

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 8 FEBRUARY 2011 AT 1.30PM

	Page No:
1. Procedure for Speaking	1
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak	2
3. Briefing Update	4
ITEM 5.1 Statement from Ward Councillor Samantha Dalton	16
Statement from Ward Councillor Matthew Dalton	17
ITEM 5.4 Additional Letter from Dr Peter Goddard and Mrs Jacqueline Harrison	18
ITEM 5.5 Email from Ward Councillor David Over	20
ITEM 5.6 Photograph submitted by Ward Councillor Peter Hiller	21
Photograph submitted by Ward Councillor Peter Hiller	22
Photograph submitted by Ward Councillor Peter Hiller	23

**UPDATE REPORT &
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC SPEAKING SCHEME - PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Procedural Notes

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

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

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

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

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 8 FEBRUARY 2011 AT 1.30PM
LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK

Agenda Item No.	Page No	Application	Name	Objector/Applicant/Agent /Supporters/Parish Council/Town Council/Neighbourhood Representatives
5.1	9	10/01598/FUL – LONGTHORPE MEMORIAL HALL, 295 THORPE ROAD, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Samantha Dalton Mr Kenneth Wappat Mr Graham Walker	Ward Councillor Applicant Agent/Architect
5.2	19	10/01267/FUL – CARBON CHALLENGE SITE, GLEBE WORKS, GLEBE COURT, FLETTON, PETERBOROUGH	Mr Peter Lee Mr Gary Goodwin	Objector (The Civic Society) Applicant
5.3	35	10/01345/FUL & 10/01346/CON – 80 LINCOLN ROAD, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor John Peach Mrs Perry Mrs Margaret Randall Mr John Walton, Mr Adrian Redmond and 1 other)	Objector (Park Ward Councillor) Objector (Local Resident) Objector (Local Resident) Applicant
5.4	55	10/01704/FUL – LAND BETWEEN 45 AND 55 NORTH STREET, STANGROUND, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Brian Rush Mrs Jacqueline Harrison	Ward Councillor Objector (Local Resident)
5.5	73	10/01594/FUL – LAND TO THE WEST OF UFFINGTON ROAD, BARNACK, STAMFORD	Mrs June Woollard	Barnack Parish Councillor

5.6	81	10/01648/FUL – 45 HIGH STREET, MAXEY, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Peter Hiller Mr Peter Hardy Mr Alan Middleton Mrs Lisa Boughton Mr Lewis Smith	Ward Councillor Objector (Local Resident) Objector (Local Resident) Objector (Local Resident) Agent
-----	----	---	---	---

BRIEFING UPDATE

P&EP COMMITTEE 8 FEBRUARY 2011

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
5.1	10/01598/FUL	Longthorpe Memorial Hall, 295 Thorpe Road, Peterborough, PE3 6LU. Installation of external downlighting to tennis courts 3 and 4

One further letter of support has been received.

An objection has also been received relating to the contents of the Report to Members produced by Officers. The objection queries a discrepancy in the interpretation of light spillage information with regards to light intrusion to windows. A copy of the full objection can be found at Appendix 2 of this Update Report. It queries the conclusion by Officers that the level of light spillage will have a minimal impact upon the amenity of surrounding residents and that the level of light intrusion will be within the levels recommended by the Institute of Lighting Engineers guidance. The objector considers that the technical justification provided by the applicant relates only to horizontal light spillage i.e. light levels measured at ground level and as such, does not account for vertical light spillage which will reach the windows of surrounding properties.

Response of the LPA:

The conclusions drawn within the original Report to Members were based upon the technical information submitted with the application which related to horizontal light spillage from the proposal. Based on understanding that the level of vertical spillage i.e. light intrusion to windows, is generally at most 3 Lux greater, the diagrams provided by the applicant displayed an acceptable level of illumination to surrounding dwellings.

Upon receipt of the above objection, Officers requested additional vertical lighting calculations from the applicant's lighting engineer which has now been received. These calculations have been based on a 2 metre x 2 metre grid to a height of 15 metres and indicate the level of light intrusion to the nearest residential property, 33 metres from the courts ('Birchfield' No.4 Longthorpe Green). The results represent a 'worst case' scenario where the lighting would have no interaction with existing surroundings (e.g. buildings, fences, trees, etc.). From the technical data provided, the maximum level of light intrusion to windows would stand at 0.9 Lux. This level is still far below that recommended for Environmental Zone E2 of the ILE guidance against which this application has been determined. As such, the conclusion that the lighting will have a minimal impact upon neighbour amenity is still supported.

This data represents the light intrusion to the closest residential dwelling which has the maximum number of luminaires visible on the courts. Therefore, it is considered that additional lighting calculations for other surrounding properties are not required as the impact would be less. In addition, Condition C3 proposed would ensure that the applicant demonstrates compliance with the ILE guidance prior to first use of the lights and that compliance is maintained in perpetuity.

5.2	10/01267/FUL	Carbon Challenge Site, Glebe Works, Glebe Court, Fletton. Construction of 294 residential units, A1 Food Store, and associated infrastructure
-----	--------------	--

Since the writing of the Committee report the number of residential units has increased by one, providing a total of 295 units rather than 294. The 295 residential units consist of 221 residential houses (63 x 2 bed, 90 x 3 bed, and 68 x 4 bed) and 74 apartments (all 2 bed).

Landscape Officer – No objections subject to the imposition of the following conditions:-

1. Prior to the commencement of development or within another such period as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, a scheme for the landscaping of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be carried out as approved no later than the first planting season following the occupation of any building or the completion of development, whichever is the earlier, or in accordance with the implementation programme.

The scheme shall include the following details:

- Proposed finished ground and building slab levels
- Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting
- An implementation programme (phased developments)

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policies DA1, DA2, LNE9 and LNE10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

2. A landscape management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development. The management plan shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable contained therein and as approved unless changes are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Plan shall include the following details:

- Long term design objectives
- Management responsibilities
- Maintenance schedules

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policies DA1, DA2, LNE9 and LNE10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

3. Prior to the commencement of development or within another such period as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, an Arboricultural Method Statement shall be carried out (As per section 7.2 BS5837-2005) and shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. This detail to cover any proposed works within the RPA of a tree – to include construction, parking and landscaping within gardens. All works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policies DA1, DA2, LNE9 and LNE10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

Highways - Amend condition 23 of the report so that the required visibility splays are 2.4m x 27m, rather than the 24m x 27m as stated in the Committee report.

Pollution Control – Add the following additional conditions:-

1. No development shall take place or within another such period as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, until an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to adequately characterise the potential impact from landfill gas. This assessment must be undertaken by a competent person, and shall assess any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. Moreover, it must include:
 - (i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
 - (ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - human health,
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,

Reason: To ensure that the development complies with approved details in the interests of Human Health and Controlled Waters, in accordance with planning Policy Guidance (PPG23 Planning and Pollution Control).

2. Prior to the construction of each phase of development details of the proposed vibration mitigation measures for each dwelling shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These measures shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of each dwelling and thereafter retained as such.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of residents, in accordance with Policy DA2 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

Additional Condition –

1. Prior to the commencement of development or within another such period as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, full details of the gabion wall shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The gabion wall shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any dwelling.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of residents, in accordance with Policy DA2 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

2. No development shall commence on any dwelling until details of the proposed surface water drainage scheme and any accompanying sustainable drainage scheme (SUD's) plus the arrangements for the long term management of the schemes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. For the avoidance of doubt the drainage and long term management schemes shall include precise details of the following:

1. Maintenance Schedule, including tasks, frequency, level of competence of operatives which will combine with the water company, highway and public open space maintenance schedules.
2. Responsibilities of SUDS management authority, or private maintenance company, to include financial arrangements (commuted sum by developer to cover costs in long term and/or local drainage levy on all residents/businesses with suitable plan or bond to protect against insolvency).
3. Responsibilities to cover emergency response to asset failure.
4. Trigger points for agreements and implementation for each phase of the development and schemes.
5. Remedial procedure to cover failure of maintenance company or adopting authority to act.
6. Arbitration arrangements in the event of dispute.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area and of the water environment, in accordance with Planning Policy Statement (PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control) and Policies U1, U2 and U9 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement)

5.3.	10/01345/FUL	80 Lincoln Road Peterborough PE1 2SN , Partial demolition and conversion of existing main building to form 4 dwellings (2 x 1 bed and 2 x 2 bed flats); full demolition of existing out buildings and construction of 21 dwellings (6 x 2 bed houses, 2 x 3 bed houses, 1 x 4 bed house and 12 x 2 bed flats) together with access, car parking and landscaping
------	--------------	--

No Further Comments

5.3	10/01346/CON	80 Lincoln Road Peterborough PE1 2SN , Partial demolition and conversion of existing main building to form 4 dwellings; full demolition of existing out buildings and construction of 21 dwellings
-----	--------------	---

No Further Comments

5.4	10/01704/FUL	Land Between 45 And 55 North Street Stanground Peterborough , Construction of 6 x two-bedroom and 2 x three-bedroom houses
-----	--------------	---

A neighbour objecting to the application has requested that Members of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee are provided with a copy of the letter of representation that they submitted. A copy is attached at Appendix 1.

Since reading the Committee report they have submitted the following further objections:

DESIGN AND IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA - It is completely deceptive for the Report to suggest that the normal height for buildings constructed in close proximity to the river is two stories when the norm is one or at most one and a half stories. It is only the frontage to North Street that is characterised by two storey houses (and even there some of the buildings are only one storey). It is also deceptive to state that the rear terrace has been dropped to two stories and that the site slopes. The site does slope, however the plans attached to the application make it quite clear that the rear terrace (plots 6,7 and 8) is to be constructed on "made up" ground bringing the houses up to the same height as the houses fronting North Street. Consequently the rear terrace will still be more than two stories above true ground level and, as such, will have a significant overbearing impact on views from adjoining properties, back river and the Nene Wash. It is entirely inappropriate to suggest that the thin strip of land between the car parking area and back river is capable of forming an adequate buffer zone between the development and Back River.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOUR AMENITY - As a result of the raised height of the rear terrace the first floor windows will overlook adjoining properties and in particular substantially the whole of the rear garden of 57 North Street - a point that has been conveniently overlooked in the Committee Report. In the circumstances the revised application has not, as suggested in the Report, successfully addressed all of the reasons for the refusal of the previous application. The noise and nuisance generated by the parking area, which will be placed in close proximity to our garden without the benefit of any screening, is totally out of keeping with the peace and tranquillity of the river scene and it will have a significant adverse impact on our residential amenity.

HIGHWAY IMPLICATIONS - Even if the entire site were to be filled with parking spaces the occupiers of the houses fronting North Street will do what comes naturally, ie: park their cars in front of their homes. The need to negotiate a set of gates in order to get to a parking area that is placed at a distance from their homes will only exacerbate that natural inclination and the situation will be made worse if the gates are manually operated.

There is absolutely no justification for the over provision of parking spaces because it will not solve the problem. That can only be resolved by giving the potential occupiers what they want - individual parking spaces adjacent to their houses/gardens.

RECOMMENDATIONS - In light of the apparent indifference that the City Council's Planning Officers are displaying towards the comfort and amenity of neighbouring residents we object most strongly to matters such as level, facing materials, landscaping, lighting and hours of work being left to their discretion. If permission is to be granted these matters should be settled by the Committee as part of the application or, if that is not possible, the subject of further neighbour consultation.

In response the Local Planning Authority makes the following comments:

1) DESIGN AND IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA

The character of the area comprises a mixed design, height and age of properties that front onto North Street, the overriding character is two storey development. Many of these properties have outbuildings/boatyards to the rear of a varying scale. The two storey block to the rear of the site is consistent with the character of the area and the height of the proposed dwellings to the front of the site. It will not therefore be out of keeping with the existing built form or the dwellings proposed to the front of the site and as such will not result in a significantly detrimental impact on the character of the street scene. The rear block is set back from the common boundaries with the neighbour to the east and west, with approximately 24 metres separation distance from the front of plot 6 to the rear of number 55 North Street (east) and approximately 21 metres from the rear of plot 6 and number 45 North Street (west). This level of separation distance is considered acceptable and it is not therefore considered that the proposal will result in an overbearing impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the existing neighbouring dwellings.

Natural England, The Environment Agency, The Local Authority's Wildlife Officer and Tree Officer have not objected to the application and consider that appropriate landscaping can be secured via condition.

2) IMPACT ON NEIGHBOUR AMENITY

A straight line measured from the front of plot 6 to the side boundary of number 57 North Street shows a separation distance of approximately 34 m. It is not therefore considered that this relationship will give rise to an unacceptable level of overlooking or a loss of privacy.

It is not considered that the level of noise or nuisance generated by cars entering and leaving the car parking area, given the scale of the development would result in an unacceptable impact on neighbour amenity. The residential use of the site is consistent with the overriding residential character of the area and it is considered that this would result in less impact on neighbour amenity than the previous uses of the site as a builders' yard/boat yard/commercial storage.

3) HIGHWAY IMPLICATIONS

Anyone can park on the public highway, this is not a matter that can be controlled by the planning process. However, in providing an acceptable level of on site parking to serve the future occupiers and their visitors it is considered that the development makes adequate provision to meet the requirements of the development. It is considered that the access gates will aid in defining public and private realm. They will be set back to provide sufficient distance for a car to pull clear of the public highway whilst waiting to enter the site and will not therefore cause a detriment to highway safety.

4) RECOMMENDATIONS

Details such as landscaping, private lighting and materials are usually dealt with via the imposition of planning conditions. It is not normal procedure for the Local Planning Authority to consult with neighbours on applications to discharge conditions. However, Members may wish to provide further comment on the specific details that should be required by the Local Planning Authority via planning conditions.

Amendment to proposed conditions

Since writing the Committee report the Local Highway Authority have requested that the following Highways condition and informatives are appended to the Decision.

Conditions:

Vehicle to vehicle visibility splays

The vehicle to vehicle visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m on both sides of the access shall be provided prior to occupation of the development and shall be maintained thereafter free from any obstruction over a height of 600mm within an area of 2.4m x 43m measured from and along respectively the channel line of the carriageway.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1 and of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

Informatives:

Numbering and Naming

Public Health Act 1925 S17-18

The development will result in the creation of new street(s) and/or new dwelling(s) and/or new premises and it will be necessary for the Council, as Street Naming Authority, to allocate appropriate street names and property numbers. Before development is commenced, you should contact the Technical Support Team Manager - Highway Infrastructure Group on (01733) 453461 for details of the procedure to be followed and information required. This procedure is applicable to the sub-division of premises, which will provide multiple occupancy for both residential and commercial buildings.

Please note this is not a function covered by your planning application but is a statutory obligation of the Local Authority, and is not chargeable and must be dealt with as a separate matter.

Vehicular Crossings S184 Access Works

Highways Act 1980 - Section 184, Sub-Sections (3)(4)(9)

This development involves the construction of a new or alteration of an existing vehicular crossing within a public highway.

These works **MUST** be carried out in accordance with details specified by Peterborough City Council.

Prior to commencing any works within the public highway, a Road Opening Permit must be obtained from the Council on payment of the appropriate fee.

Contact is to be made with the Transport & Engineering - Development Team on 01733 453421 who will supply the relevant application form, provide a preliminary indication of the fee payable and specify the construction details and drawing(s) required.

NR&SWA 1991

The development is likely to involve works within the public highway in order to provide services to the site. Such works must be licensed under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. It is essential that, prior to the commencement of such works, adequate time be allowed in the development programme for; the issue of the appropriate licence, approval of temporary traffic management and booking of road space. Applications for NR & SWA licences should be made to Transport & Engineering – Street Works Co-Ordinator on 01733 453467.

Wheel Cleansing

The wheel cleansing equipment shall be capable of cleaning the wheels, underside and chassis of the vehicles. The road between the cleaning equipment and the public highway shall be surfaced either in concrete or blacktop and be maintained free of mud, slurry and any other form of contamination whilst in use.

5.5	10/01594/FUL	Land To The West Of Uffington Road, Barnack, Stamford. Construction of a barn for rabbit breeding and construction of 1 X Poly tunnel for trees, shrubs and plants
-----	--------------	--

Further representations

Cllr Over has made the following comments:

LNE1 There is no evidence that this application is essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry etc

LNE3 This application would result in the loss of agricultural land where there is no overriding need

LNE5 This would have significant effect on an Area of Best Landscape

A further neighbour representation has been received making the following comments:

Proposal is likely to be a stepping stone to construct a dwelling

Same people have bought similar fields close to other villages

If this was a viable business they would not operate from multiple small sites

If approved, this will be an incentive for other landowners to implement schemes to obtain planning permission

Members should note that the application is for agricultural buildings, which will support agricultural enterprises. It is not possible to breed rabbits effectively without a building, and the polytunnel is to support the expansion of an existing horticultural company.

The use of the land will not change. It will still be in agricultural use.

There will be some impact on the Area of Best Landscape, this impact is assessed in the Report.

The possibility that a future application for a dwelling or anything else may be submitted, the business of the applicant in other areas and the viability of the business are not in this case material planning considerations and these matters should not influence the decision on the application.

Highway Issues

There are currently two accesses into the site from Uffington Road neither of which is hard surfaced.

There is no evidence of intensive recent use however there are gates and fences in these locations, and no other way of accessing the site.

The initial proposal showed one additional access and upgrading of the existing accesses. As Uffington Road is classified, these would required planning permission. This was discussed with the applicant as it is likely that significant works would be required which could have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the site, and could result in loss of some of the hedging. The applicant has agreed to withdraw the accesses from the application, and therefore an additional condition is recommended.

Condition 5

Notwithstanding the approved plans, the additional access and upgraded accesses shown on the submitted block plan are not permitted.

Reason: Insufficient information has been submitted to ensure adequate assessment of these alterations against Policies T1 and LNE5 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2005 (First Replacement).

5.6	10/01648/FUL	45 High Street Maxey Peterborough , Construction of 2 semi-detached and 1 link detached houses (1 x 3 bed and 2 x 4 bed) with parking
-----	--------------	--

Drawings

Revised drawings have been received;

Elevations (Drwg No. 564-30-01-DD01 Rev E) – Introduction of quoins to Plots 2 & 3 and removal of barge boards to dormer windows on Plot 1.

Site Plan (Drwg No. 564-30-SPO1 Rev E) – Revised site layout to amend parking layout. Plot 1 will be independently accessed from High Street, Plots 2 & 3 will utilise tandem parking accessed off Woodgate Lane.

Highways

Highways have commented that the proposed Site Layout Plan illustrates the boundary wall to creep onto the Woodgate Lane grass verge. However the red line, illustrated on the Site Location Plan, illustrates the development to be within the land ownership of the deeds. To confirm, the layout discrepancy relates to the boundary wall only; the actual building and its foundations will be unaffected. For the avoidance of doubt it is considered condition 16 should be amended to the following;

Prior to commencement of development, a topographical survey of the existing site and details of proposed boundary walls and fences, including their positioning and location, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and erected prior to the first occupation of the development, and thereafter such boundary treatment shall be maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the adjoining occupiers, in accordance with Policy DA2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005.

Representation

Additional Information has been received from Cllr Hillar regarding 3x Computer Generated Impressions of the proposal. It should be emphasised these are impressions only; the proposed materials are natural limestone and Bradstone Conservation Slate (sandy brown). The impressions do not illustrate the boundary wall or boundary landscaping.

Other

On the Committee Report 3 letters of objection is noted to have been received. To clarify a total of 6x letters of representation has been received. The content of these letters are as summarised on the committee report. Full details can be found on Anite or are available upon request.

Letter of objection to planning application reference: 10/01704/FUL – Land between 45 and 55 North Street

***The Old Ferry
57 North Street
Stanground
Peterborough
PE2 8HS***

DELIVERED BY E-MAIL AND BY HAND on 12 January 2011

Planning Services
Peterborough City Council
Stuart House East Wing
St. John's Street
Peterborough
PE1 5DD

Dear Sirs,

**Planning Application Reference: 10/01704/FUL
Construction of six two-bed and two three-bed dwellings
At land between 45 and 55 North Street Stanground Peterborough**

Thank you for your letter of 15 December 2010 notifying us of the above mentioned Planning Application. We object to the above mentioned application on the grounds that the housing development to which it relates represents a major contravention of a number of the Council's stated planning policies. We will deal with these issues in more detail at a later point.

In the meantime we would draw your attention to the fact that a number of the supporting documents are inaccurate because they state that the fence between the above mentioned site and numbers 45 and 55 North Street is the boundary. The fence line is not the boundary and the City Council's legal department has confirmed that to be the case. I am currently liaising with the City Council's officers and my neighbour to make an appointment to stake out the actual boundary.

The site to which the application relates (hereinafter referred to as "the Site") is situated in an area that the Peterborough Local Plan First Replacement (2005) designates as an Urban Area Boundary. The Site abuts Back River and an important local, national and international conservation site known as Stanground Wash both of which are part of the Nene Valley. These areas are used by the general public for recreational purposes such as boating dog walking, bird watching and fishing.

The current application appears to be little more than a watered down version of a prior application that has already been considered and refused by the City Council's Planning Committee on, among other grounds, the basis that it failed to respect the character and amenity of the surrounding area. For ease of reference I will address the issues raised by this application under separate sub-headings.

Design and Amenity – Policy DA1

The pre-existing residential development on the northern side of North Street consists of one or two storey dwellings (with a predominance of one or one and a half storey where constructed in close proximity to Back River). One of the primary characteristics of the majority of these dwellings is that they have a "double frontage" to both North Street and Back River with gardens sloping down to the river. The majority of these dwellings are sited well back from the river and are of brick and tile/slate construction.

The proposed construction of ugly two storey half timbered dwellings and a car park in close proximity to Back River is incompatible with the primary characteristics of the existing residential dwellings. The development will also have a detrimental impact on its surroundings, nearby buildings and spaces and

longer views creating, in particular, an adverse visual impact when viewed from Back River, Stanground Wash and one of the primary railway lines into Peterborough.

Amenity and Character of the Area – Policy DA2

The northern side of North Street is characterised by low density development with gardens sloping down to the river. The proposal relates to a high density development which, in the context of this sensitive location, would constitute overdevelopment and have an adverse impact on the amenity and character of the area.

The construction of scruffy half timbered two storey dwellings at the rear of the site would have a detrimental and overbearing impact on the character of the area and the views from Back River and Stanground Wash.

The noise and fumes from the proposed parking area would have a detrimental effect on the peace and tranquillity of the Nene Valley, Back River, Stanground Wash and the gardens of neighbouring residential properties.

Materials – Policy DA3

The residential dwellings in Stanground Village and, in particular, North Street are largely of brick and tile construction. Consequently the half timbered finish of the proposed dwellings at the rear of this site will not harmonise with the established building materials used in this locality. This type of construction weathers badly and is inappropriate for a windswept and exposed site where it will become unsightly in a very short space of time giving off a slum like appearance in a highly sensitive area.

Tandem, Backland and Piecemeal Development – Policy DA6

The scale and density of the proposed development (which includes construction of backland dwellings) are inappropriate for this sensitive site. The houses at the rear of the development and the car park adjacent to Back River will harm the area which is generally characterised by one or two storey dwellings with gardens sloping down to the river. In particular the proposed parking area will cause noise and nuisance to the adjoining properties.

Contaminated Land - Policy DA14

The history of the Site is industrial and for many years it was used, among other things, as a boat yard and haulage yard during the ownership of Mr Jackson, the proprietor of Jackson's Boat Haulage. Consequently there is a high risk of soil contamination from a large range of contaminants which, without appropriate remediation, could cause a risk to the health and/or safety of persons visiting the Site during the course of the development and/or residential occupiers of the completed development. Disturbing the soil on the Site could cause significant harm or possibility of harm to the adjacent controlled waterway known as Back River.

Residential Density – Policy H15

The density of the proposed development is totally incompatible with the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area which largely consists of low density residential development with gardens sloping down to the river. The design and layout of the proposed development compromises the quality of the environment and will cause serious harm in this highly sensitive location. The proposed access road and parking arrangements will cause excessive noise and nuisance to neighbouring and adjoining properties.

Transport Implications of New Development – Policy T1

Development affecting the Cycle Route Network – Policy T4

The traffic survey which accompanies the application was taken at a time when traffic was diverting via Daffodil Grove, Thistle Drive and Coneygree Road in order to avoid road works at the junction of Church Street and South Street. The survey was, in any event, directed at the speed, rather than the quantity, of traffic.

The additional vehicle movements generated by the proposed development will, when added to the additional traffic that will be generated when 12 North Street is redeveloped (permission already granted), cause congestion and have an unacceptable impact on other elements of the transport network such as cyclists (who use North Street as part of the Green Wheel) and local bus services which already experience difficulty as a result of on street parking.

The increase in traffic as a result of the proposed development will, when added to the increase in traffic as a result of the redevelopment of 12 North Street, seriously prejudice the safety of and/or cause significant inconvenience and discomfort to cyclists using North Street as part of the Green Wheel.

The application does not appear to indicate whether the gates separating the proposed development from the highway will be automatic or manual. In either case it is highly likely that the occupiers of the development, particularly those with houses fronting North Street, will take the lazy option and park in the Street.

North Street is narrow and residents from the properties opposite the proposed development are forced, by lack of parking facilities, to park in front of their houses. If residents from the proposed development, from choice, do likewise the double parking will cause serious obstruction on a bus route and endanger cyclists using the Green Wheel. Such a situation could be avoided by providing yellow lines on the north side of North Street (including numbers 55 and 57).

Car Parking Requirements – Policy T10

The parking arrangements shown on application plan numbered 104/D(--)-102 are completely inconsistent with the parking arrangements shown on the Vehicle track site plan numbered 104/SK(-)14 Rev B (which still refers to 2.5 storey houses). To which of these plans will the applicant adhere when the development is carried out?

If the applicant proposes to adhere to the application plan numbered 104/D(--)-102 the development will result in a substantial over-supply of residents' parking spaces contrary to Policy T10 and the national parking standards set out in PPG13. If Appendix 5 is used for the calculation the overall requirement is for 10 resident spaces (one space x 6 two bed units and two spaces x 2 three bed units). The application plan shows 16 resident spaces, an over-supply of 6 spaces.

Guidance attached to the Council's policy states that an application which results in an oversupply of parking should be refused unless the applicant can show an overriding need for the additional spaces. It would appear unlikely that such a need can be shown in this case given the nature of the proposed development and the proximity of frequent bus services.

Since the proximity of the car parking facilities to the river is one of the major concerns with regard to the proposed development there would appear to be some scope for addressing that issue by complying with national policy and the stated policies of the Council.

The Nene Valley – Policy LNE4 and LNE8

The construction of ugly half timbered dwellings and a car park in close proximity to the river will have an adverse impact on the views from Back River and Stanground Wash (both of which form part of the Nene Valley) and, therefore, prejudice the character and use of this part of the Nene Valley for recreational purposes. The development proposals do not contain an adequate "buffer zone" to protect these views. Even if the landscaping provision was satisfactory conditions (which can only impose replacement obligations for a limited duration) would not resolve the problem of ongoing maintenance and replacement.

Buffer Zones for Development Bordering the Countryside – Policy LNE6

The site is on an Urban Area Boundary. It abuts Back River and the nature conservation site known as Stanground Wash both of which form part of the Nene Valley. The inconsistent landscaping proposals are no more than a derisory form of screen planting. Such a planting scheme is totally inadequate for the purpose of constructing a satisfactory buffer zone or assimilating the development into the landscape.

The provision of a buffer zone could not, in any event, compensate for the poor quality of the design or the construction of scruffy half timbered houses and an unsightly car park in close proximity to Back River. These structures are incapable of forming and/or maintaining a coherent and attractive “edge” to the urban area boundary.

Landscaping Implications of Development Proposals – Policy LNE9

The Site contains a number of trees and other natural features that make a positive contribution to the quality of the local environment. The proposed development fails to take account of this and/or make adequate provision for the retention and/or replacement of all barring one of these trees and/or features and/or to provide appropriate landscaping and tree replacement as part of the development.

The landscaping detail on the plans submitted for approval is inconsistent throughout. None of the submitted plans show landscaping which complies with the recommendation (set out in paragraph 9.2 of the accompanying Tree Survey) that replacement trees be planted in plots 1 and 4 to 8 (inclusive).

Irrespective of the inconsistencies in the submitted plans the landscaping detail shown on them does not respond to the setting of the proposed scheme in relation to adjoining land uses. The proposed landscaping fails to preserve the natural appearance of the part of the Site which immediately abuts Back River and Stanground Wash and is totally inadequate for the purpose of protecting the views from those areas and the adjacent residential properties.

The imposition of landscaping conditions (which can only impose replacement obligations for a limited duration) would be inadequate for securing future replacement and the management of landscaping in this highly sensitive location.

Sites of Local, National and International Nature Conservation Importance – Policies LNE14, LNE15 AND LNE16

The increased activity resulting from the density of this development together with the noise and fumes from excessive parking activity in close proximity to the river will have an adverse affect on the integrity of Back River and Stanground Wash by disturbing the wildlife and adversely affecting the tranquillity of and views from this part of the Nene Valley.

The development proposals, and in particular the density and general appearance of the development together with the construction of a car parking area in close proximity to Back River will have an adverse visual impact on the views from Stanground Wash and Back River. The development proposals do not appear to contain a landscaping bund that would sufficiently protect those views.

Embanked Watercourses – Policy U7

The river wall on the northern boundary of the proposed development site is badly undercut and in poor condition. In the absence of any remedial work the proposed development, and in particular the construction of the proposed parking area, will place an additional strain on these already weak defences and put both the proposed development site and the adjacent properties at risk.

Flood Zone

It is inappropriate to situate the veranda of plot 8 and the car parking area within an area that is susceptible to flooding.

Reference to Planning Committee

Finally it is wholly inappropriate for an application that affects such a sensitive area to be dealt with under delegated authority. Consequently the application should be considered by the Council’s Planning Committee and we are writing to our ward councillors asking them to call in the application.

Yours faithfully,
Dr. Peter John Goddard
Jacqueline Harrison

Letter of objection to application reference 10/01598/FUL – Longthorpe Memorial Hall

From: Ronnie Leishman
Sent: Wed 02/02/11 22.48
To: Lovegrove Louise
Cc: Cllr Dalton Matthew; Democratic Services
Subject: URGENT: Potential errors in report going before Committee on 8th Feb re 10/01598/FUL

Louise -

I received a letter from Gemma George re the above application with a link to the report going before the Planning Committee next Tuesday. On inspection of the report, I believe that there are material errors which could mean that a decision could be taken on that day based upon what I think may fundamentally incorrect information.

The errors concern the section from pages 15 and 16 reproduced from the report below:

"the applicant has provided a detailed Lighting Assessment and associated light spillage diagram (Annex 1) with indicative lighting levels spilling out of the site. This diagram clearly shows that some spillage beyond the courts will occur as a result of the proposal and this is to be expected.

However, the diagram shows that the level of lighting that will reach neighbouring residential properties will be limited to only 0.3 Lux or lower (brightness of a full moon on a clear night). The level indicated is far lower than that of standard street lighting which has an average level of between 3 and 15 Lux. The level proposed is in line with the Institute of British Lighting Engineers Guidance (ILE) for light intrusion into residential properties. The area is considered to fall within category E2 (dark urban areas) as at present, the area is unlit but has some sky glow by virtue of the street lighting to the residential area surrounding. The ILE guidelines clearly state that in this type of area light trespass into windows should be limited to 5 Lux pre-curfew (23.00) and post- curfew to 1 Lux. Therefore, it is anticipated that the impact from the floodlights will be minimal."

The figure of 0.3 Lux supplied by the applicant is NOT, as stated in the report, a measure "the level of lighting that will reach neighbouring residential properties." According to the ILE guidelines, there are two main types of lighting which will reach neighbouring residential properties - spill light and light trespass. The quoted figure of 0.3 Lux is spill light only i.e. it is a measure of light taken at ground level. Light trespass into windows is defined in the ILE guidelines as "Vertical Illuminance in Lux and is measured flat on the glazing at the centre of the window" and there has been no measurement of this included in the report. This is the light that adjacent residents will see when they look out of their windows at the floodlit tennis courts and is a very important factor to be measured.

The report is, therefore, incorrect when it states that "The level proposed is in line with the Institute of British Lighting Engineers Guidance (ILE) for light intrusion into residential properties" because there has been no measurement of light trespass included in the report. It also follows that the statement in the report "Therefore, it is anticipated that the impact from the floodlights will be minimal" also cannot be correct because there has been no evidence presented to prove that light trespass into windows has been "limited to 5 Lux."

I cannot see how the report can go to committee when it has clearly not demonstrated that the impact is minimal and that ILE guidelines have been complied with. Given that the committee meets next Tuesday, I'd welcome your views on this as soon as possible

Regards

Ronnie Leishman

10/01598/FUL – Longthorpe Memorial Hall, 295 Thorpe Road, Peterborough

Longthorpe Tennis Club contacted me to speak on their behalf in support of the application.

The tennis club enjoys playing throughout the year on the all weather courts and they play for as long as there are daylight hours. In the summer, matches can continue into the light evenings and the club would like to enjoy the same in winter months, after the nights draw in. The club is concious of light that may impact local residents and plan to put "shields" round the lights to minimise this. The light should only light the immediate court area and my understanding is that it is 30 metres from neighbouring houses.

I feel that it is a reasonable request to be able to play tennis all year round in the evening making use of the new courts. In terms of light pollution, if a street light is between 3 and 5 lux, I am happy that the impact is minimal. The Memorial Hall that is in front of the Tennis Courts, already have a flood lit car park so I do not believe that complaints about light pollution are valid when the area is already brightly lit.

In terms of additional traffic, many residents who use the tennis club are local. It is true to say that the Memorial Hall is busy all year round and have a small car park.

Living almost opposite the Memorial Hall, in the summer I have not noticed an issue in terms of parking, it is untested in the winter. I will however encourage the club to speak to our Travel Choice team to do some travel planning to minimise any impact and encourage local residents to walk or cycle.

Noise should be no more of an impact than in the summer months.

I agree with the case officer that the application should be approved.

Thanks
Councillor Sam Dalton

10/01598/FUL – Longthorpe Memorial Hall, 295 Thorpe Road, Peterborough

The following is a written submission to the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee in respect of their consideration of application 10/01598/FUL, being floodlighting for courts 3 and 4 at Longthorpe Tennis Club.

The application before the committee this afternoon has the capacity to significantly change the character and appearance of the local area (being within the Longthorpe Conservation Area). The application site is within an established dark residential area and thus it could be argued that such an imposition of a large 'square of light', would have a significant detrimental effect on local residents.

The successful (retrospective) application for hard courts in January 2010, has, according to local residents, fundamentally changed the character of the local area. Rather than tennis being played during the summer only, disruption (e.g. noise and traffic movements) is now caused during the entire year. The application will add hours of further disruption during the winter.

I have received representations with regards traffic movements at the site during the winter also. The point has been made that 'uniform groups' meet at the hall only in the winter evenings and thus there is no traffic 'pinch point' with tennis only being played summer evenings. Winter tennis would add potential serious capacity problems at the hall car park.

This application could be looked at through a simplistic model of cost-benefit analysis. My understanding is that the tennis club has approximately 50 local members (with 50 being from outside the area). The committee needs to weigh up whether the benefit to the erection of such floodlights to local tennis players is in excess of the potential societal cost.

Cllr Matthew Dalton
West Ward

10/01704/FUL – Land between 45 and 55 North Street, Stanground, Peterborough

Dear Miss George,

Following my earlier e-mail my husband and I have now had an opportunity of considering the Committee Report in more detail and we believe that it contains a number of active misrepresentations to which we consider the Committee's attention should be drawn. Consequently we would like to make the following late submissions:-

DESIGN AND IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA - It is completely deceptive for the Report to suggest that the normal height for buildings constructed in close proximity to the river is two stories when the norm is one or at most one and a half stories. It is only the frontage to North Street that is characterised by two storey houses (and even there some of the buildings are only one storey). It is also deceptive to state that the rear terrace has been dropped to two stories and that the site slopes. The site does slope, however the plans attached to the application make it quite clear that the rear terrace (plots 6, 7 and 8) is to be constructed on "made up" ground bringing the houses up to the same height as the houses fronting North Street. Consequently the rear terrace will still be more than two stories above true ground level and, as such, will have a significant overbearing impact on views from adjoining properties, back river and the Nene Wash. It is entirely inappropriate to suggest that the thin strip of land between the car parking area and back river is capable of forming an adequate buffer zone between the development and Back River.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOUR AMENITY - As a result of the raised height of the rear terrace the first floor windows will overlook adjoining properties and in particular substantially the whole of the rear garden of 57 North Street - a point that has been conveniently overlooked in the Committee Report. In the circumstances the revised application has not, as suggested in the Report, successfully addressed all of the reasons for the refusal of the previous application. The noise and nuisance generated by the parking area, which will be placed in close proximity to our garden without the benefit of any screening, is totally out of keeping with the peace and tranquillity of the river scene and it will have a significant adverse impact on our residential amenity.

HIGHWAY IMPLICATIONS - Even if the entire site were to be filled with parking spaces the occupiers of the houses fronting North Street will do what comes naturally, i.e.: park their cars in front of their homes. The need to negotiate a set of gates in order to get to a parking area that is placed at a distance from their homes will only exacerbate that natural inclination and the situation will be made worse if the gates are manually operated.

There is absolutely no justification for the over provision of parking spaces because it will not solve the problem. That can only be resolved by giving the potential occupiers what they want - individual parking spaces adjacent to their houses/gardens.

RECOMMENDATIONS - In light of the apparent indifference that the City Council's Planning Officers are displaying towards the comfort and amenity of neighbouring residents we object most strongly to matters such as level, facing materials, landscaping, lighting and hours of work being left to their discretion. If permission is to

be granted these matters should be settled by the Committee as part of the application or, if that is not possible, the subject of further neighbour consultation.

Yours faithfully,

Dr. Peter John Goddard
Jacqueline Harrison

10/01594/FUL – Land to the West of Uffington Road, Barnack, Stamford

Dear Gemma

I wish to object to this application for the following reasons:

LN1 - There is no evidence that this application is essential to the effective operation of local agriculture, horticulture, forestry etc

LNE3 - This application would result in the loss of agricultural land where there is no overriding need

LN5 - This would have significant effect on an Area of Best Landscape

Dr David Over

Cllr for Barnack





