shared use premises i.e. for employees with differing work patterns as the first car to park gets blocked in, once a second car parks behind it. This would not be an ideal situation for the care home or residents in the nearby area.

- This type of parking can result in 'car juggling' within the site and out onto the adjacent public highway Shift handover periods for the care home are also a concern for the LHA.

- There shall be 6 carers (changed from 10 to 6) alternating between 2 separate shift patterns which shall result in a significant number of vehicles parked on the adjacent public highway. This shall impede the free flow of movement for motorists and pedestrians on the adjacent public highway.

Based on above and if you actually take measurements of the Drive way as well, it is obvious that no more than 2 cars can be parked on this drive way. If 4 are parked (2 sets back to back), the 2 rear cars will protrude onto the footpath. This will require pedestrians to take little diversion on walking on the road.

Q: Our kids go to school on foot - Can the Council guarantee their safety in that scenario?

Even a 3 person care home would require 3 staff cars plus 1 visitor. On top of that, it has to cater for staff shift handover period which would mean at least 6 cars at the property and possibly 7 if there already is a visitor.

Let's do some maths and see how/if it will work.

Based on above, we have following information:

- Case 1: Required parking space of 4 vehicles all the time (staff plus visitor)

- Case 2: Required parking space of 7 vehicles during shift handover (3 times a day based on 8 hours shifts)

- 2 parking spaces available on drive way

- 1 parking space available on Turnpike road (12 off 13 occupied)

Q: Where will be the remaining cars for Case 1 (1) & Case 2 (4) parked? Please note that the 2 cases considered the domestic cars only. For a care home, you need to cater for bigger vehicles too

In case you are not aware, the parking is already so cramped - just 2 weeks ago, the waste collection truck, while turning from Daisy drive into Turnpike road, ran into the canopy of the house located across the road adjacent to 4 turnpike road property. The canopy was damaged and luckily no one was hurt. As far as I know, this is the 2nd incident in past 2 years at this junction.

Right now, 2 cars are parked on the double yellow lines at the Dukes way and Turnpike road junction. I have provided evidence in the previous letter so I am not sure if any attention was paid to that. If you add more cars on the street, "MORE PEOPLE WILL MORE FREQUENTLY PARK CARS ON DOUBLE YELLOW LINES".

Q: Why has the council not notified all at Dukes way about this application?

Please note that for all the properties located on Dukes way, their only way in/out is through the Turnpike and Dukes way junction. Therefore significant changes to parking/traffic condition at this junction concerns them all. Back in December, I had to personally knock the doors to make them aware of this planning application - they were concerned that the Council did not inform them directly.

I understand and agree the need to care for the vulnerable and that it fulfils Council's goal of providing the care homes but you must fairly weigh the requirement of achieving this goal against the risk that will be imposed on existing residents concerning the high safety issue alone. Care home for one child might be ok from High safety point of view.

Address: 73 New Lakeside Hampton Vale Peterborough PE78HU

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Adjoining Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects

Comments: I'm still objecting to this my main concern is parking, I have been blocked in enough in the past, with restrictions easing now I would like to be able to get out of my driveway again. With yellow lines placed across mine and my neighbors driveway we always get people parking on the opposite side of our driveway making it difficult to manover out , I feel this will result in a regular occurrence. The roads are narrow enough.

Address: 29, Dukes Way Peterborough PE7 8JN

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Adjoining Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects

Comments: In response to the "Committee Report"

The reasoning under section "c) Highway Safety and Parking" is completely flawed.

I invite the committee to kindly visit the premises once on a working day and once over the weekend to see for yourself that residential and commercial (postal) vehicles are already being parked on the double yellow lines. Why? Because, there is no space available to park on the road, on the driveways.

Please bear in mind that this is the case while 4 turnpike road property is unoccupied (which contradicts with what is claimed under section 14 "Existing Use" of the Application form by the Applicant).

The report says that the 3rd staff vehicle can be parked in front of the property. Please show where? And the report completely ignores the 4th space required for visitors and is taking the changeover period very lightly - an activity that will happen 2-3 times a day.

You do not need 2 years to see the negative effects on highway safety.

Address: Dukes Way Hampton Vale Peterborough PE7 8JN

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Adjoining Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects

Comments: Still Objecting.

Reasons for objections - As per my previous objections, parking in the area is still very busy and a danger to the public. From studying the Parking Survey I see there has been Black lines highlighting the 'Not Safe' parking areas. I have since seen many vehicles parked within those spaces. I have taken evidence of the those and many other parking issues I came across over 5 days of Lockdown, this document has been emailed to planningcontrol@peterborough.gov.uk, matt.thomson@peterborough.gov.uk & louise.simmonds@peterborough.gov.uk but I will quickly summarize for your reference.

There were 7 pictures taken, with those breaking 13 rules within the Highway Code Rule 243, breaking 4 rules of Highway Code Rule 242 which relates to Laws RTA 1988 sect 22 & CUR reg 103, breaking 6 rules of Highway Code Rule 244 which relates to Law GL(GP)A sect 15. Also on 4 separate occasions during the past few months I have been involved incidents due to unsafe parking. 2 near head on collisions, 1 having to walk with my youngest daughter along the road due to the pavement being blocked and finally having to stop on cross roads at night to have to fold my mirrors in to pass vehicles without any contact.

The scary thing is also is that once Covid restrictions are lifted, the parking situation will no doubt get busier as visiting friends and family will be allowed.

Also having worked within Traffic Management and car parking on events across the UK where we have hundreds and sometimes thousands of vehicles that are required to be safely parked, the local authorities and Law enforcement would be soon on my back if I was to allow parking such as the state of Turnpike Road that is putting the health and safety of the general public at risk.

On the Peterborough.gov.uk website there is plenty of Introductions in regards to Traffic Management Acts, TRO's and PCN's but during my 5 years of living in Hampton I have only just recently seen that double yellow lines were placed on the entrance of Dukes Way. Why have the vehicles that are blocking pavements and restricting emergency vehicles access not being addressed? Then to think that there could be a potential 6-10 extra vehicles within the area for just 1 house is not going to help the situation.

Also the 1 to 1 caring for the occupants is a concern. I did witness 2 female carers and a male with what I believe to be possible mental health issues taking a walk around the lakes. The area is great to exercise, but when returning from my run, these same 2 females were struggling to control the male who was shouting and lashing out. Before I could offer any assistance a male member of public stepped in to help while 1 of the carers was able to call out. If we have 3 occupants, and 3 carers at 4 Turnpike Road and on a 1 to 1 basis and this happened while enjoying some fresh air around Hampton, anything could happen...and then taking another carer out of the house to address this scenario will then leave a potential shortness of carers at the location. How can we get reassurance that this will not happen, and also be witnessed by many of the young children who live locally?

Another concern is for the safety of all in the house. A 3 storey family home is not built for such a care home. There are no other fire escapes apart from 1 set of stairs. The double glazed UPVC window can open enough to allow an adult out, and with having these windows on the 2nd and 3rd floor offers some hair raising thoughts. It would be unfair to have these windows locked to prevent fresh air and the sound of the local community in. But it would also not be ideal or a pretty sight to see the windows caged or any other prevention that maybe put in place.

Hampton has a lot of young families that need to feel safe and placing such a facility in the middle of a housing estate is not ideal. There has been a location recently built in Hampton but not yet filled even though work seems to be complete. This is behind Serpentine Green and next to the local Church and Police station. This would be the perfect place for such a situation as it is a safer environment for the occupants. Why can't Lorac Lodge select a location like this to ensure that their occupants are safe and comfortable and will allow sufficient parking.

For the above reasons I strongly object to the revised planning application for this Change of Use at 4 Turnpike Road, Hampton Vale, Peterborough, PE7 8JP.

Turnpike Road Parking 26th March 2021 to 31st March 2021

Below is a screenshot of where 4 Turnpike Road is based in relation to the below parking issues I came across in a matter of a few days during Lockdown. This will only get busier once restrictions are lifted and visiting can commence. I have highlighted the Highway Code Rule which these are breaking and the relating Law to them.



Rule 243

DO NOT stop or park:

- near a school entrance
- anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services
- at or near a bus or tram stop or taxi rank
- on the approach to a level crossing/tramway crossing
- opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space
- near the brow of a hill or hump bridge
- opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle
- where you would force other traffic to enter a tram lane
- where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles
- in front of an entrance to a property
- on a bend
- where you would obstruct cyclists' use of cycle facilities

except when forced to do so by stationary traffic.

Rule 243

DO NOT stop or park:

- near a school entrance
- anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services
- at or near a bus or tram stop or taxi rank
- on the approach to a level crossing/tramway crossing
- opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space
- near the brow of a hill or hump bridge
- opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle
- where you would force other traffic to enter a tram lane
- where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles
- in front of an entrance to a property
- on a bend
- where you would obstruct cyclists' use of cycle facilities

except when forced to do so by stationary traffic.

Rule 243

DO NOT stop or park:

- near a school entrance
- anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services
- at or near a bus or tram stop or taxi rank
- on the approach to a level crossing/tramway crossing
- opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space
- near the brow of a hill or hump bridge
- opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle
- where you would force other traffic to enter a tram lane
- where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles
- in front of an entrance to a property
- on a bend
- where you would obstruct cyclists' use of cycle facilities

except when forced to do so by stationary traffic.

Rule 244

You **MUST NOT** park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the pavement can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs.

Law [GL\(GP\)A sect 15](#)



Rule 242

You **MUST NOT** leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road.

Laws [RTA 1988 sect 22](#) & [CUR reg 103](#)



The house within the picture is 4 Turnpike Road. The other day when driving out of Dukes Way a delivery van was coming out of this street (Daisy Drive), while struggling to see any oncoming traffic from the right he was continuing to turn left resulting in a near miss with myself.

Rule 244

You **MUST NOT** park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the pavement can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs.

Law [GL\(GP\)A sect 15](#)



Rule 242

You **MUST NOT** leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road.

Laws [RTA 1988 sect 22 & CUR reg 103](#)

Rule 243

DO NOT stop or park:

- near a school entrance
- anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services
- at or near a bus or tram stop or taxi rank
- on the approach to a level crossing/tramway crossing
- opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space
- near the brow of a hill or hump bridge
- opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle
- where you would force other traffic to enter a tram lane
- where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles
- in front of an entrance to a property
- on a bend
- where you would obstruct cyclists' use of cycle facilities

except when forced to do so by stationary traffic.

Rule 242

You **MUST NOT** leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road.

Laws [RTA 1988 sect 22 & CUR reg 103](#)

Rule 243

DO NOT stop or park:

- near a school entrance
- anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services
- at or near a bus or tram stop or taxi rank
- on the approach to a level crossing/tramway crossing
- opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space
- near the brow of a hill or hump bridge
- opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle
- where you would force other traffic to enter a tram lane
- where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles
- in front of an entrance to a property
- on a bend
- where you would obstruct cyclists' use of cycle facilities

except when forced to do so by stationary traffic.

Rule 242

You **MUST NOT** leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road.

Laws [RTA 1988 sect 22 & CUR reg 103](#)

Rule 243

DO NOT stop or park:

- near a school entrance
- anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services
- at or near a bus or tram stop or taxi rank
- on the approach to a level crossing/tramway crossing
- opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space
- near the brow of a hill or hump bridge
- opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle
- where you would force other traffic to enter a tram lane
- where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles
- in front of an entrance to a property
- on a bend
- where you would obstruct cyclists' use of cycle facilities

except when forced to do so by stationary traffic.

Rule 244

You **MUST NOT** park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the pavement can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs.

Law [GL\(GP\)A sect 15](#)



Rule 244

You **MUST NOT** park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the pavement can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs.

Law [GL\(GP\)A sect 15](#)



Following on from the above picture, I had to stop and pull my wing mirrors in to ensure I could get past without any contact. This had to happen on the cross roads of Turnpike Road & Kiln Street. Not the best place to have to stop in the dark. Also I drive a Ford Focus which is 1.8 metres wide....Emergency service vehicles would stand no chance a getting by resulting in the risk of life to many people.

Rule 244

You **MUST NOT** park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the pavement can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs.

Law [GL\(GP\)A sect 15](#)



The car on the right is the same car within the above night time photo. Still parked close the Turnpike Road and Kiln Street. I also had a very close incident on this junction early evening with a car coming from the right side of the cross road without stopping and unable to see me until he nearly hit me head on.

Rule 243

DO NOT stop or park:

- near a school entrance
- anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services
- at or near a bus or tram stop or taxi rank
- on the approach to a level crossing/tramway crossing
- opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space
- near the brow of a hill or hump bridge
- opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle
- where you would force other traffic to enter a tram lane
- where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles
- in front of an entrance to a property
- on a bend
- where you would obstruct cyclists' use of cycle facilities

except when forced to do so by stationary traffic.

Rule 244

You **MUST NOT** park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the pavement can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs.

Law [GL\(GP\)A sect 15](#)



I have to walk up Turnpike Road to get to the local shops, on this day me and my youngest daughter had to walk along the road to ensure we could get past this vehicle. There was also another vehicle parked opposite side of the road also partially blocking the pavement.

To: Peterborough City Council Planning Services Department

Ref: Objection to Planning Application: 20/01550/FUL, 4 Turnpike Road, Hampton Vale

I strongly object to the planning application for change of use of 4 Turnpike Road from C3 to C2 Carer home. Please see below some of the concerns, to highlight unsuitability of the proposed plan.

Follow up Response Since revised planning in March 2021

It looks like the planning office has not considered or responded to any other objections made earlier, so I will skip those for now and focus on the parking hazard issue alone in this objection.

I am surprised to see that the application has not already been refused given 3 times refusal by LHA – this includes the recent refusal (29th March) for the changed application (3 person care home).

In addition to LHA's survey, an independent "Parking Survey" was conducted on behalf of the applicant (8th Feb <http://plandocs.peterborough.gov.uk/NorthgatePublicDocs/01232160.pdf>) concluding:

- 88% parking space is occupied on turnpike road. That is, 12 out of 13 available spaces

LHA's survey dated 14/12/2020 concluded that:

- Tandem parking is not ideal for shared use premises i.e. for employees with differing work patterns as the first car to park gets blocked in, once a second car parks behind it. This would not be an ideal situation for the care home or residents in the nearby area.
- This type of parking can result in 'car juggling' within the site and out onto the adjacent public highway Shift handover periods for the care home are also a concern for the LHA.
- There shall be 6 carers (changed from 10 to 6) alternating between 2 separate shift patterns which shall result in a significant number of vehicles parked on the adjacent public highway. This shall impede the free flow of movement for motorists and pedestrians on the adjacent public highway.

Based on above and if you actually take measurements of the Drive way as well, it is obvious that no more than 2 cars can be parked on this drive way. If 4 are parked (2 sets back to back), the 2 rear cars will protrude onto the footpath. This will require pedestrians to take little diversion to walking on the road.

Q: Our kids go to school on foot – Can the Council guarantee their safety in that scenario?

Even a 3 person care home would require 3 staff cars plus 1 visitor. On top of that, it has to cater for staff shift handover period which would mean at least 6 cars at the property and possibly 7 if there already is a visitor.

Let's do some maths and see how/if it will work.

Based on above, we have following information:

- Case 1: Required parking space of 4 vehicles all the time (staff plus visitor)

- Case 2: Required parking space of 7 vehicles during shift handover (3 times a day based on 8 hours shifts)
- 2 parking spaces available on drive way
- 1 parking space available on Turnpike road (12 off 13 occupied)

Q: Where will be the remaining cars for Case 1 (1) & Case 2 (4) parked?

Please note that the 2 cases considered the domestic cars only. For a care home, you need to cater for bigger vehicles too

In case you are not aware, the parking is already so cramped – just 2 weeks ago, the waste collection truck, while turning from Daisy drive into Turnpike road, ran into the canopy of the house located across the road adjacent to 4 turnpike road property. The canopy was damaged and luckily no one was hurt. As far as I know, this is the 2nd incident in past 2 years at this junction.

Right now, 2 cars are parked on the double yellow lines at the Dukes way and Turnpike road junction. I have provided evidence in the previous letter so I am not sure if any attention was paid to that. If you add more cars on the street, "MORE PEOPLE WILL MORE FREQUENTLY PARK CARS ON DOUBLE YELLOW LINES".

Q: Again, can the Council guarantee the safety of our kids when they go to school across this junction while cars are parked illegally on double yellow lines?

Q: Why has the council not notified all at Dukes way about this application?

Please note that for all the properties located on Dukes way, their only way in/out is through the Turnpike and Dukes way junction. Therefore significant changes to parking/traffic condition at this junction concerns them all. Back in December, I had to personally knock the doors to make them aware of this planning application – they were concerned that the Council did not inform them directly.

I understand and agree the need to care for the vulnerable and that it fulfils Council's goal of providing the care homes but you must fairly weigh the requirement of achieving that goal against the risk that will be imposed on existing residents concerning the highway safety issue alone. Care home for one child might be ok from Highway safety point of view.

Follow up Response after Publish Planning Report for the Planning Committee April 2021

In response to the "Committee Report"

The reasoning under section "c) Highway Safety and Parking" is completely flawed.

I invite the committee to kindly visit the premises once on a working day and once over the weekend to see for yourself that residential and commercial (postal) vehicles are already being parked on the double yellow lines. Why? Because, there is no space available to park on the road, on the driveways.

Please bear in mind that this is the case while 4 turnpike road property is unoccupied (which contradicts with what is claimed under section 14 "Existing Use" of the Application form by the Applicant).

The report says that the 3rd staff vehicle can be parked in front of the property. Please show where? And the report completely ignores the 4th space required for visitors and is taking the changeover period very lightly - an activity that will happen 2-3 times a day.

You do not need 2 years to see the negative effects on highway safety.