

Application Ref: 20/01113/FUL

Proposal: Erection of 2no. 3-storey buildings and 1no. 2-storey building comprising 59no. affordable residential units and 2no. retail units, with associated car parking, landscaping and relocation of bus stop

Site: The Former Staniland Court Site, Werrington Centre, PE4 6NA
Applicant: KREAM and Funding Affordable Homes

Agent: Barker Storey Matthews
Site visit: 29.10.21

Referred By: **Councillor J Fox**
Reason: Out of character for the area, removal of bus terminal, no Green spaces for tenants to use and concerns about building more retail units

Case officer: Mr M A Thomson
Telephone No. 01733 4501733 453478
E-Mail: matt.thomson@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to conditions and the signing of a S106 legal agreement

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

Site Description

The application site relates to land situated within the Werrington District Centre.

The Centre is characterised by single storey development with large roofscapes, which is atypical of the Werrington Township and other District and Local centres built out under the Development Corporation. The Centre comprises a public house, Tesco supermarket, a number of retail and eateries with a car park beyond to the west. There is also a doctor's surgery, now vacant, and dentists to the south, and two storey offices known as Olympus House and Sundance House to the north and north-west.

Part of the site was formally occupied by Staniland Court (APP Ref: 14/00777/PRIOR), however this building has since been demolished. There is also a bus layby and bus stop, accessed via Goodwin Walk, a bus-only route. There are also established areas of landscaping and pedestrian footway links from Crowhurst and Ploverly, two residential streets to the east.

To the immediate west of the application site is a service yard servicing a Tesco supermarket and a number of retail units, which is also used for staff car parking.

Proposal

The Applicant seeks planning permission for the 'erection of 2no. 3-storey buildings and 1no. 2-storey building comprising 59no. affordable residential units and 2no. retail units, with associated car parking, landscaping and relocation of bus stop'.

Blocks 1 and 2 would stand at 3 storey in height and would comprise entirely of residential units. These two blocks would have an overall floor area of 94m x 17.8m and propose to stand at 10.2m (11.1m including plant) in height utilising a mansard roof with recessed windows. These blocks would comprise a total of 56 residential dwellings over three floors.

Block 3 would have a floor area of 17.3m x 18.1m and propose to stand at 7.3m in height, also utilising a mansard roof with recessed windows. This building would comprise two retail units and

bin storage for both the retail and residential units at ground floor, with 3 residential dwellings above.

Access for cars and refuse collection vehicles would be from Staniland Way to the north, which is shared with Olympus House, the service yard for Tesco Supermarket and a number of retail units situated within Werrington Centre, as well as the exit to the Tesco Petrol Filling Station.

These buildings would be served by a communal car park, which would provide 75no. parking spaces (4no. of which would be disabled).

To facilitate development, several landscaped areas and a bus stop would be removed. A new bus stop is proposed to be situated along Goodwin Walk, and public realm improvements are proposed within Werrington Centre. Further, the adjacent service yard would be remodelled to facilitate the proposed car park, which would displace 21x staff car parking spaces and a cycle store.

This application has been subject to amended plans, which are discussed in further detail below.

2 Relevant Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
12/01543/WCPP	Revised application for regeneration of the Werrington Centre, comprising demolition and alteration of existing buildings including erection of new supermarket, shop units and public house, alterations to car park and access, together with landscaping and other ancillary works including off site highway works, new roundabout at the junction of David's Lane and Staniland Way Specifically variation of Condition 1 of 11/01582/NONMAT (approved drawings/documents) and C21 of 08/01471/FUL (off site highway works) and removal of conditions C3 (details of contamination - petrol station), C4 (contamination), C5 (fire hydrants), C7 (tree protection), C8 (tree specification), C9 (arboricultural method statement), C15 (acoustic barrier), C22 (visibility splays) and C29 (service yard management plan) of 08/01471/FUL	Withdrawn by Applicant	02/01/2015
08/01471/FUL	Resubmission of Phase 1 of the regeneration of the Werrington Centre, comprising demolition and alteration of existing buildings including removal of petrol filling station, erection of new supermarket, shop units and public house. Alterations to car park and access, together with landscaping and other ancillary works (including off site highway works, new roundabout at the junction of David's Lane and Staniland Way)	Permitted	12/06/2009

08/00286/FUL

Phase 1 of the regeneration of the Werrington Centre comprising: Demolition and alteration of existing buildings including removal of petrol filling station, erection of new supermarket, shop units and public house; alterations to car park and access; together with landscaping and other ancillary works (including off site highway works: new roundabout at the junction of David's Lane and Staniland Way)

Refused

26/09/2008

3 Planning Policy

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

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2021)

Section 6 - Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Section 7 - Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres

Section 8 - Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities

Section 9 - Promoting Sustainable Transport

Section 11 - Making Effective Use of Land

Section 12 - Achieving Well Designed Places

Section 14 - Meeting Climate Change

Section 15 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019)

LP02 - The Settle Hierarchy and the Countryside

LP03 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

LP08 - Meeting Housing Needs

LP12 - Retail and Other Town Centre Uses

LP13 - Transport

LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

LP17 - Amenity Provision

LP19 - The Historic Environment

LP28 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

LP29 - Trees and Woodland

LP32 - Flood and Water Management

LP33 - Development on Land Affected by Contamination

4 Consultations/Representations

Local Highway Authority (31.01.22)

No objection - The Agent has produced satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the proposed

allocation of 75 spaces for the number of units now proposed is acceptable.

Revised Parking survey - Werrington Centre car park

As a result of the approval of further development around the Werrington Centre an updated Parking Survey was requested. An additional Parking Survey was carried out on Thursday the 25th November 2021 which demonstrated that there would be significant spare capacity in the car park during peak times.

Parking Beat Survey

Having studied the data produced by the Parking Beat Survey it demonstrates that there is a significant amount of on-street parking available in the vicinity of the development.

The survey work overall demonstrates that there is available parking provision within the local centre car park and public highway to accommodate the 18x spaces displaced by the revised service layout arrangement.

Cycle Parking

Whilst conducting the Parking Survey it was noted that the cycle shelter that shall be lost because of the proposals was little used therefore the Applicant proposes to install a new cycle shelter in the south west corner of the Tesco service yard.

Proposed bus stop location

The agent has stated that details of the new bus stop would be provided under separate cover in due course by the Project Architect.

Swept path analysis

Swept path analysis was previously submitted as part of the Transport Assessment. Tesco have also undertaken their own tracking exercises to ensure that the development shall not interfere with the operation of their service yard. This is acceptable to the LHA.

Other Highway Matters

For convenience, drivers that regularly visit the Werrington Centre park along Skaters Way. There are concerns that because some staff parking spaces would be lost, demand for on street parking in this location would increase.

To discourage this the Applicant has agreed to secure a sum of money (either through a S106 or a Unilateral Agreement) to fund the implementation of a traffic regulation order (TRO) to address any highway problems that may arise on the public highway as a result of the proposals.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) (15.07.21 and 28.10.21)

Object - Further to reviewing the crime and incident systems covering this location for the last 2 years, this area is considered to be an area of medium risk to the vulnerability from crime at present.

There are concerns regarding the proposed Pocket Park and re-introduction of boundary treatments in front of the supermarket. Historically, the landscaping was used for drug dealing, hiding the drugs, anti-social behaviour, rubbish, gang crime surrounding the local school, issues around Cookoo's Hollow and the skate park and county lines/exploitation. There are several local parks and there is no requirement for an additional pocket park in Werrington.

Communal entrance doors should be access controlled for residents only, with no trade buttons or other armed-release mechanism. What will be proposed for mail delivery e.g. external post boxes? The development looks to be contained with gated access to the site and the rear car park, what access control measures are being installed?

With the above crimes in mind cycle storage should have security doors with residential access control, fitted with self-closers, and internal thumb turns for easy egress to ensure people cannot

get trapped inside. Sheffield cycle stands should be fitted inside cemented 300mm into the ground, the same applies to the external cycle stands. Would the proposed retail units have access to the cycle stores?

Bin stores should have security doors fitted with self-closers and internal thumb turn, with dual access control, fob access for residents and key-pad for bin collection.

The revised boundary treatments surrounding the ground floor flats gardens the plan mentions low brick wall and railings, please confirm the height of the wall and the fencing? What types of boundary treatments will demarcate the individual green space?

A copy of the lighting plan is sought by condition.

PCC Tree Officer (07.10.2020 and 28.06.21)

Object - This proposal is too large for its position/ location on site; it is too close to the footpath/PCC street trees/highway, and in landscape terms would dominate the street scene, despite the tree lined avenue. The loss of the bus turnaround area would detract from the immediate area, as a valuable piece of grassed open space with eleven shade trees, which would be difficult to replace. The proposal is unacceptable due to the loss of tree cover and the area of open space, and the proximity of the proposed building to the PCC avenue trees.

There is a clear contradiction with regards to the assessment of some of the trees, which requires revision within an updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment. The full growth potential of the street trees appears to have been downplayed within the AIA, as these trees would not be able to reach their full growth potential due to the close proximity of the proposed buildings and balconies, which would directly influence future management and pruning of the trees.

If the loss of trees is accepted, Policy LP29 requires 46 trees to be replaced. Please request an updated Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement which reflects the proposal.

PCC Wildlife Officer (07.12.20 and 18.06.21)

No objection - The main issues on this site are arboricultural. None of the trees appear to have bat roosting potential and there's very little ecological interest so do not think there's anything ecological needed in particular. The potential for net gain delivery is negligible so the suggested nest boxes is a pragmatic approach in such an urban setting.

Some of the locations of the boxes will need to be adjusted to fit in with the new design however this is not a large amount of work.

Conditions are sought with respect to the protection of nesting birds and the development to be implemented in accordance with the submitted Ecological Management Plan.

PCC Open Space Officer (27.10.20)

Object - It would appear that there is an intention to develop non-PCC Public Open Space. Adhering to Policy LP23 within the Peterborough Local Plan this should be protected. Furthermore it indicates that new development that would result in the loss of POS will not be supported unless the criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are met.

Also draw your attention to PCC Tree Officer's comments regarding this proposed development. To confirm, the loss of these mature trees is unacceptable to PCC.

PCC Archaeological Officer (04.11.21)

No objection - The Desk Based Assessment submitted to support the current application would suggest that there is moderate potential for finds and features dating from the Prehistoric, Roman and Medieval periods in the general area. Although some degree of disturbance may be anticipated as the result of the former use of the site, nonetheless there are important Prehistoric, Roman and Medieval remains and find-spots known from the surrounding areas. Therefore, the

proposed development site has a moderate risk to contain preserved archaeology in undisturbed/least disturbed pockets of land.

Given the anticipated degree of disturbance, archaeological monitoring of all groundwork should be secured by condition.

PCC Strategic Housing (08.11.21)

No objection - This revised mix is acceptable:

Level 0: 10 x 1b2p, 4 x 2b3p & 4 x 2b4p flats

Level 1: 10 x 1b2p, 10 x 2b3p & 3 x 2b4p flats

Level 2: 9 x 1b2p, 7 x 2b3p & 3 x 2b4p flats

As the intention is to deliver all of the dwellings as affordable rented tenure, in accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan, all dwellings should meet Building Regulations Part M4(2), unless they are exceptional design reasons for not being able to do so. On all development proposals of 50 dwellings or more, 5% of homes should meet Building Regulations Part M4(3)(2)(a). In this instance that would equate to 3 dwellings. Policy LP8 also says that all new rented tenure affordable housing will be required to be built to meet minimum National Space Standards (as defined by Building Regulations).

Environment Agency (12.10.20 and 01.11.21)

No objection.

Lead Local Drainage Authority (26.01.22)

No objection - Subject to a condition being appended with respect to a condition being attached with respect to construction technical details for all drainage assets and a detailed maintenance and management schedule for all drainage assets.

Anglian Water Services Ltd (03.11.21)

No objection - There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site; an informative is sought to be attached should permission be granted.

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Peterborough (Flag Fen) Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991.

The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is acceptable. Request that the agreed strategy is reflected in the planning approval.

PCC Pollution Control (08.11.21)

Object - The submitted noise assessment has failed to demonstrate the suitability of the location for residential development. Further, the internal layout of the proposed development has not been designed to take into account the likelihood of noise nuisance from external or internal sources.

However, should planning permission be granted, conditions should be attached securing an updated noise assessment, details of glazing and whole unit ventilation, which ensure satisfactory temperatures for residents, as well as uncovering unsuspected contaminated land.

Waste Management (14.10.20)

Object – The Local Highway Authority have confirmed that Goodwin Walk cannot be used to accommodate anything other than buses, as such it cannot be used for refuse collection vehicles.

The development far exceeds the maximum drag distances for certain residential units, as well as

the drag distances for refuse collection crews, which is set out under the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service (26.10.21)

No objection - Should the Planning Authority be minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority would ask that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants, which may be by way of Section 106 agreement or a planning condition.

The number and location of Fire Hydrants will be determined following Risk Assessment and with reference to guidance contained within the "National Guidance Document on the Provision of Water for Fire Fighting" 3rd Edition, published January 2007.

If there are any buildings on the development that are over 11 metres in height (excluding blocks of flats) not fitted with fire mains, then aerial (high reach) appliance access is required, the details of which can be found in the attached document.

Werrington Neighbourhood Council

Object – The need for housing, especially affordable housing, is acknowledged. Generally, WNC support development of the Staniland Court site as it forms an important part of the Centre, which is desperate for regeneration and increased footfall to support the existing shops and services. Despite adjustments being made to the original plans, however, we still oppose the development described in the application for the following reasons:

1. Open space and the environment

- i) The ground floor flats only have a minute garden and no communal open space so the surroundings are not in keeping with the local character especially given the importance that Peterborough & Werrington gives to open spaces,
- ii) There could be around 140 people with no access to any substantial open space. There is no space for parents with younger children, children to play on their bikes, people to sit out after work, older generations to sit out nor even space for hanging out washing. Covid 19 has demonstrated that how important access to open space is to health and mental health.
- iii) Given that half of these flats have more than one bedroom there could be over 30 families with children putting these children within the Werrington Centre courtyard. The shop owners already describe the damage caused by the juveniles playing. (The 'Post and Packing' shop currently has a smashed window caused by a football). Local open space is 5 mins or more walk away. 60 households looking for an immediate space to relax, play and socialise is going to add to the antisocial problems.
- iv) The area is losing a large informal open space, numerous trees and extensive shrubbery areas. It cannot be said that the landscaping and installation of bat and bird boxes described in the ecological report gives compensatory environment benefit nor enhanced biodiversity. The trees in the car park will be vulnerable to car damage, run off and root compaction.
- v) Given Peterborough's Environment City status and the need to achieve sustainability, there are no obvious zero carbon initiatives.

2. Antisocial behaviour

- i) Werrington Centre is already subject to antisocial behaviour: drug taking, petty crime and vandalism (e.g. stealing of artificial grass, damage to canopy), youths loitering making it a no go area (see 1 iii)
- ii) By enclosing the Centre and making narrow approaches this will encourage more antisocial behaviour. The flats are not facing in the right direction to provide natural surveillance.
- iii) In the appeal decision of application: APP/J0540/W/19/3221876 the inspector said of Werrington Centre the following: Proposals should be 'safe and designed to minimise crimes and anti-social behaviour...'; any development should be 'well-spaced built form, ... have views through the central area, ... prevent a sense of enclosure ... have a spacious appearance and ... not an enclosing effect on the appearance of the precinct's central area'. None of these Inspector's views have been addressed in this new application.
- iv) The above appeal also refers to the installation of CCTV as follows: 'recourse to such measure

does not indicate a proposal which constitutes good design ... and does not render the enclosed walkways more attractive ... It does not overcome the public safety concerns'. This applies equally Goodwin Walk walkway in this application.

v) There is no convincing argument about how antisocial aspects will be addressed e.g. given the CCTV blind spots especially around the canopied area, how/where the enhanced lighting will improve things.

3. Design and Height of building

i) There are no residential developments of this height and style and it is out of character with the immediate area and Werrington.

ii) The structure will overwhelm Goodwin Walk and the landscaped treelined setting. It only stands a short way back from the edge of the road and is out of character for the design of the road.

iii) The distance between the structure and Ploverly/Crowhurst is only just over the minimum legally permitted distance (being 24 metres at the narrowest point). As these flats have kitchens and lounge accommodation at 1st/2nd floor level and the large windows and Juliette balconies this will encourage people to stand at their windows/balconies and take the view - thereby directing looking into the windows and back gardens of residents opposite. Given the road, there is no landscaping to soften this. Therefore the overlooking aspect and loss of privacy is not acceptable for these residents directly opposite.

4. Bus stop and access path

i) The access to/from Goodwin Walk from the Centre will be a narrow path between the 3 storey flats/ 2 storey shops and the Dentist/Medical Centre. The visuals do not give a true impression of this access as they show a wide path enhanced by a well-trimmed border. In reality the border to the south owned by the Medical Centre is an overgrown shrubbed area with an overhanging tree thereby narrowing the path and giving a feeling of enclosure. This busy narrow access has the potential to create an unsafe path in an area already susceptible to antisocial behaviour and making the adjoining flats vulnerable to crime. (See 2 above).

ii) Ken Stimpson Community School has a significant number of pupils using the bus service. This enclosed space has impact for pupil movement passing by shops and flats creating problems for their chaperones. The accumulation of pupils in this space is too close to the bus pulling in thereby putting pupils at risk and creating disturbance for the flats.

iii) Visuals are suggesting there will be a crossing on Goodwin Walk which we understand is not the case.

iv) This narrow path will be the main way into the Centre for those living in East Werrington and this is not a welcoming gateway. It conflicts against the open spaciousness of the Centre design.

5. Infrastructure

i) This development will put increased traffic on the already busy Staniland Way. The pinch point is the David's Lane roundabout with queuing traffic at school run times backing onto the Paston Parkway roundabout in the morning and down Staniland Way in the afternoon taking many many minutes of queuing. When Ken Stimpson Community School was proposing to expand, the proposed changes to the roundabout layout confirmed the local roads inability to handle increased volumes of traffic.

ii) The suggested increase in traffic seems very under estimated. In the morning there are three shops with employees opening up, customers arriving and shop deliveries, home deliveries and workmen, school runs (given that many local secondary pupils travel to Arthur Mellows) and people going to work. The majority of people now use a supermarket delivery service and online shopping and this is not reflected in the dated traffic data being supplied. It is impossible to suggest that 60 flats and 3 shops generates comparable traffic to an office last occupied approx. ten years ago where approx. 30 people worked. Similarly the peak time pm is being shown as Friday 5pm to 6pm. Tesco's is not the generator of traffic as this is a small supermarket used predominately by people on foot. The peak time is earlier with the school run of William Law and Ken Stimpson and when Igo4 and Olympus House employees leave. Most office workers on a Friday will have left by 5pm. The Centre dynamics are not understood by the applicant as the wrong peak times are being addressed.

iii) The local Doctors and Dentists are already under significant strain.

iv) We note that Section 106 aspects are being considered by other residents.

6. Shop Units

- i) With the stated need for housing why aren't the shop units being used to create residential units.
- ii) There are empty units within the Centre desperate for occupancy. With no demand, there is the prospect for these new units to remain empty with the potential for antisocial behaviour.
- iii) This will move the retail sector into the narrow access point outside the foot print of the current Centre
- iv) The shop buildings block the current open access thereby enclosing the Centre to create a courtyard effect, a bottle neck and narrow access. This is contrary to the open plan nature of the Centre and general green openness which characterises Werrington. The Centre deserves a better gateway from the east.

7. Car parking and transport

- i) The proposed car parking is inadequate for the number of potential residents. Given that the City Council have parking standards we cannot understand why these are being so radically overturned for this application. Having read the parking assessment we would reflect on the following:
 - There is no provision for motorcycles with the National Travel Survey suggesting that at least 2 motorcycles would need to be accommodated
 - There are 30 two/three bedroom flats therefore most of the case studies are irrelevant as they refer to one bedroom flats.
 - Werrington is not a transport hub with only one suitable bus route so therefore it cannot be related to a City Centre location.
- ii) People will be arriving home at night to find no parking. No one will chose leave a car in the Tesco carpark overnight and the walk through the Centre is unsafe in the dark especially for women. People will choose to park in the adjoining residential areas which are already suffering their own parking problems. If people park in Skaters Way it will affect the trade of those local businesses.
- iii) The future of unrestricted car parking is questionable in the Tesco car park. Despite acknowledging this, the report still refers to this as a 'public carpark'. Free unrestricted parking will surely end if the development is built bringing into question longer car parking for users of the library and Sports Centre.
- iv) The main bus service going into the City is a slow and unreliable with no services for people on early and late shifts and does not reach out to employment areas. Having a car is important for most people in employment, seeking work or for older people to keep their independence.
- v) The other two listed services are the Call Connect service for designed for Lincolnshire residents linking villages to Peterborough and Stamford (Per Call Connect the service is not for commuters and rarely comes into Werrington) and a meandering service linking the northern villages to the City. The inclusion of these timetables gives the misleading impression of an extensive bus connection to a wider area.

8. Consultation.

- i) There is no opportunity for anyone not online to see these proposals. Werrington's older generation are proportionally the biggest users of the Centre and they have not had the chance to adequately express their opinions on this.
- ii) The visuals are giving concern giving the depiction of spacious alleyways and crossings on Goodwin Walk.

9. Emerging Neighbourhood Plan

In October/November 2019 a community questionnaire was undertaken by Werrington Area Forum to support the emerging Neighbourhood Plan with over 1,000 residents responding. Extracts from the output of the questionnaire include the following:

- 70% are against flats being built in Werrington
- 99% want retention of existing open spaces
- 89% are concerned about the future of Werrington Centre
- 72% are concerned about levels of crime

- 73% are concerned about antisocial behaviour
- 39% are concerned about parking at Werrington Centre

Respondents were also encouraged to make comments and the highest responses refer to: the decline of Werrington Centre/lack of shops and concern about future development in Werrington.

Second Round

We note the changes to the application. We continue to object to the application as per our comments submitted on 7th July 2021, the main concerns being the proposed 3 storey flat development being out of keeping with the surrounding area and Werrington in general, the parking not being in line with the required standards, the impact of traffic in the surrounding roads especially the junction with Davids Lane and the lack of open space provision.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

The application has been subject to a number of rounds of public consultation. Each round, the Case Officer has summarised these comments, therefore these have been presented as First, Second and Third Round. In the interests of conciseness, Officers have endeavoured to avoid repeating any matters raised.

Initial consultations: 64
 Total number of responses: 224
 Total number of objections: 200
 Total number in support: 15

First Round

Objections

Design Matters

- Size scale and appearance out of keeping with the Centre and area; the maximum height of Werrington is two storeys;
- The proposal would introduce a bland building which could simply belong anywhere;
- Overdevelopment of the site;
- New developments should match the character and built form of surrounding area, proposed development does not;
- The proposal would diminish permeability and connectivity of the area;
- Policy LP37 requires that proposals for the redevelopment of Werrington Centre be brought forward as part of Master planning proposals for the whole area, in order that coherent, joined up development takes place;
- This type of high density development risks becoming the slums of the future
- The design of the block of flats appears to be based on functionality only with little consideration given to the setting of the site. Three storey construction is out of keeping and should be dropped to two storey to match surrounding houses. "Pitch Roof" designs should also be stipulated thereby matching all the surrounding buildings, this will also assist the new buildings to blend into the existing environment;
- The proposed elevations of the block of flats are more suitable to an industrial/office block setting with little thought to the aesthetics. Mass brick elevations as proposed without any relief will create an overwhelming sense of being enclosed and bland with the east elevation in particular being of concern. The aesthetic design of these blocks of flats should be revisited with a view to making the overall impression of the development more in keeping with the local environment and being somewhere where people will be pleased to live in and look after
- New developments should improve the quality of the housing stock and residential environment. A development of social low cost accommodation does not meet these requirements;
- This plan would build over existing walkways, which we thought was illegal;
- Will the new bus stop be large enough for buses to turn around?

Existing and Future Occupier Amenity

- Loss of privacy and overbearing on neighbour amenity;
- Future occupiers would be able to look into windows of neighbours, particularly those along Crowhurst and Ploverly;
- Can Peterborough City Council push for sound-proofing for all flats when they are built, to protect future occupier amenity?;
- We are in the midst of a worldwide pandemic; Planning Committee should be required to consider the potential impact on the mental health of prospective residents. High density, battery hen housing, with no ready access to quality outside space is causing too many mental health lockdown issues. There are no communal gardens or areas of outdoor recreation for any age groups.

Highway Matters

- Lack of car parking to serve the development;
- Concerns re the amount of additional traffic generated by the proposal, particularly along Staniland Way junction and David's Lane roundabout during peaks hours;
- The roundabout at David's Lane suffers minor accidents on a regular basis;
- The scheme would remove the bus stop;
- The proposed bus stop would be closer to the road, and the associated increase in traffic would force school children to wait on the footpaths and would be placed at risk when walking to school;
- The shared vehicle access with servicing vehicles, including HGVs, raises safety issues;
- If this permission is granted there must be a reconsideration of the one way system/bus lanes etc. to allow traffic to flow more freely in this area;
- The proposal would result in cars using Goodwin Walk;
- There is no provision for electric car charging in the car park;
- No indication of secure cycle parking provision has been made for users of the shopping centre?
- The technical note on parking provision fails to provide a full rationale for why Local Plan parking provision requirements will not be met. The analysis cites car ownership figures from the 2001 census. Such data would have been available when setting the requirements of the Local Plan and is therefore already taken into account in the local requirements and cannot be overridden with such rationale. Local public transport provision and city accessibility does not equate to lower car ownership as residents of outlying suburbs such as Werrington remain likely to possess cars for other, longer journeys and therefore still require parking provision at their place of residence;
- The assumptions of the analysis are therefore fundamentally flawed, at odds with the Local Plan requirements and fail to make a robust case for the reduced parking provision;
- No information considering junction capacity or safety at the site access point from Staniland Way is included within the application

Drainage and Flood Risk

- Goodwin Walk suffers from poor drainage and additional building will cause additional flooding;

Biodiversity and Open Space

- Loss of green space and trees;
- Impact on protected species and wildlife;
- The landscape scheme for the centre seems outline only and therefore subject to change?
- Removal of tress is unnecessary; Silver Maple do not suffer any worse that other tress with regard to falling branches, existing trees are in good condition
- the lack of provision of garden areas for the flats is worrying. The developer should be encouraged to prioritise providing garden space for future residents of the flats, rather than cramming people in as tightly as possible;
- The loss of open spaces and facilities would lead to higher mental health issues, poverty, crime and anti-social behaviour;
- The application includes no details relating to the sustainability credentials;
- The proposed 'Pocket Park' is merely another superficial revamp of the space between retail units, totally inappropriate for children to play and not conducive to a peaceful sit in the fresh air.

Crime

- Increased crime and anti-social behaviour;
- The centre has suffered from a lack of investment, with poor lighting and no CCTV;

All Other Matters

- Pressure on schools, doctors and dentists; these are already oversubscribed;
- There is plenty of new housing being built at Manor Drive;
- They should build bungalows or 10x dwellings; Send this proposal back. Demand lower density, and a better quality environment. It may be impossible to right the mistakes of the past, but it's a simple matter to avoid repeating them.
- This is a shopping centre and not a housing estate;
- There is a lack of demonstrable need for additional retail units at this location - with many existing units still empty in the existing centre;
- We do not need another fast foot outlet, phone shop or vaping shop;
- The local centre should be reinstated to its former glory and requires investment, not flats;
- It's my understanding that this development would make no contribution towards CIL or Sec. 106.
- The proposal would result in the loss of a view;
- There is already enough social housing in this area;
- Noise and disturbance during construction;
- The construction of the development, happening so close to other homes, will be considerable. How will this be mitigated? What contribution will be made to the community in return for this disruption?;
- Concerns with a sharp increase in population and a historic lack of infrastructure and services (doctors, dentists and school places)
- Devaluation of house prices
- Litter
- I live in Werrington and am appalled and dismayed that this planning application has been permitted to get even thus far;
- You have a duty to make clear what sort of people you intend to house in these flats.
- Disabled Access - it is noted that access to Levels 1 and 2 accommodations would be by stairs (no lifts), so only the ground floor would be suitable for those with reduced mobility issues.
- Additional highway information has been submitted, however, this has not been sent out for public consultation, as such due process has not been followed
- I can assure whoever is reading this that the locals are strongly against this but not many have the time or technical awareness to submit a comment.

Support

- By building flats it may give the centre a boost. It could bring new businesses in and create a more issuable space for the whole community;
- The need for more housing in the Werrington area is needed and as a young first time buyer this development would be an ideal first flat to buy;
- The plans also show improvements to the surrounding area which the area needs as it is currently neglected in its current state;
- I am strongly in favour of affordable housing;
- I do not understand why it is assumed that this development would add to anti-social behaviour,

Comments

- Whilst housing is definitely a need in Peterborough there must be plenty of sites that could be utilized. Werrington centre is carnage now with school traffic causing daily congestion, this will cause added pressure on medical and school services in the area. We need additional retail units to bring the area back to what it was and providing much needed services;
- I have no objection to homes and improvements to Werrington, but, I feel that a 3 storey is not in keeping with the surroundings. I also have concerns about the sustainability of the community services (doctors, schools etc.). I think it needs to go back to the drawing board;
- I'm not against the idea of new flats in the area at all. The designs seem complementary to the area. However the height (3 storeys) is not and I feel it would be oppressive and bring down the friendly suburban feel of Werrington. The path along the proposed build is pretty dark already and tall building would make it a narrow dark alleyway essentially. Additionally the current path is too

narrow for its purpose and often leads to congestion around school times etc. The current proposed plan looks like this would be made worse as people would be funnelled solely down that route with the alternative (along the curb on the bus stop side) would no longer exist;

- Not opposed to the building of dwellings but why build three additional retail units when you have three empty retail units within the centre, which have stood empty for ten plus years.

Second Round

Objections

The following additional matters have been raised, not previously raised within the first round of public consultation:

- The street elevation / layout plan whilst addressing Goodwin Walk does not continue or take into account the main symmetrical central path which runs through the adjacent housing and which previously addressed and accessed the Town Centre. From a quick scan of the drawings this seems poor urban design to me;
- There has been no improvements to the plan with the exception of reducing the number of flats. The problems identified by Anglian Water re flooding, drainage, increased traffic, noise pollution and associated costs have still not been resolved. The concerns of residents opposite and their right to privacy being overlooked by a block of flats, also disregarded. The established trees which will be removed, irrelevant to the developer. What is laughable however, is the developer employing a parking consultant to contest the provision of parking LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan which was only implemented in 2019. The consultants have decided that LP13 should not apply to them and imply all those local planners/consultants who advised on LP13 were incompetent;
- The council should be concentrating on rejuvenating the run down Werrington centre and encouraging traders to come back in;
- Unless you have a strategy where rates and rents are reduced, giving business' a chance to profit and recirculate tax for the benefit of the local community and insuring that all the retail units are occupied, I regret that I object to further retail units being developed
- This development proposes 3 & 2 storey blocks with metal mansard roofs which in my opinion is not in keeping with its surroundings.
- It is felt that this development would jeopardise my human rights and my safety;
- Fear of, and vulnerability to, crime
- Please take a step back and rethink these plans you could actually do something good different and imaginative for Werrington Centre and not lumber us with a slum on our doorstep.
- You are removing the petrol filling station and public house

Support

- Looks a great development and we need more quality affordable housing with easy access to village facilities;
- The current land is an eyesore, and the proposed development is broadly in keeping with the other property in the area. More homes are needed in this area as much as any other, and I would rather have them built on a brown field site like this than previously undeveloped green fields. I hope that the planners will take account of the provision of amenities in the area, but I don't expect that a development of this size will have a marked impact on existing provisions;
- I support the changes that have been made to earlier proposals and feel this is a good addition to affordable dwellings in the city;

Comments

- I don't object other than more housing requires more local police presence. The centre is bad enough as is. More homes mean more people hence my comments;
- I think the revised plans have taken many of the community concerns into consideration and I welcome the changes that have been proposed. It is reassuring to see the description of the type of tenants that will be encouraged and so I have no strong feelings either way despite the fact I would probably be able to see the new buildings from my garden.

Third Round

Objections

- The Werrington Centre should be master planned in accordance with Policy LP37;
- a district centre is primarily for shopping and community facilities not housing. Force the landlords to increase the diversity of retail outlets in the centre and bring back some of the shops that have been forced out by the landlord and Tesco's;
- New developments should improve the quality of the housing stock and residential environment. A development of social low cost accommodation does not meet these requirements;
- The local road network is blocked Monday to Friday because of the school, and at weekends due to Tesco;
- Moving the bus stop will endanger children and OAPS;
- The loss of the bus hub would be detrimental to the community;
- Cars already speed along Goodwin Walk and the proposal would create a ratrun;
- inadequate parking provision; the access arrangements are not acceptable or safe;
- Overdevelopment of the site, three storey would be out of keeping with the area, as well as Werrington overall;
- The development would result in the loss of openness;
- The development would result in an increase in crime and anti-social behaviour;
- Policy LP12 Werrington centre should cater for the needs of the community; empty shop units and anti-social behaviour do cater for these needs;
- Loss of privacy, overlooking and overbearing impact to adjacent residents;
- No details of the sustainable credentials of the development;
- The community consultation shows overriding preference for two storey only;
- Noise pollution;
- the area is overcrowded;
- Goodwin Walk suffers from poor drainage;
- The loss of trees is unnecessary, and the development would not provide satisfactory greenspace;
- There is not need for new retail units, a number of existing units have been vacant for years;
- We do not want lots of charity shops, we want a varied plethora of shops and the centre to be welcoming instead of a rundown area;
- Send this proposal back. Demand lower density, and a better quality environment. It may be impossible to right the mistakes of the past, but it's a simple matter to avoid repeating them.
- There is no need, it doesn't benefit anyone except the company who owns them; and
- Local services are at capacity.

Support

- The area looks run down and the plans will provide much needed improvement; and
- We have an urgent need for more affordable housing in Werrington and for regeneration of the Werrington Centre and so I support the proposed redevelopment

Councillor John Fox has called this application to Committee on several grounds, but mainly as it is out of character for the area, removal of bus terminal, no Green spaces for tenants to use and concerns about building more retail units.

MP Bristow has relayed the following concerns made by residents:

- Loss of residential amenity for neighbours
- Scale of the development - out of character for the area;
- Traffic Issues on Staniland Way - this already busy road will be placed under further pressure, particularly at peak times when there are already queues on the surrounding roads;
- Parking - the number of bays in the proposed development will not meet the needs of residents, with a potential flow-on impact on the already busy Tesco car park;
- Crime and anti-social behaviour - so much has been learnt about the way estate and developments should be built to 'design out' crime and anti-social behaviour, and there is concern that this proposal does not do that effectively;

- Access to public services - there is a serious concern that public services, including schools and surgeries, will be put under further pressure;
- Drainage and flooding issues have not been addressed; and
- The unnecessary removal of trees.

Peterborough Civic Society

Object - Peterborough Civic Society support the proposed provision of affordable rented apartments, and are of the opinion that the redevelopment will assist the regeneration of Werrington Centre. The Society is also pleased to note that their concerns regarding the scale of the proposed housing blocks, voiced in response to the pre-application publicity conducted by Athene, have been taken into account in the preparation of the revised scheme. Nonetheless, the Society continues to have strong reservations concerning certain aspects of the submitted proposals.

The site forms part of a landscaped urban space created with the housing scheme opposite on Goodwin Walk. However, the proposed layout and design fail to respect the visual character of this well-established urban area.

The proposed three-storey flat roofed apartment blocks are out of scale with the existing Centre and nearby housing. Blocks 2 and 3 press hard against the footpath presenting a long over-bearing elevation to Goodwin Walk.

The architectural form of the proposed development is thus alien to the surrounding area where everything is pitched and hipped. It is recognised that an attempt has been made to relieve the linear effect along Goodwin Walk by means of different tones in brick colour, but this fails to obviate the overwhelming impact of the virtually continuous horizontal emphasis.

The submitted proposals thus fail to have regard to the original design concept for Werrington Township, and to Werrington Centre in particular.

The positioning of the apartment blocks obstructs a well-used pedestrian route to the District Centre shops. It is inevitable that from within the site itself future occupants will walk to the Centre shops. The pedestrian link between the proposed apartments and shops should thus be more clearly defined, with clear separation between the walkway and parking areas whilst dissuading residents from accessing the Centre passed the bin store.

Finally, the Society's concern regarding the need for development to have regard to the established architectural character of Werrington Centre was supported by an Inspector in an appeal decision issued in September 2019 dismissing an appeal against the Council's refusal of permission for the erection of two single storey shop units on land adjacent to Werrington Police Station at 6A Skaters Way (application 18/00667/FUL). The Inspector stated:-

11. I acknowledge representations on the desirability of regenerating the Werrington Centre. However, I consider that the harm to the centre's spacious and verdant appearance which the proposal would involve would not contribute positively to such an aspiration.

12. The proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, with resulting conflict with Policy LP16 of the PLP, which states that proposals will be required to demonstrate that they respect the context of the site and surrounding area. They should additionally respond appropriately to existing natural features that contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness, and existing views into, out of or through the site.

Peterborough Civic Society thus object to the application on grounds that the proposed siting, scale and architectural design of the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and to Werrington Centre in particular.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

- a) The Principle of Development
- b) Affordable Housing
- c) Loss of public open space
- d) Design and Layout
- e) Crime
- f) Access and Parking
- g) Neighbour Amenity
- h) Amenity of Future Occupiers
- i) Biodiversity
- j) Drainage
- k) Contamination
- l) Archaeology
- m) Legal Matters
- n) Other Matters

a) The Principle of Development

The application site is situated within the Urban Area of the City and the Werrington District Centre, and is a scheme proposing 100% affordable housing, therefore the principle of development would accord with Policies LP2, LP8 and LP12, 'providing that the proposed development is otherwise suitable in the light of all other policies in the development plan'.

The service yard and former office building are shown to be situated within a Primary Shopping Area (PSA). Blocks 1, 2 and 3 would be situated within the PSA, Block 3 of which would provide retail at ground floor, where it is considered the introduction of additional retail, as well as residential accommodation, into an established District Centre would go towards enhancing the vitality and viability of the centre through increased footfall during the day and night time, and is accepted in this instance.

A letter of representation has been received, which has referred to Policy LP37. This policy states there is a requirement that proposals for the redevelopment of Werrington Centre be brought forward as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the whole area, in order that coherent, joined up development takes place. As confirmed by the Council's Planning Policy team, the idea for Werrington Centre was that there would be wider regeneration of the whole centre, mainly the shopping area, where it was estimated that this could include up to 200 dwellings. This proposal of 59x dwellings would go towards the 200x dwelling figure in the Local Plan, however, this proposal is a standalone planning application and is not part of any wider regeneration plans of the district centre. Therefore, Officers are of the view that there is no need for this application to form a masterplan in this instance.

b) Affordable Housing

As detailed above, the application seeks to provide 59no. affordable residential units. The proposed housing mix would be 100% affordable comprising:

- Level 0: 10 x 1b2p, 4 x 2b3p & 4 x 2b4p flats
- Level 1: 10 x 1b2p, 7 x 2b3p & 5 x 2b4p flats
- Level 2: 9 x 1b2p, 7 x 2b3p & 3 x 2b4p flats

In accordance with Policy LP8, the proposed development would accord with M4(2) accessible dwellings and M4(3) wheelchair dwellings of the building regulations, as well as the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (DCLG, 2015).

Referring to the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (published in 2017), this identified a need to deliver 559 new affordable homes per year to meet all affordable housing need in the Peterborough area. The current anticipated number of new affordable homes to be completed in 2020/21 is 301, with 680 affordable homes completed between 2016 and 2020. This clearly falls

far short of the requirement set out in the SHMA. As such, it cannot be demonstrated that the need for such homes in Peterborough is being met; this proposal would generate significant benefits to the City, which is afforded considerable weight in the planning balance.

c) Loss of Public Open Space

Policy Considerations

The Council's Open Space Officer has advised that the proposed development would result in the loss of an area of open space which is not owned by Peterborough City Council. Policy LP23 states '*existing non-designated open spaces will, in principle, be protected from development. New development that will result in the loss of existing open space will not be supported, unless the criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) are met*'.

Paragraph 99 of the NPPF (2021) states, '*Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:*

- a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or*
- b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or*
- c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use'.*

LP23 then goes on to state '*In addition, if the requirements of the NPPF (2021) can be satisfied, the proposal must also demonstrate that:*

- a. The open space does not make an important contribution to the green infrastructure network or connectivity of habitats, and the development would not result in landscape or habitat fragmentation or incremental loss; and*
- b. The proposed development can be accommodated on the open space without causing significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, ecology or any heritage assets'*

Discussion

With respect to the Peterborough Open Space Strategy (Atkins, 2016), Werrington Ward is expected to experience a population decrease of -4.35%, from 11,500 to 11,000 by 2036. Referring to Table 6-2 (Page 59), this sets out the quantitative deficiency of open space per type, per ward. Within Werrington Ward, there is an excess of 3.7ha of neighbourhood parks, a 0.18ha shortfall of children's play, and 3.34ha shortfall of allotments. However any surplus should not be taken to mean surplus to requirements.

In accordance with Policy LP23, the starting point is Paragraph 99 of the NPPF (2021). The application has not been accompanied by an assessment which demonstrates that there is a clear surplus of open space or land, the development would not be replaced by an equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity or quality in a suitable location, and the development is not for an alternative sport or recreation provision. Whilst this assessment should not rest on the shoulders of Officers, the application site is situated within a District Centre, the area of non-designated POS is for all intents and purposes an area of land surrounded by roads (bus route), and amounts to 0.01ha in overall area.

With respect to Policy LP23(a), the area of open space is not considered to make an important contribution to the green infrastructure network or connectivity of habitats, and it would not result in landscape or habitat fragmentation or incremental loss. Further, it is unlikely that this area of land would be forthcoming as a children's play area or allotment, and as noted above, there is a surplus

of neighbourhood parks within the Ward.

With respect to Policy LP23(b), there are wider character and appearance concerns, which are discussed elsewhere within this report, however, there has been no objections from the Council's Wildlife Officer.

This proposed development would result in the loss of 0.01ha of non-designed public open space, however, Werrington Ward has a surplus of neighbourhood park POS, and the land itself does not lend itself to be used as a neighbourhood park, children's play area or allotment. As such, the loss of non-designated POS is accepted in this instance. Furthermore, the benefit arising from the provision of the affordable units is considered to weigh against this limited harm such that the scheme is acceptable in this regard.

New POS provision

The proposed development would not provide any on-site public open space, therefore to accord with Policy LP21, an off-site public open contribution of £43,949.79 + 5 years maintenance costs is required. This would be to upgrade the following owing to increased usage demand arising from the development:

- Neighbourhood Parks (POS): £25,015.09 + 5 years maintenance costs for enhancement of Cuckoo's Hollow Open Space.
- Children's Play: £11,082.13 + 5 years maintenance costs for enhancement of Copsewood Play Area.
- Allotments: £2,409.78 + 5 years maintenance costs for enhancement of Werrington Allotments.
- Natural Greenspace (NGS): £5,442.79 + 5 years maintenance costs for enhancement of Cuckoo's Hollow Open Space

The above would be secured by way of a Section 106 legal agreement. It should be noted that the Council's Open Space Officer has advised that such a contribution would not cover the loss of established POS and mature trees within the site arising from the proposed development. However such a contribution would not be in place of this loss which is accepted as above, it would be to enhance existing provision to meet the needs of future occupiers.

As such, the proposal would accord with Policies LP16, LP21 and LP23 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 99 of the NPPF (2021).

d) Design and Layout

Paragraphs 42 and 67 of The National Design Guide (2021) states that well-designed new development responds positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond the site boundary. It enhances positive qualities and improves negative ones. Well-designed places use the right mix of building types, forms and scale of buildings and public spaces for the context and the proposed density, to create a coherent form of development that people enjoy. They also adopt strategies for parking and amenity that support the overall quality of the place.

Paragraphs 130 of the NPPF (2021) states, 'planning ... decisions should ensure that developments ... will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; ... [and] ... create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users'.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF (2021) states, 'permission should be refused for development of poor

design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions ...'

Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) is also relevant.

The District Centre has a strong sense of place, the character of which is largely defined by single storey buildings with large roofscapes and overhanging eaves, the materials which are typically brick and tile. The exceptions to this are Sundance House and Olympus House, which are two storey office buildings situated to the north-east and north-west of the centre, which also benefit from large roofscapes and overhanging eaves. This design is atypical for local and district centres designed by the Development Corporation during the 1970s and 1980s. Residential development within the immediate vicinity (Crowhurst and Ploverly) is typically two storey semi-detached and terraced properties situated within distinctive pattern of development, with parking bays to front and good levels of landscaping and areas of open green space. This strong pattern of permeability and landscaping carries through to the District Centre.

This application has been subject to amended plans, which can broadly be summarised as follows:

- Blocks 1 and 2 have been separated (formerly one block), reduced to three storey and set back from Goodwin Walk;
- Block 3 has been reduced to two storey, as well as overall footprint;
- The roof design of all 3 blocks have been amended from a flat roof to a mansard roof design;
- The overall number of residential units have been reduced to 59;
- The number of car parking spaces to serve the development has increased;
- Access for a refuse collection vehicle has been confirmed from the Tesco service yard;
- Additional cycle storage and refuse areas have been provided;
- The existing bus stop would be relocated to Goodwin Walk; and
- The provision of a 'pocket park' has been removed from the scheme.

Layout

As with other Development Corporation schemes elsewhere within the City, these are characterised by strong patterns of development with high levels of permeability and established areas of landscaping. Officers note that the proposal would result in the loss of a historic bus stop, which was capable of allowing buses to turn, and would relocate a number of footpaths linking the Centre to Crowhurst and Ploverly to the east. However, the proposed scheme would retain a pedestrian link from the Centre to Goodwin Walk, which would be situated adjacent to the Health Centre and Dentists Surgery, where a replacement bus stop would be secured (by condition and S106 legal agreement) should planning permission be recommended for approval.

Whilst this alternative layout would result in a slightly increased journey time by foot, it is considered to provide a clear line of sight from the Centre to Goodwin Walk, where there would be good levels of natural surveillance, during the daytime and night-time, from Blocks 2 and 3.

With respect to the proposed layout and further to the receipt of amended plans, the proposed blocks are considered to follow the rhythm of buildings and established pattern of development of the area, and the introduction of a car park on what is largely a disused brownfield site, is not considered to harm the character or appearance of the District Centre, and is accepted in this instance.

Blocks 1 and 2

Further to the receipt of amended plans, Blocks 1 and 2 would stand at three storeys; these would utilise a mansard roof design, with a regimented arrangement of windows and doors. Materials proposed are four different colours of bricks (Dark, Mid and Light Red, with a Cream / Red Brick), which have been put forward to break up the overall massing of the blocks. The mansard and dormer windows would utilise a metal cladding, and upper floor windows serving lounge / diners would utilise Juliet balconies.

Blocks 1 and 2 have also been repositioned further to the east, to improve the relationship with the pedestrian footpath and trees which line Goodwin Walk. The ground floor units which face Goodwin Walk would be served by a dedicated pedestrian footpath leading to front doors, which is considered to add visual interest and ties these residential properties to the street. The proposed units on the west elevation would have small areas of landscaping proposed at ground floor, which would provide an element of defensive space. There would be two communal access points to the upper floors serving each block.

Officers are minded that one of the defining characteristics of the street scene and local centre is large roofscapes, typically with overhanging eaves. The scheme has been subject to amended which has replaced a flat roof with a mansard roof, and sought to use a palette of materials which would be in keeping with the character of the area (reds and browns). Whilst dormer windows are not a defining characteristic, the use of a mansard roof does provide visual relief on the third floor and adds visual interest. As such, the use of a mansard roof in this location is accepted in this instance.

Given the constraints of the site, the set back from Goodwin Walk and adjacent buildings, Officers do consider that the application site is capable of accommodating a building which is up to three storeys in height. Further to the receipt of amended plans, this has split one large block into two, it has repositioned the blocks away from Goodwin Walk and introduced design features which ties the building into the street scene, and it has removed the flat roof design and replaced it with mansard roof. As such, by reason of size, scale and juxtaposition, Blocks 1 and 2 are not considered to unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the area, and are accepted in this instance.

Block 3

This block is crucial in linking the proposed development to the Werrington Centre. This block has been reduced in overall footprint and has been amended in line with Blocks 1 and 2, reducing the building from three storeys to two storeys and now proposes a mansard roof.

Officers are extremely conscious that the Werrington Centre is defined predominantly by single storey buildings with large, low-pitched roofscapes with overhanging eaves, and Block 3 would be positioned on a similar building line when walking between the Centre and Goodwin Walk. By reason of Block 3's juxtaposition to the Centre and its proposed size, scale, massing and mansard roof design, it is acknowledged that to some degree it would stand in isolation, forming a somewhat jarring feature which would be visually prominent from the public realm. However, Block 3 ties in with Blocks 1 and 2, and an appropriate colour of materials would be used. It would also act as a 'stepping stone' to the building heights and form between the proposed and existing. As such, in this instance, it is accepted.

Loss of Open Space

The loss of public open space (POS) is discussed above. Policy LP23(b) requires an assessment as to the loss of non-designated POS on the character and appearance of the area. As set out above, the area of POS is bounded by Goodwin Walk and a bus stop / turning area. Whilst it does have amenity value within the wider street scene, the benefits of bringing forward a 100% affordable scheme are considered to outweigh the 0.01ha loss of POS in this instance. For the avoidance of doubt, Officers typically resist any loss of POS in principle, however, for the specific reasons outlined above, the loss of POS would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the area, and would be accepted in this instance.

Landscaping and public realm

The proposed development would introduce some elements of landscaping, however, it would largely be hard edged. The scheme no longer proposes a pocket park within the Centre, which is regrettably, however, it was omitted due to concerns of anti-social behaviour and crime, as confirmed by the Police. The lack of soft landscaping is not considered to give rise to an unacceptable adverse impact to the character or appearance of the area.

Summary

Due to the juxtaposition of Blocks 1 and 2, which would be set away from the Werrington Centre and situated adjacent to Goodwin Walk, which itself is subject to good levels of mature landscaping, the overall size, scale, massing and design of these blocks are considered to be acceptable. Block 3 would be situated within a prominent position with the Centre and introduce a two storey building, which would utilise a mansard roof onto a similar building line to neighbouring units in a centre which is characterised by single storey buildings with large, low-pitched roofs and overhanging eaves. As such, Block 3 is considered to be jarring to an extent, however, would not significantly erode the strong sense of place and is accepted in this instance.

The scheme would largely be hard landscaped, with some areas of soft landscaping, however, when considered within the context of the extension character of the centre, this is in itself unacceptable in this context.

Subject to conditions with respect to hard and soft landscaping, levels and materials, the proposed development would not have an unacceptably harmful impact on the character or appearance of the area, and would accord with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021).

Letters of representation have been received raising concerns: with the proposed size, scale and appearance of the building; that the maximum height of Werrington is two storeys; the proposal would introduce a bland building which could simply belong anywhere; and is overdevelopment of the site, however, for the reasons outlined above, it is considered the development could be accommodated on site without having an unacceptably adverse impact on the character of the area, and whilst it is noted that the height of adjoining development, each case is considered on its individual merits.

e) Crime

The Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) has identified the area as being at medium risk in terms of vulnerability from crime at present. There are known issues of burglary, criminal damage, vehicle and cycle crime, public order offences and drugs. The PALO has sought details of entrance doors (no trade buttons) and external post boxes, the cycle and bin storage areas (which should be fitted with suitable access control), details of boundary treatment to ground floor flats, as well as means of access and control. However, it is considered that these details could be controlled by suitably worded conditions, which could be implemented pre-occupation.

The PALO, liaising with the local Policing team, raised an objection to the proposed pocket park, and this has since been omitted from the proposal. The reason for this, is that historically, the local centre was used for drug dealing, hiding drugs, anti-social behaviour and resulted in rubbish, and there were wider issues of gang crime surrounding the local school, issues around Cookoo's Hollow and the Skate Park and county lines/exploitation. As such, much of the landscaping was removed. The Police strongly oppose the reintroduction of soft or hard landscaping within the centre, as it could result in an increase in crime and anti-social behaviour. Officers note that the Applicant was including the pocket part as a means of securing further public benefit from the proposal, improving the currently hard and poor public realm. However, on balance the crime risk was considered too great and Officers requested its removal from the scheme.

Subject to conditions being appended securing access security measures the proposal would accord with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019), and Paragraphs 92(b) and 130 (f) of the NPPF (2021).

A number of letters of representation have raised concerns of historic anti-social behaviour and crime in the Centre, which has been echoed by Councillors and MP Bristow. However, the PALO has not advised that this development would give rise to crime or anti-social behaviour, and satisfactory mitigation could be put in place to design out crime and ensure future occupiers would not be vulnerable to crime.

Letters of representation have asked who would be housed in the proposed accommodation; this is not a material planning consideration and cannot be considered.

f) Access and Parking

Further to the receipt of additional information, which includes a parking survey for the Werrington Centre (Tesco) car park and a parking beat survey of the area, the Local Highway Authority withdrawn its objection to the proposal.

Parking

A number of design iterations have been produced for this development since the original submission. Based on the housing mix proposed, Policy LP13 and Appendix C requires 102x parking spaces be provided, whereas only 75x parking spaces are proposed - a shortfall of 27x car parking spaces.

It is important to recognise that the Council's parking standards do not differentiate between flats or houses, or private/affordable ownership. As such, the Applicant has provided a parking technical note that refers to 2011 Census data and car ownership levels for flats within Peterborough. The data demonstrates that flats attract much lower levels of car ownership than houses, whereby flats attract an average car ownership of 0.53 per flat. In addition to this, evidence from the National Travel Survey in Appendix 2 or the Car Parking Technical Note shows household car availability. On the assumption that Peterborough reflects the national average, this gives a robust estimate of 0.62 cars per flat. Lastly, the agent has surveyed car ownership levels at 5 comparable affordable residential sites (3 sites in Peterborough), which shows a car ownership demand of less than one car per unit, which reinforces that parking demand for residents on the application site would be below 1x car per unit.

The Tesco car park currently has no parking restrictions and is otherwise a free car park, which is rarity. As it is a private car park, it could become subject to parking restrictions with automatic number plate recognition and limited parking periods for visitors at any time in the future, and as such it would not be reasonable for Officers to accept that the displaced car parking for residents could be accommodated within this car park on a permanent basis. If we were to do so, and parking restrictions were implemented, future occupiers could end up parking in unsafe locations within the public highway, to the detriment of the safety of other highway users.

For the avoidance of any doubt, the default position is for development to meet minimum parking standards, to avoid vehicles parking in unsafe locations within the highway, and causing an adverse highway safety hazard. However the Applicant has provided sufficient evidence for the Local Highway Authority to accept that, in this instance, 75x parking spaces for the 59x units proposed would be acceptable, and future occupiers or visitors would not park in unsafe locations within the public highway, causing an adverse highway safety hazard.

As Officers are accepting a reduce on-site parking provision, it is considered reasonable in this instance to remove permitted development rights for a change of use from C3 residential to C4 house in multiple occupation.

Service Yard

The proposed car park would displace a minimum of 20x marked car parking spaces and a cycle store within an established service yard, which appears to serve as staff car parking for both Tesco employees and adjacent retail units within the Centre.

A parking survey of the main Werrington Centre (Tesco) car park was undertaken in 2019, which demonstrated that the main Tesco car park would have capacity to accommodate the displaced staff car parking, however, the Ken Stimpson School has since been expanded and caters for a significantly larger number of students.

As a result of development approvals around the Werrington Centre, an updated Parking Survey was requested. This additional survey was carried out on Thursday the 25th November 2021 which

demonstrated that there would be significant spare capacity in the car park during peak times. As such, it has been demonstrated that there would be spare capacity for staff car parking, and this is accepted by the Local Highway Authority. This is accepted in respect of staff parking as the car park is within the ownership of the employer of the staff requiring parking and differs from the situation regarding future occupier parking.

Swept path analysis of the service yard was previously submitted as part of the Transport Assessment. Tesco have also undertaken their own tracking exercises to ensure that the development shall not interfere with the operation of their service yard. This is acceptable to the LHA.

Kerbside Parking

Having studied the data produced by the Parking Beat Survey, the LHA have advised that it demonstrates that there is a significant amount of on-street parking available in the vicinity of the development site. The survey work overall demonstrates that there is available parking provision within the local centre car park and public highway to accommodate the 18x spaces displaced by the revised service layout arrangement, in addition to the main Tesco car park.

The Local Highway Authority has noted should the displaced staff parking result in additional demand for on-street parking provision, and that the Applicant has agreed to pay for the implementation of parking prohibition traffic regulation orders (TRO) to address any highway problems that may develop as a result of the development. However, it is not considered that this can reasonably be secured by way of a legal agreement as such a TRO would need to be subject to its own public consultation and is therefore not a certain outcome.

In addition, Paragraph 57 of the NPPF (2021) states that planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) directly related to the development; and
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The LHA have accepted a reduced on-site parking provision for residents, that there would be capacity for displaced staff car parking within the main Werrington Centre (Tesco) car park, and that there is capacity for on-street parking along Skaters Way (within 100m of the application site). As the contribution sought is on the basis of 'any highway problems which may arise as a result of the development', there has been insufficient evidence to demonstrate whether this would in fact be the case. For example, the scheme has not been subject to robust modelling whereby off-site highway improvements to roundabouts or key junctions have been identified.

As such, it would not be reasonable in this instance to secure a financial contribution towards a traffic regulation order, which may or may not be required.

Bus Stop

The Applicant is proposing to relocate the bus stop that would be lost as a result of the proposal. Details of the relocated bus stop will need to be secured by planning condition, in agreement with the PCC Passenger Transport team.

Cycle parking

Two bike stores would be created within Block 3, which would be available to residents only. A condition shall be appended securing additional cycle parking to serve future retail staff, as well as mitigate the loss of the communal bike store which currently exists within the service yard.

Conclusion

It has been demonstrated that a reduced provision of on-site parking would be suitable in this instance, and satisfactory levels of cycle parking could be secured by condition. In addition to this, displaced staff car and cycle parking could be accommodated within the communal Werrington

(Tesco) car park, or on-street along Skaters Way. A safe access for refuse collection has also been demonstrated. Subject to conditions being attached with respect to securing a Construction Management Plan, a Travel Plan, parking and turning, bin storage as well as secure cycle parking, the development would not give rise to an adverse highway safety hazard, and the proposal would accord with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

g) Neighbour Amenity

Whilst there are no policies or supplementary planning documents which explicitly sets out separation distances between facing primary windows and principal amenity areas, the following are generally accepted separation distances which are used by Planning Officers at other Local Authorities in England.

Where a primary habitable room (such as a bedroom, living room or kitchen) faces another primary habitable room, Officers typically seek to achieve a separation distance of 21 metres, or 18 metres if these features are offset. These separation distances also apply where a primary habitable room faces a primary amenity space, which is the garden area immediately behind a dwelling, which is afforded the most weight. Where a three storey building faces a two storey building, Officers typically seek to achieve a separation distance of 25 metres. Lastly, where a primary window faces a two storey blank wall elevation, Officers typically seek to achieve a minimum separation distance of 14 metres.

It should be highlighted that where primary rooms face one another across a public highway, such as a road, the amount of weight which can be afforded would be less. Notwithstanding this, each case is considered on its own merits.

The nearest neighbours to the application site are as follows:

- 62 – 65 Crowhurst – This an end of terrace block of 4x flats with a comparatively shallow rear garden, but larger communal garden to the front;
- 28-31 Ploverly – This an end of terrace block of 4x flats with a comparatively shallow rear garden, but larger communal garden to the front;
- 27 Ploverly – This is an end of terrace dwelling, again with a shallow rear garden, but larger front garden;
- 22-26 Ploverly – These comprise a pair of semi-detached dwellings and a terrace of 3x dwellings, which utilise rear gardens, and the dwellings sited adjacent to the highway; and
- 15-21 Ploverly – An L-shaped two storey building with shallow rear garden, but communal garden to front.

It should be emphasised that these properties are situated east of the application site, on the opposite side of Goodwin Walk, which is host to a number of mature trees which line the road. Officers are conscious that landscaping does, in the fullness of time, die, therefore landscaping on its own cannot be considered to mitigate any unacceptable relationships.

62 – 65 Crowhurst, 28-31 Ploverly and 27 Ploverly

Further to reviewing the juxtaposition of the proposal to these neighbouring properties, there would be a minimum separation distance of 29 metres, 30 metres and 30 metres respectively between Block 1 and the rear wall of these neighbours. As these properties benefit from very shallow gardens, the main garden is considered to be situated to the front. Therefore, given the separation distances and the intervening bus route, which carries pedestrians, cyclists and buses, the relationship to these neighbours are considered to be acceptable in this instance.

22-26 Ploverly

Further to reviewing the juxtaposition of the proposal to these neighbouring properties, the closest dwelling and its primary amenity space, there would be a minimum separation distance of 37 metres. As such, given the separation distances involved, and the intervening bus route, which carries pedestrians, cyclists and buses, the relationship is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

15-21 Ploverly

There would be a minimum separation distance of 36 metres between Block 2 and the nearest dwelling. As these properties benefit from very shallow gardens, the main garden is considered to be situated to the front. As such, given the separation distances involved, and the intervening bus route, which carries pedestrians, cyclists and buses, the relationship is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

Given the separation distances, it is not considered the proposed development would form an unacceptably adverse overbearing impact on the amenity of adjacent residential properties, it would not result in unacceptably adverse loss of light, privacy or outlook, and the relationship is accepted in this instance. As such, the proposal would accord with Policy LP17(a) of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Officers are conscious that there are a number of businesses that adjoin the application site, however the proposed development is not considered to give rise to unacceptably adverse levels of amenity harm, and the relationship is accepted.

Letters of representation have raised concerns with respect to a loss of privacy however, as set out above, the proposed separation distances would exceed the guidance, and therefore the relationships are accepted in this instance. The matter of noise and disturbance during construction is addressed below.

h) Future Occupier Amenity

Noise

The Council's Pollution Control Officer has objected to the proposal, advising that the submitted noise assessment has failed to demonstrate the suitability of the location for residential development. Further, the internal layout of the proposed development has not been designed to take into account the likelihood of noise nuisance from external or internal sources.

The application site is situated within an established Local Centre, where a number of adjacent units utilise some form of air handling unit. The Ploughman holds music events, including within the rear yard throughout the year, and there is a car wash associated with a nearby petrol filling station, as well as an adjacent dentist and medical facility. In addition to this, immediately adjacent to the application is a communal service delivery yard serving Tesco and a number of other business units, which could be used 24-hours a day, 7x days a week as no planning conditions restrict this use. Activities associated with the service yard include, but are not limited to, the manoeuvring of vehicles, reversing beepers, forklifts, shouting/voice from operatives, clashing cages etc. In addition to this, there is a National Grid Electricity Substation adjacent to the application site.

Officers have concerns as to whether the proposed development would achieve satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers who might occupy units facing the service yard. In addition to this, the internal layout of the proposed development, with bedrooms adjacent to living rooms and communal areas, could give rise to unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to future occupiers.

The submitted Noise Assessment has not assessed how the proposal would be affected by noise from the nearby Tesco Service Yard by comparing their measured results and predictions against a suitable background noise level, and assessing the result using the correct standard, i.e. BS4142. At present the conclusions of the report are based on misguided assumptions that the noise from the service yard is part of the general background noise, and that anyone moving into the new properties would have to put up with it because they have 'chosen' to live there.

The Pollution Control Officer does not agree with the noise consultant's conclusion that 'the development is subject to external sound levels that allow for natural ventilation across the entire

development, in order to achieve suitable internal noise levels within internal residential amenities, including in areas facing the Tesco Superstore Service Yard,' as they have not proved this. Officers are of the opinion that mitigation measures would most likely be required to ensure that future residents are able to sleep without being disturbed by external night-time noise, especially in the flats facing the service yard.

In addition, they consider that the layout of the proposed development is unsatisfactory with bedrooms next to living rooms and communal areas.

Officers note the provisions of Paragraph 187 of the NPPF which require that new development does not result in a relationship such that noise complaints may hinder/harm the effective operations of existing businesses, and the concerns of the Pollution Control Officer. The Pollution Control team have advised that conditions could be attached to ensure the development would be protected from noise, however, this would likely require costly noise mitigation in the form of glazing and whole unit ventilation systems, which would be capable of ensuring satisfactory temperatures for future occupiers, as opening windows would result in unacceptable noise levels and living conditions. Officers have advised the Agent that this could be avoided through proper submission of a noise assessment and internal redesign, however, the Agent has confirmed that they wish to proceed as submitted, and notes the costs associated with mitigating noise.

Refuse Collection

The Local Highway Authority have confirmed that Goodwin Walk cannot be used by refuse collection vehicles. Therefore the only means of servicing the site, as illustrated on the submitted plans, would be via the Tesco Service Yard.

The scheme as amended now proposes bin stores serving Blocks 1, 2 and 3, and a refuse collection vehicle would be able to collect from the adjacent Service Yard, adjacent to Block 3. The Council's Waste Officer has objected to the proposal.

As set out under Paragraph 5.9 and Table 5.1, RECAP guidance states, 'in low-rise blocks (up to 4 floors) it is typical for residents to transfer their waste to communal compounds, within which are located a number of bins to receive their waste. Residents should not have to transfer waste more than 30m (excluding vertical distance). Best practice is to install bins allowing the segregation of material types from residual waste. Waste compounds should form a designated structure ...'

Further to reviewing the internal layout, Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 14, 16 and 18, and their respective units situated at first and second floor above, would need to walk more than 30 metres to reach a communal bin area. For example, future occupiers of Unit 1 would have to carry their waste 82 metres to the Block 2 communal bin store, or 67 metres should they chose to use the communal bin store serving Block 3. As such, some of the flats would be required to carry their waste well over maximum guidance.

In addition to this, Paragraph 5.11 states, 'where it is necessary for collection crews to move bins from the communal storage facility to tip into the collection vehicle, they should not have to move large containers (4 wheels) more than 10m ...'. The communal store for Block 3 would be within 10 metres of the refuse collection point, however, the communal stores for Block 1 and 2 would be situated 43 metres and 68 metres from the refuse collection areas respectively.

The Applicant has confirmed that they would utilise a private refuse collection company, who would be prepared to transfer waste the distances established; however, future occupiers would still be forced to carry their waste far in excess of the 30 metres set out within RECAP Guidance.

Other Matters

Turning to the development itself, further to the receipt of amended plans, the proposed units which front Goodwin Walk would be afforded a separation distance of 5m from the back edge of the public highway, which is considered to be a suitable separation distance for the ground floor units to achieve a satisfactory outlook and levels of natural light whilst maintaining privacy.

In addition to this, ground floor units have been afforded 1.5m of defensive space in front of their windows, which would be the only openings serving these units and would overlook pedestrian circulation areas and the communal car park. Officers would typically seek to achieve a better outlook, particularly given that these ground floor units would be single aspect, however, 1.5m of defensive space is considered to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers.

Further to the receipt of amended plans, Block 3 has been reduced in footprint and there has been due consideration of the first floor flats and the orientation of windows. Units 4, 6, 8, 26, 28 and 30 would now face onto a two storey blank wall elevation, save an obscure window serving Unit 19's bathroom, and there would be a separation distance of 14.4m, therefore the outlook from these flats, in this specific respect, is accepted in this instance. Further, given the distances and angles between Unit 21 and Units 11, 13, 33 and 35, this specific relationship is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

Subject to conditions securing mitigation from internal and external noise sources, the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP17(b) of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraphs 185 and 187 of the NPPF (2021).

Letters of representation have asked whether Officers can consider the mental health of prospective residents. Policy LP7 states, 'development proposals should promote, support and enhance both the physical and mental health and wellbeing of the community, contributing to reducing health inequalities and helping to deliver healthy, active lifestyles'.

As this scheme would be for affordable housing, the Developer would be obliged to meet minimum National Space Standards, as well as M4(2) and M4(3) of the building regulations. In addition to this, the application site is within a District Centre, and is within a short walking distance to a number of areas of public open space, and for the reasons set out above, each dwelling would be afforded satisfactory levels of natural light and privacy.

i) Biodiversity

Trees

The Council's Tree Officer has objected to the proposal, advising that the arboricultural impact assessment (AIA), tree protection plan (TPP) and arboricultural method statement (AMS) submitted are not supported. The Tree Officer has stated that the proposed development is too large for its position/ location on site; the massing of the buildings, in landscape terms, would dominate the street scene, despite the tree lined avenue. The proposed development would result in the loss of tree cover as well as areas of open space, and there are grave concerns with the proximity of the proposed buildings to the avenue trees, which are owned and maintained by the Council.

There is a contradiction with regards to the assessment of some of the trees, for instance tree NT4 Silver Maple is assessed as a Category B1 tree (Cat B1), whereas all the trees within Group D are Category C2, despite being the same species Silver Maple and of greater amenity value both as a group and as individual trees. There are 9x Category B (Cat B) trees within Group D and 2 Category C (Cat C) trees, therefore this Group should have a Cat B designation. With respect to Group E, both trees are considered as Cat B therefore, is classified as a Cat B group, Group F has three trees, two of which are Cat B, one is Cat C, therefore is also a Cat B group. There is also an error with regard to the size of the bole/stem of tree NT6 Eucalyptus recorded as 630mm; the bole/stem size is 730mm. Additional information was submitted, however this did not overcome Tree Officer concerns, and the objection has been sustained

In short, the full growth potential of the street trees appears to have been downplayed within the AIA, as these trees would not be able to reach their full growth potential due to the close proximity of the proposed buildings and balconies, which would directly influence future management and pruning of the trees.

Officers note that the submitted AIA has incorrectly assessed some of the on-site trees, and that the proposal would result in the loss of a number of B category trees. However, as illustrated above, these trees have subsequently been categorised by the Council's Tree Officer and therefore Officers are able to make an informed judgement as to the loss proposed. The trees to be lost would be situated within the centre of the application site, whereas the trees surrounding the application site, namely the trees which line Goodwin Walk and hold the highest amenity value, would be retained and could be satisfactorily protected as part of a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement.

To compensate the loss of trees, the Agent originally proposed to re-provide a number of trees within a pocket park, however, for the reasons outlined above, the pocket has been omitted from the proposal. As such, and at the time of writing this report, Officers are in discussions with the Agent to mitigate the loss of on-site trees by providing 46x off-site trees, including maintenance, as part of a S106 legal agreement, to accord Policy LP29 and 'Mitigation for the Loss of Trees and Woodland'.

Whilst Officers would always endeavour to protect and retain trees, particularly category A and B trees, Officers do have to weigh up the benefits of providing 59x affordable dwellings within an identified district centre. Subject to securing a detailed soft landscaping scheme for the site, a detailed arboricultural method statement to protect surrounding trees and a legal agreement securing a contribution to plant and maintain 46x trees off-site, which are of a suitable size and species, the loss of on-site trees is accepted in this instance.

Wildlife

The Council's Wildlife Officer has raised no objections to the proposal, advising on site mitigation would be required in the form of nesting boxes for birds and the development be implemented in accordance with the submitted Ecological Management Plan. Subject to securing these conditions, the development would make provision for protected species, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

j) Drainage

Surface Water Drainage

Further to the receipt of additional information, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have raised no objections, nor have any objections been received from the Environment Agency.

The drainage scheme would utilise permeable paving to all car parking areas as well as crates, which would achieve a greenfield runoff rate of 1.94l/s, or 2.80l/s in a 1 in 30 year event using a hydrobrake and orifice plate. The LLFA have sought a condition be attached, securing full details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the SUDS scheme to be submitted, which shall include construction technical details for all drainage assets and a detailed maintenance and management schedule for all drainage assets.

Subject to this condition, the development would not give rise to unacceptable levels of surface water flooding, and that flows could be satisfactorily attenuated on site, therefore the proposal would accord with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 167 of the NPPF (2021).

A letter of representation has advised that Goodwin Walk suffers from poor drainage, however, the LLFA have advised the development would make provide for on-site attenuation, and would not constitute an off-site flood risk.

ii) Foul drainage

Anglian Water have confirmed that the foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Peterborough (Flag Fen) Water Recycling Centre, and there would be available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to the Anglian Water sewerage network, they would be required to serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991, which is separate to the

planning process.

iii) Water Efficiency

In addition to flood risk, Policy LP32 places a duty on new developments to secure efficient use of water and meet the Optional Technical Standard of 110 litres of water usage per person per day. It is therefore necessary and appropriate to secure a planning compliance condition to ensure that this requirement is met, should planning permission be approved.

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the development would make provision for surface water drainage, and would not give rise to a risk of off-site flooding, as such the proposal does not accord with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

k) Contamination

The Council's Pollution Control Officer has raised no objections to the proposal in this respect, however has raised concerns regarding the contamination, which could arise as a result of any materials which may have been brought on to the site to be used as hard core under the now demolished building and existing block paving. As such, subject to securing a condition which would deal with uncovering unsuspected contamination, the proposal would accord with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

l) Archaeology

The Council's Archaeological Officer has raised no objections to the proposal. The Desk Based Assessment submitted to support the current application would suggest that there is moderate potential for finds and features dating from the Prehistoric, Roman and Medieval periods in the general area. Although some degree of disturbance may be anticipated as the result of the former use of the site, nonetheless there are important Prehistoric, Roman and Medieval remains and find-spots known from the surrounding areas. Therefore, the proposed development site has a moderate risk to contain preserved archaeology in undisturbed/least disturbed pockets of land.

The Council's Archaeological Officer has suggested a condition be appended, securing archaeological monitoring of all groundworks.

Subject to securing archaeological monitoring of all groundwork by condition, the proposal would preserve known and unknown archaeology, and would accord with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

m) Legal Matters

Should the application be recommended for approval, a legal agreement would be sought to secure the following matters:

- The development is built out and retained as 100% affordable accommodation;
- The re-provision of a bus stop, at the cost of the developer, including a temporary provision; and
- An off-site contribution for loss of open space and planting of off-site trees.

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue have sought the provision of fire hydrants by way of a legal agreement, however, Officers have historically secured this provision by way of planning condition. As such, and for the sake of consistency, Officers shall secure the provision of fire hydrants by condition.

At the time of writing this report, Officers have sought a figure for off-site tree contribution, which will be set out within the Update Report, however, the Agent has confirmed that, providing the off-site tree contribution is reasonable, they would accept this and all other contributions sought, and these matters would be secured by legal agreement.

n) Other Matters

The following matters were raised within letters of representation, which were not addressed

above:

- It is felt that this development would jeopardise my human rights and my safety;

Officer Response: Matters of neighbour amenity have been considered above, as such the human rights impact has been considered, with particular reference to Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of property), Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life) and Article 14 (Prohibition of discrimination) of the Convention. The recommendation is considered appropriate in upholding the council's adopted policies and is not outweighed by any engaged rights, including the Public Sector Equality Duty

- Pressure on schools, doctors and dentists; these are already oversubscribed, and, it's my understanding that this development would make no contribution towards CIL or Sec. 106.

Officer Response: As this development would be for flatted development, and would be 100% affordable, a CIL charge would not be applicable in this instance. The funding of schools comes from the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy which is set to allow for exemption for affordable housing schemes. Nonetheless, CIL monies shall be used to support the infrastructure needed.

- This type of high density development risks becoming the slums of the future, and, new developments should improve the quality of the housing stock and residential environment. A development of social low cost accommodation does not meet these requirements.

Officer Response: As this development would be for 100% affordable housing, in accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan, all dwellings should meet Building Regulations Part M4(2). On all development proposals of 50 dwellings or more, 5% of homes should meet Building Regulations Part M4(3)(2)(a). In this instance that would equate to 3x dwellings.

Policy LP8 also says that all new rented tenure affordable housing will be required to be built to meet minimum National Space Standards (as defined by Building Regulations).

- This plan would build over existing walkways, which we thought was illegal;

Officer Response: The walkways are not public rights of way, and are understood to be situated on private land.

- Will the new bus stop be large enough for buses to turn around?

Officer Response: The design of the new bus stop would be secured by Section 106 legal agreement and planning condition(s), should planning permission be granted, and the design of the new bus stop(s) would be agreed with the Local Highway Authority.

- The proposal would result in cars using Goodwin Walk;

Officer Response: This proposal would not introduce private vehicles to Goodwin Walk. This road is for buses only, and any other vehicle using the road should be reported to the Police.

- You are removing the petrol filling station and public house

Officer Response: This proposal does not propose to remove either the petrol filling station or public house.

- There is no provision for electric car charging in the car park;

Officer Response: Should planning permission be granted, a condition would be attached requiring ECV points to be provided, as well as future proofing the car park.

- No indication of secure cycle parking provision has been made for users of the shopping centre?

Officer Response: Secure cycle parking does form part of this proposal however the development is only required to make provision for its own needs, and not address those of the wider district centre.

- The landscape scheme for the centre seems outline only and therefore subject to change?

Officer Response: This detail would be secured by planning condition(s).

- There is plenty of new housing being built at Manor Drive;

Officer Response: Each application is considered on its merits, the fact that dwellings are being built at Manor Drive would not preclude development coming forward within other areas of the City.

- They should build bungalows or 10x dwellings; Send this proposal back. Demand lower density, and a better quality environment. It may be impossible to right the mistakes of the past, but it's a simple matter to avoid repeating them.

Officer Response: Officers are required to assess the application submitted, on its merits against Local and National Planning Policies.

- This is a shopping centre and not a housing estate, we do not need another fast foot outlet, phone shop or vaping shop, and, the local centre should be reinstated to its former glory and requires investment, not flats;

Officer Response: The Local Planning Authority do not get to choose what developments come forward, however, we are obliged to determine applications against Local and National Planning Policies, which do support the mix of residential and retail units within identified District Centres.

- There is a lack of demonstrable need for additional retail units at this location with many existing units still empty in the existing centre;

Officer Response: Competition between businesses is not a planning matter, and cannot be considered. The application site is situated within a District Centre, where the creation of new retail development is encouraged.

- The proposal would result in the loss of a view;

Officer Response: There is no right to a view; this is not a material planning consideration.

- There is already enough social housing in this area;

Officer Response: This is not a material planning consideration.

- The construction of the development, happening so close to other homes, will be considerable. How will this be mitigated? What contribution will be made to the community in return for this disruption?;

Officer Response: Matters of noise and dust are covered by separate legislation to the planning process. If planning permission was approved, a condition would be attached securing a Construction Management Plan.

- Devaluation of house prices

Officer Response: This is not a material planning consideration and cannot legally be considered.

- Litter

Officer Response: There is nothing to suggest that this proposal would result in an increase in litter.

- You have a duty to make clear what sort of people you intend to house in these flats.

Officer Response: This is not a planning requirement; Officers assess the development put forward, not the end user.

- Disabled Access - it is noted that access to Levels 1 and 2 accommodations would be by stairs (no lifts), so only the ground floor would be suitable for those with reduced mobility issues.

Officer Response: Further to the receipt of amended plans, lifts form part of Blocks 1 and 2.

- Additional information has been submitted, however, this has not been sent out for public consultation, as such due process has not been followed

Officer Response: The application has been advertised in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Provisions) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and the

Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

- Werrington Town Council advised that the development was different to what was shown at the Public Exhibition

Officer Response: Should the developer choose to change the scheme further to their public consultation exercise that is at their discretion. The Local Planning Authority must determine the scheme that has been submitted.

- The council should be concentrating on rejuvenating the run down Werrington centre and encouraging traders to come back in, and unless you have a strategy where rates and rents are reduced, giving business' a chance to profit and recirculate tax for the benefit of the local community and insuring that all the retail units are occupied, I regret that I object to further retail units being developed.

Officer Response: It is understood that the District Centre is privately owned, therefore, it is not anticipated that the Council would seek to rejuvenate the Centre. The Local Planning Authority do not set business rates, and does not form part of the planning consideration process.

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 development site is situated within the urban area of the city and an identified District Centre, the proposal would provide a mix of residential and retail uses, as well as 59x affordable dwellings. As such, the proposal would go towards enhancing the vitality and viability of the District Centre, and would accord with Policies LP2, LP3, LP8 and LP12 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraphs 183-185 of the NPPF (2021);
- The proposed development would not unacceptably harm the character or appearance of the immediate area, and would make provision for uncovering buried archaeology, as such the proposal would accord with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021);
- The proposed development would not have an unacceptable harmful impact to neighbouring amenity, and would provide satisfactory amenity for future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 180 of the NPPF (2019);
- The proposed development would not constitute a highway safety hazard, it has been demonstrated that satisfactory on-site parking would be provided to serve future occupiers, and that there is capacity within the vicinity to safely cater for displaced parking, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019); and
- The development would make provision for surface water drainage and uncovering unsuspected contamination, and would accord with Policies LP32 and LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan, and Paragraphs 183-185 of the NPPF (2021).

7 Recommendation

The case officer recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED**, subject to the signing of a Section 106 legal agreement and the following conditions:

- C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- 1676-SBA-XX-00-DR-A-001- P3 Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- 1676-SBA-XX-01-DR-A-002- P2 Proposed First + Second Floor Plans
- 20072-001 rev P5 Drainage Strategy
- 20072-002 rev P5 Exceedance Flows
- 20072-003 rev P5 Hydrobrake & Attenuation Detail
- 1676-SBA-XX-00-DR-A-501 - P1 Proposed Site Plan
- 110. OLA KREAM Werrington Proposed Planting Plan 01 v3
- 1676-SBA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-202- P1 Proposed Elevations sheet 2 of 3
- 1676-SBA-XX-03-DR-A-003 - P1 Proposed Roof Plan
- 1676-SBA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-201- P1 Proposed Elevations sheet 1 of 3
- 1676-SBA-XX-ZZ-DR-A-203 – P2 Proposed Elevations sheet 3 of 3
- 110. OLA - KREAM - Werrington - Landscape Maintenance Schedule (1)
- 110. OLA - KREAM - Werrington - Soft Landscaping Specification (1)
- Ecological Management Plan EMP Staniland Court
- 4064.Staniland.Eddisons.Tree_Protection_Plan_A1_500
- 103414-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-YA-0001-REV01-Werrington-Peterborough

Reason: To clarify the approved details and to ensure the development accords with the reasoning and justification for granting approval.

- C 3 No development shall take place above slab level unless and until material samples/details of the following external materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Walling;
- Roofing;
- Windows;
- Doors;
- Shop fronts; and
- Rainwater goods.

The samples/details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number and the materials shall be made available for inspection 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, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 4 Notwithstanding the approved plans and prior to first occupation of the first residential unit or retail unit hereby permitted, a scheme for refuse storage to serve the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include both residential and commercial refuse storage, and security measures for occupants and collection crews.

The approved refuse storage shall thereafter be implemented prior to first occupation of the unit to which it serves, and retained and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of providing satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers and the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policies LP13, LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 5 Prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby permitted, details of: a mail delivery system serving the units and an audio access control system to communal doors serving the units, shall be submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of any doubt, to communal entrances there shall be no trade buttons or other

armed released mechanism.

Thereafter, the mail delivery and audio access control system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the first residential unit to which it relates and thereafter retained and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of protecting the amenity of future occupiers from crime and anti-social behaviour, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 6 Notwithstanding the submitted information, no land raising is permitted and the finished floor levels of the development hereby permitted shall be no more than 250mm above existing ground floor level.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the adjoining occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 7 Notwithstanding the approved plans and prior to first occupation of any development hereby permitted, a scheme of cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include secure and covered cycle parking for occupants of the residential units and staff of the commercial units, and outdoor uncovered parking for customers. The approved cycle parking shall be provided prior to first occupation of the residential or commercial unit it serves, and thereafter be retained and as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of ensuring that the site is served by sufficient cycle parking and to encourage more sustainable travel to/from the site, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 8 Notwithstanding the approved plans, no development shall take place above slab level unless and until a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the following:

- Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting;
- Details of any boundary treatments (where any are impenetrable, provision shall be made for adequately sized gaps at intervals of 10 metres to enable the movements of hedgehogs);
- Hard surfacing materials;
- External lighting (including lux levels and light spillage);and
- CCTV (where applicable).

The approved hard landscaping scheme (boundary treatments, hard surfacing, lighting and CCTV) shall be carried out prior to first occupation of the first residential unit, or upon completion of development, whichever is sooner.

The soft landscaping shall be carried out within the first available planting season following first occupation of any unit or alternatively in accordance with a timetable for landscape implementation which has been approved as part of the submitted landscape scheme.

Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme that die, are removed or become diseased within five years of the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the developers, or their successors in title with an equivalent size, number and species to those being replaced. Any replacement trees, shrubs or hedgerows dying within five years of planting shall themselves be replaced with an equivalent size, number and species.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the amenities of future occupiers, in accordance with Policies LP16, LP17 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 9 During construction works all construction trenches shall be covered overnight and a method of escape for mammals, specifically hedgehogs, shall be provided to each trench.

Reason: In the interest of preserving the biodiversity value of the site, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C10 Prior to completion of the development, the bird/bat boxes detailed within the submitted Ecological Management Plan (Hiller Ecology, 2021) shall be installed. The bird/bat boxes shall be suitably placed in accordance with best practice methodology as set out by the Royal Society for the Protection for Birds and Bat Conservation Trust. Evidence of the inclusion of these boxes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of preserving the biodiversity value of the site, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C11 No development shall take place above slab level unless and until a revised noise assessment and noise mitigation scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The noise mitigation scheme shall identify the affected rooms on each façade, and shall include full details of the glazing performance, including measurements and assessment of transmission loss where applicable. Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details, prior to the occupation of any unit to which it relates, and shall thereafter be retained and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of providing satisfactory amenity for future occupiers in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C12 No development shall take place above slab level unless and until a scheme which specifies the provision of any necessary mechanical ventilation for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ventilation scheme shall include the specification of ventilation, and confirmation that an acceptable temperature climate shall be provided, and comply with the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (including acoustic ventilation units incorporating fans for insertion in external walls) and the Approved Document F. Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details, prior to the occupation of any unit to which it relates, and shall thereafter be retained and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of providing satisfactory amenity for future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 180 of the NPPF (2019).

- C13 If, during development, contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure all contamination within the site is dealt with, in accordance with Paragraphs 183-185 of the NPPF (2021) and Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C14 No development other than groundworks or foundations shall take place unless and until a

scheme for the provision of fire hydrants to serve the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of any unit.

Prior to the first occupation of any unit to be served by the scheme, written confirmation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that the scheme has been implemented in full and is certified as being ready for use.

Reason: In order to ensure that sufficient resources are available for firefighting, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C15 With the exception of site clearance, preparation and the digging of foundations, no development shall take place unless and until full details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those details shall include, but are not limited to:

- Construction/technical details for all drainage assets which includes, but is not limited to, separate details for the proposed permeable paving and the attenuation crates; and
- A detailed maintenance and management schedule for all drainage assets.

Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the following:

- 20072-001 Rev 5 - Drainage Strategy- 20072-002 Rev P5 - Exceedance Flows
- 20072 Storm Drainage - Complete System
- 20072-003 Rev P3 - Hydrobrake Detail

The sustainable drainage scheme shall be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved schedule in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and ensure that no increased flood risk occurs as a result of the development, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C16 The development hereby permitted shall be constructed such that it achieves the Optional Technical Housing Standard of no more than 110 litres of water usage per person per day.

Reason: In order to reduce the impact of the development upon the water environment, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C17 No demolition/development shall take place/commence unless and until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No demolition/development shall take place unless in complete accordance with the approved scheme. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full including any post development requirements e.g. archiving and submission of final reports.

Reason: To secure the obligation on the planning applicant or developer to mitigate the impact of their scheme on the historic environment when preservation in situ is not possible, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

C18 No development involving the loss of the existing bus stop on site shall take place unless and until details of the re-provided bus stop have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details to be submitted shall include, but not limited to:

- the bus shelter, digital timetables and any other associated apparatus;
- timescale for implementation; and
- any temporary bus stop provision.

The temporary bus stop shall be made available prior to the removal of the existing bus stop and retained until the replacement bus stop has been provided.

Reason: In the interest of ensuring the District Centre is served by a continuous bus service, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C19 Prior to the demolition/removal of the existing staff cycle shelter within the service yard, as shown on Drawing 1676-SBA-XX-00-DR-A-501 - P1 (Proposed Site Plan) details of a replacement staff cycle parking shelter shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Within 4 weeks of the staff cycle shelter being removed, the replacement staff cycle parking shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details, and shall thereafter be retained and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of ensuring that the site is served by sufficient cycle parking in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C20 Prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby permitted, the parking and turning areas shall be laid in accordance with Drawing 1676-SBA-XX-00-DR-A-501 Rev P1 (Proposed Site Plan) and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles in connection with the use of the dwellings hereby permitted. For the avoidance of any doubt, the parking spaces shall be marked out in accordance with the dwelling to which they serve.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with satisfactory parking, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C21 No later than 3 months following occupation of 50% of the residential units hereby permitted, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan shall include the following information:

- Travel Accessibility to the site;
- Site details;
- Predicted travel data - trip generations;
- Confirmation as to who is responsible for the future updates of the Travel Plan; and
- Objectives, Targets and Action Plan.

Thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved travel plan.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety and to mitigate vehicle movements to and from the site, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C22 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 permitted shall be dwellinghouses 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 development site would not be capable of meeting the needs of small-scale houses in multiple occupation in terms of car parking or amenity, in accordance with

Policies LP13, LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C23 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a scheme of work to facilitate the closure of the existing bus/vehicle access, and make good the public highway, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include a timetable for the implementation of the approved scheme, and shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the agreed details and timetable.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to preserve the character of the area, in accordance with Policies LP13 and LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C24 The residential units hereby permitted shall be affordable housing units only, as defined in Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and as the impacts of the development have been considered specifically in relation to the units being affordable, in accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C25 No development shall take place above slab level unless and until details of the electric vehicle (EV) charging points which shall serve the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of any doubt, 5% of the bays must be EV bays from day one, with the remaining car parking areas having the ducting installed at construction to enable easy future conversion to EV bays.

Thereafter, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of providing sustainable means of transport and futureproofing the development, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copies to: Cllr Judy Fox, Cllr John Fox and Cllr Stephen Lane