

APPENDIX A

CABINET REPORT OF 8 NOVEMBER 2010	
	PUBLIC REPORT

Cabinet Member(s) responsible:	<i>Cllr Marco Cereste, Portfolio Holder for Growth, Strategic Planning and Economic Development</i>	
Contact Officer(s):	<i>Richard Kay – Policy and Strategy Manager, Chief Executives Andrew Edwards – Head of Peterborough Delivery Partnership</i>	Tel. 863795 384530

PETERBOROUGH SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD) – PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION

RECOMMENDATIONS	
FROM : Head of Peterborough Delivery Partnership	Deadline date : Council on 8 December 2010
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That Cabinet recommends the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (Proposed Submission Version) to Council for approval for the purposes of public consultation and submission to the Secretary of State.2. That the Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning, Growth and Economic Development be authorised to approve, by Cabinet Member Decision Notice, a list of amendments (if any) to be incorporated into the Site Allocations DPD arising from either (a) the outcome of the Core Strategy Examination (if available) or (b) any other relevant new information which arises after the date of the Cabinet meeting, with that list of amendments being presented to Council for approval together with the Site Allocations DPD.	

1. ORIGIN OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report is submitted to Cabinet following approval of the Preferred Options version of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD for the purposes of public participation at the meeting of Cabinet on 8 February 2010, and following the ensuing public participation and further evidence gathering since that date.

2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to enable Cabinet to consider and recommend to Council a document which forms part of the major policy framework – namely the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (Proposed Submission version). If it is approved by Council, it will be published for public consultation and then submitted to the Secretary of State.
- 2.2 The recommended Site Allocations DPD (Proposed Submission version) is available at Appendix 1, with the exception of the accompanying 'Proposals Map' which is available on the Council's website <http://democracy.peterborough.gov.uk> and copies have been placed in each of the Members Group Rooms.
- 2.3 This report is for Cabinet to consider under its Terms of Reference No. 3.2.4, 'to promote the Council's corporate and key strategies and Peterborough's Community Strategy and approve

strategies and cross-cutting programmes not included within the Council's major policy and budget framework'.

3. TIMESCALE

Is this a Major Policy Item/Statutory Plan?	YES	If Yes, date for relevant Cabinet Meeting	8 November 2010
Date for relevant Council meeting	8 December 2010	Date for submission to Government Dept <i>(please specify which Government Dept)</i>	CLG - April 2011 (approx)

4. PETERBOROUGH SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD (PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION)

- 4.1 The Site Allocations DPD is probably the second most important statutory planning document for Peterborough, after the Core Strategy (see Cabinet agenda papers of 12 October 2009 for full details of the Core Strategy). For the public, it is probably the most sensitive planning document, for the reason that, unlike the Core Strategy, it allocates, on a map, specific sites for new development (and hence the public can see precisely what is proposed in their community).
- 4.2 In short, the Core Strategy sets the headlines and 'broad' areas for growth; the Site Allocations DPD translates the Core Strategy into actual proposed development sites.
- 4.3 We are reaching the final stages of preparing the Site Allocations DPD. Numerous consultations have taken place over the past 2-3 years (see Cabinet agenda papers of 8 February 2010, for example), all of which have influenced what is to be included in what is known as the "Proposed-Submission" version of the plan. If approved by Council, it will be made available for formal public comments and then "Submitted" to the Secretary of State, together with any comments received from the public (i.e. the public comments submitted at this stage are, in simple terms, NOT considered by the Council, but rather an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. Under the current regulations, the Inspector has the final say on whether to accept or reject such objections).
- 4.4 Main features of the recommended Site Allocations DPD (proposed submission version):
- Main locations for new **dwelling**s 2010-2026 are (and delineated on an Ordnance Survey based map):
 - District Centres - 1,155
(of which: 224 are already committed / 931 are new allocations)
 - Elsewhere within the urban area of Peterborough - 4,214
(1,458 committed / 2,756 new allocations)
 - Urban Extensions (Hampton / Paston Reserve / Norwood / Stanground South / Great Haddon) – 14,041
(6,391 committed / 7,650 new allocations)
 - Key Service Centres (Eye/Eye Green and Thorney) – 531
(256 committed / 275 new allocations)
 - Limited Growth Villages (Ailsworth, Barnack, Castor, Glinton, Helpston, Newborough, Northborough and Wittering) – 468
(145 committed / 323 new allocations)
 - Major locations for new **employment** at Alwalton Hill, Great Haddon and Red Brick Farm.
 - Confirmation of a **Regional Freight Interchange** at Stanground (Magna Park).

- Other policies (and delineation on a map as applicable) on issues such as green wedges and safeguarded land.
- Unlike an earlier draft, it no longer includes any **Gypsy and Traveller** sites other than the proposed transit site at Norwood.

4.5 Cabinet should be aware that the Site Allocations DPD has been prepared on the **assumption that the Core Strategy is found 'sound'** by the Core Strategy Inspector (with or without relatively minor changes). The Core Strategy Hearing sessions closed on 15th October 2010, and we hope (but no guarantee) that the Inspector's Report will be with us in December, ideally for Council on 8 December.

4.6 If the Inspector finds major fault with the Core Strategy (either finding the plan 'unsound' or making significant changes to the plan to make it 'sound'), then the Site Allocations DPD is likely to require changes or even a complete re-think. This may subsequently result in the Site Allocations DPD: (i) being pulled from Council on 8 December 2010, reconsidered by Cabinet, and submitted to Council at a later date; (ii) adjustments made to the Site Allocations DPD directly by Council to ensure it remains in line with the Core Strategy; or (iii) a delegated authority to amend the Site Allocations DPD in advance of Council in December to ensure it remains in line with the Core Strategy. We regard any of these scenarios to be unlikely (because officers believe we defended robustly the content of the Core Strategy at the Hearing sessions), but there is a small risk that one will occur. The recommendations at the head of this report hopefully enable an efficient procedure to be put in place so as not to unnecessarily hold up the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.

4.7 For clarity, Cabinet should also note that the Site Allocations DPD covers the entire unitary area of the authority **except the City Centre**. The City Centre is subject to its own equivalent plan (the City Centre Area Action Plan) which is due in 2011.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 Extensive consultation has already taken place on the emerging Site Allocations DPD, in line with the following summary table:

Stage	Description	Date
Evidence gathering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of main issues • Submission of approximately 200 potential development sites. 	July 2007 - Oct 2008
Issues and Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public consultation on all potential sites. 	Oct 2008 - Jan 2009
Preferred Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public consultation on the Council's preferred sites. 	March 2010 - April 2010
Cemetery Provision Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Consultation relating specifically to Cemetery Provision. 	August - September 2010
Proposed Submission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final opportunity for public consultation on the proposed sites. 	Due Early 2011
Submission and examination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Allocations Document submitted to government along with all public comments received during the proposed submission consultation. • Independent Examination by a Planning Inspector. 	April 2011 and Aug 2011
Adoption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council adopts Final Plan. 	Dec 2011

Monitoring and Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each year, identified targets are monitored. 	Ongoing
-----------------------	--	---------

- 5.2 All of the consultation to date has been carefully logged, considered and subsequently influenced the final version of the document. A report on the consultation is being prepared, and will be made available to the public on the website. Whilst, obviously, we have not been able to meet everyone's requests, we have attempted to prepare the document on a collaborative and iterative basis, whilst at the same time ensuring it conforms to the guiding principles of the Core Strategy and national planning policy.
- 5.3 The latest two consultations included the 'preferred options' consultation, which was carried out in March - April 2010. We received over 4,000 comments, with a particularly high level of response from Eye and Helpston residents (the vast majority of which objected to the allocation of new development in the two villages).
- 5.4 Some representations we received came from landowners supplying new information, especially on sites we did not list as 'preferred' choices. Such information has been very helpful in reconsidering those sites, and has resulted in changes to some of the allocations. These changes are explained in the early pages of the document itself.
- 5.5 The most recent consultation took place over the summer, and focussed on options for cemetery provision. The responses received, together with analysis of the technical abilities of option sites to best meet cemetery needs, has resulted in a recommended site to the north of Castor and the A47 to be selected.

Consideration prior to Cabinet

- 5.6 Prior to this being presented to Cabinet, the emerging 'Proposed Submission' Site Allocations DPD has been presented to all seven **Neighbourhood Councils** throughout September 2010. A numbers of issues were raised at those meetings, and a set of draft minutes are attached at Appendix 2. Cabinet is asked to read these minutes alongside this agenda report.
- 5.7 Next, Local Development Framework (LDF) Scrutiny Group was presented with a draft of the proposed development sites on 18 October 2010. A lengthy discussion took place, and the key issues which the Scrutiny Group wished to raise at Cabinet were:
- Cemetery - Concern over the location of the additional cemetery, especially poor access;
 - Gypsy and Travellers (lack of sites allocated for) – concern that there may be future problems if the Council did not allocate sites;
 - Loss of employment sites – concern at the loss of some sites, but noted such loss could enable the development of more mixed use sites;
 - Design – emphasised the need for very careful design of development on some of the proposed sites (e.g. those near railway lines); and
 - Villages – acknowledged the importance of having some housing development in villages, including mixed use sites.
- 5.8 Planning and Environment Protection Committee considered the proposals on 26 October 2010. A very lengthy debate took place, including a full explanation of where the housing numbers came from and the need for the Site Allocations Document to conform to the Core Strategy targets. With specific reference to the Site Allocations Plan, the Committee asked Cabinet to consider the following points before reaching a decision:
- The **majority** of committee members were concerned with the amount of housing in **Eye**, which they considered was still too high, especially considering the high level of public objection in April 2010 to the 'preferred options' Site Allocation Document. *(For information: the Site Allocations Document which is now recommended proposes 324 dwellings in Eye, of which 229 are already committed with planning permission and 95 are 'new' allocations. The 'preferred options' version had proposed 498 dwellings in Eye, of which 193 were committed and 305 were new allocations)*

- **Half** the committee members were concerned with the amount of housing in **Thorney**, which they considered was too high.
(For information: the Site Allocations Document which is now recommended proposes 205 dwellings in Thorney, all of which are 'new' allocations. The 'preferred options' version had proposed 141 dwellings in Thorney, all of which were new allocations)
- The committee supported a suggestion raised by a committee member of setting up a Members 'working group' to determine the best location for the **Gypsy and Traveller Transit Site**. However, the committee did not seek changes to the Transit policy in the Site Allocations DPD which only 'safeguards' (rather than commits) a transit site at Norwood Lane and leaves open the option of the transit site being delivered elsewhere in the city.

Future consultation

- 5.9 After the Proposed Submission version has been approved by Council, it will be published and there will then be a consultation opportunity for the public to lodge formal representations on the 'soundness' of the document (consultation due in Jan/Feb 2011). The document, and any representations made, will be submitted to the Secretary of State, who will arrange for a public examination by an independent inspector from the Planning Inspectorate. The inspector will produce a report with recommendations, but these are binding on the Council.

6. ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

- 6.1 It is anticipated that Cabinet will recommend the Site Allocations DPD (Proposed Submission version) for approval by Council.

7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Cabinet is recommended to approve the Site Allocations DPD (Proposed Submission version) because it will help to progress the Sustainable Community Strategy vision for a bigger and better Peterborough that grows the right way; and because production of the Site Allocations DPD is a statutory requirement.

8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 8.1 The alternative options of not producing a Site Allocations DPD or not taking into account comments made at the Preferred Options stage were rejected, as the Council would not be fulfilling its statutory requirement.

9. IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The Site Allocations DPD will have implications for all sectors of society and all wards and parishes of the local authority area. The process of sustainability appraisal, based on social, economic and environmental criteria, ensures that all potential implications are taken into account in a systematic way.
- 9.2 Legal Implications: The Council would be in breach of planning legislation if it did not comply with the plan making regulations.
- 9.3 Financial Implications: There are some immediate direct financial implications flowing from the approval of the Site Allocations DPD (Proposed Submission), and these relate to public consultation costs and, in due course, paying the Planning Inspectorate for their services in examining the submitted document. However, these are items that have been anticipated and planned for, and budgets are set aside for this purpose.
- 9.4 Indirectly, there are other financial implications. For example, a small number of the proposed new sites for development are owned by the Council. Allocations can affect land values, usually positively but not always. However, plan making decisions of the Council must not take into account any financial gain or loss of its property holdings, other than (as with all

development sites) consideration as to whether the proposed use is deliverable. A key aspect of this test is whether the landowner (i.e. the Council in some cases) is willing to develop the site for the intended proposed use. We understand that all sites affected by the Site Allocations DPD which the Council has a direct interest in are 'deliverable', and that satisfies that particular plan making test. No assessment of whether this would result in a financial book gain or loss to a Council asset has been undertaken by planning officers, nor would it be taken into account if it had.

- 9.5 Even more indirectly, the detailed financial implications of the growth that will occur on the new development sites will be assessed as individual development schemes develop, and these will be incorporated into the Council's Capital and Revenue financial planning processes as appropriate.

10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985)

- 10.1 A vast amount of evidence has been compiled as part of the plan making process and is either already available on the Council website or will be made available as part of the consultation and examination process to take place in 2011.

Attached:

Appendix 1 – Proposed Submission Site Allocations DPD

Appendix 2 – Neighbourhood Council draft minutes