

Public Document Pack



PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 15 OCTOBER 2024

1.30 PM

Engine Shed, Sand Martin House

AGENDA

Page No

Supplementary Agenda

3 - 14

Emergency Evacuation Procedure – Outside Normal Office Hours

In the event of the fire alarm sounding all persons should vacate the building by way of the nearest escape route and proceed directly to the assembly point in front of the WHSmiths. The duty Beadle will assume overall control during any evacuation, however in the unlikely event the Beadle is unavailable, this responsibility will be assumed by the Committee Chair. In the event of a continuous alarm sounding remain seated and await instruction from the duty Beadle.

Recording of Council Meetings: Any member of the public may film, audio-record, take photographs and use social media to report the proceedings of any meeting that is open to the public. Audio-recordings of meetings may be published on the Council's website. A protocol on this facility is available at:

<http://democracy.peterborough.gov.uk/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=Protocol%20on%20the%20use%20of%20Recording&ID=690&RPID=2625610&sch=doc&cat=13385&path=13385>

Committee Members:

Councillors: C Harper (Chairman), Mahmood (Vice Chair), Iqbal, B Rush, Antunes, W Fitzgerald, Warren, Bond, Skibsted, Rangzeb and McNally

Substitutes: Councillors: P Hiller, Walsh, Hogg and Ali

Further information about this meeting can be obtained from Matt Makin on telephone 01733 384641 or by email – democratic.services@peterborough.gov.uk



There is an induction hearing loop system available in all meeting rooms. Some of the systems are infra-red operated, if you wish to use this system then please contact Matt Makin on 01733 384641 as soon as possible.

Did you know? All Peterborough City Council's meeting agendas are available online or via the modern.gov app. Help us achieve our environmental protection aspirations and view this agenda online instead of printing it.

NOTES:

1. Any queries on completeness or accuracy of reports should be raised with the Case Officer, Head of Planning and/or Development Management Manager as soon as possible.
2. The purpose of location plans is to assist Members in identifying the location of the site. Location plans may not be up-to-date, and may not always show the proposed development.
3. These reports take into account the Council's equal opportunities policy but have no implications for that policy, except where expressly stated.
4. The background papers for planning applications are the application file plus any documents specifically referred to in the report itself.
5. These reports may be updated orally at the meeting if additional relevant information is received after their preparation.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 15 OCTOBER 2024 AT 1:30PM

1. Procedure for Speaking
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak
3. Briefing Update

UPDATE REPORT AND 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 (collectively) shall not exceed ten minutes, or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

MPs will be permitted to address Committee when they have been asked to represent their constituents. The total time allowed for speeches for MPs shall not exceed five minutes, unless the Committee decides on the day of the meeting to extend the time allowed due to unusual or exceptional circumstances.

The total time for speeches in respect of objectors (collectively) shall not exceed five minutes, or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

The total time for speeches in respect of applicants, agents or supporters (collectively) shall not exceed five minutes, or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 15 OCTOBER 2024 AT 1:30 PM

LIST OF PERSONS REGISTERED TO SPEAK

Agenda Item	Application	Name	Ward Councillor / Parish Councillor / Objector / Applicant
5.1	23/00400/OUT – East of England Showground, Oundle Road, Alwalton, Peterborough, PE2 6XE	Cllr Nicola Day Cllr Kirsty Knight Cllr Julie Stevenson Mike Fowler Steve Cawley Brian Connolly Mick Bratley Ashley Butterfield Dilraj Kaur David Poulton Fiona Radic	Ward Councillor Ward Councillor Ward Councillor Objector Objector Objector Objector Applicant’s Representative Supporter Supporter Supporter
5.2	23/00412/OUT – East of England Showground, Oundle Road, Alwalton, Peterborough, PE2 6XE	Cllr Nicola Day Cllr Kirsty Knight Cllr Julie Stevenson Mike Fowler Brian Connolly Mick Bratley Ashley Butterfield Dilraj Kaur David Poulton Fiona Radic	Ward Councillor Ward Councillor Ward Councillor Objector Objector Objector Applicant’s Representative Supporter Supporter Supporter
5.3	Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order 24/00002/TPO – Land rear of 20 Gunthorpe Road, Peterborough, PE4 7TG	Nick Sandford Fabienne Loveder David Jeffrey	Supporter Supporter Supporter
5.4	24/01062/HHFUL – 1 Silvester Road, Castor, Peterborough, PE5 7BA	None	None
5.5	24/01009/WCPP – Causeway Lodge, The Causeway, Thorney, Peterborough, PE6 6QH	Cllr Steve Allen Cllr Mark Ormston Cllr John Shearman	Ward Councillor Ward Councillor Thorney Parish Council

BRIEFING UPDATE

Planning & Environmental Protection Committee 15 October 2024

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1 .	23/00400/OUT	East Of England Showground Oundle Road Alwalton Peterborough , Outline permission for construction up to 850 dwellings, care village (up to 3.27 hec gross), up to 20,300 sq m of Class E [Class E (a), (b), (c), (d), (e),(g) (i)] and F1 floorspace of which: 1. Not more than 1000 sq m of floor space being Class E (a); 2. Not more than 1000 sq m being Sui Generis drinking establishment / drinking establishment with expanded food provision; bed hotel (up to 250 bed), car parking / servicing, 2 FE primary school, associated open space & infrastructure. Demolition of all buildings except for Arena and barn. All matters reserved save for access. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.
and		
2 .	23/00412/OUT	East Of England Showground Oundle Road Alwalton Peterborough , Outline permission for demolition of all buildings and construction of up to 650 dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure, with access secured and all other matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) reserved. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

The above applications 23/00400/OUT and 23/00412/OUT are essentially 2 parts of the same overall development, with the same key issues raised in public representations, with consultee responses generally referring to both applications, and with very similar recommended conditions and an intention to draft a single section 106 agreement to cover both applications. As such they are considered together below:

Additional Consultee Comments

Huntingdonshire District Council – Reiterates no objections

North Northamptonshire Council – Questions raised about amount of traffic on A605

Active Travel England – Reiterate their previous concerns about maximising opportunities for walking and cycling and links to the existing network.

Officer Comment: ATE's comments are noted. Access is included as a matter for consideration, meaning that any reserved matters would be required to be in accordance with the position and type of the proposed accesses, as well as the internal movement corridors as shown on the illustrative masterplan and access and movement parameters plans. The exact details of the access and cycle/pedestrian routes would be assessed and determined at reserved matters stage. Furthermore mitigation in the form of offsite enhancement of the cycleway network can be secured via a section 106 agreement. Officers are satisfied that the proposal at this stage does make provision to maximise opportunities for active travel.

PCC Open Space Officer – Reiterates concerns about allotment provision, lack of detail of open space and play areas, and makes various suggestions and comments around the location and type of open space. States quantum and type of open space that would be required in accordance with policy.

Officer Comment: The Open Space Officer's comments are noted. However as outline applications with all matters reserved except access, the exact design and specification would be assessed and determined at reserved matters stage. The quantum and type of open space and play facilities would be set in the section 106 agreement, and reserved matters applications would be required by condition to

be in “broad accordance” with the illustrative masterplan and parameters plans, thereby allowing sufficient flexibility to incorporate the design features suggested.

PCC Education -Confirm that a 0.5FE extension to an existing primary school is no longer likely to be required. However the need for a 2FE primary school is imperative given the number of houses being proposed and that the existing infrastructure within the area simply would not cope with the demand.

They have requested the contributions (as set out in their original consultee response) based on the number of pupils that would be expected, given the size of development and the number of new school places that would be needed. The formula used to reach these figures is used on all housing developments in the City, and the amount originally stated, still stands.

They confirm that in regard to payment of Section 106 monies via a tariff based system with amounts payable being on completion of each house sale, this would be acceptable to them (subject to agreement with PCC Finance Team). However they would need a long stop date to ensure any borrowing PCC need to forward fund the school, would be paid back in a timely fashion.

The only other alternative would be for the developer to provide the Council with a built 2FE school, in line with DfE regulations, and in collaboration with PCC.

This still doesn't negate the funds required for the early years / secondary school places. Extensions to neighbouring schools would be essential to accommodate the demand from the housing development.

Officer Comment: The applicant had sought clarification on the level of Section 106 contributions requested by PCC Education. Following the clarification above, officers are satisfied that the request is compliant with reg 122 of the CIL regulations and is necessary to mitigate the impacts on local schools. The Section 106 HOTs have therefore been updated below in line with PCC Education's comments with the figures included.

NHS - They reiterate the amounts requested for the residential elements of the two applications. They confirm that there is no capacity within the existing health infrastructure to absorb additional growth from this application without mitigation, and that this includes the care village. Specialist accommodation has a significant impact on health infrastructure in the local area and generally requires additional primary care services. This additional level of primary care service provision is crucial to avoiding unnecessary hospital admissions, therefore local practices having the capacity to accommodate the additional workforce and related resources needed to support this type of accommodation is key. The impact of older patients is well accepted, with them placing a higher demand on practices, as evidenced by practices weighting patient demographics.

They are comfortable that their request meets the CIL Regulation tests and this has been supported by a number of recent appeal decisions including a recent Appeal Decision, (ref: APP/V0510/W/23/3324141) for a 'Care Village' where the justification, contribution and approach were found acceptable and in accordance with the CIL Regulation tests. The inspector's comments on this matter are set out between paras 89-99 of the appeal decision.

As there is a lack of detail for the care village at this stage, in terms of size, form, unit numbers etc – they would propose adopting a formulaic approach pending final unit/beds confirmation at the reserved matters stage. This would use the 1.8 persons per unit (or bedspace) approach (as accepted in the above appeal) – as per paragraph 11 of the Government's Housing Delivery Test Measurement Rule Book (July 2018).

Therefore they propose a formulaic approach such as:

- $((A \times B) \times C) \times D = E$
- o A = No. of care units/beds
- o B = 1.8 (HDT Rule Book)
- o C = 0.08571429sqm (floorspace per person)
- o D = £6,447 (Cost psqm)
- o E = Total Care Village Contribution

The section 106 contributions could either be spent on a new facility on site (subject to a serviced plot

being made available) or on an off site health project which would directly serve the development. To confirm, they are seeking a 'Capital' contribution towards the physical delivery of healthcare infrastructure and not revenue funding, which formed the basis of the NHS's request in the quashed high court case cited by the applicant.

Officer Comment: The applicant had sought clarification on the level of Section 106 contributions requested by the NHS, in particular relating to the care village. They had also cited case law relating to a quashed appeal decision in Harborough. In respect of the case law quoted by the applicant, this was found to be not directly relevant to the applications, being concerned with revenue expenditure rather than capital investment. Following the clarification above, officers are satisfied that the request is compliant with reg 122 of the CIL regulations and is necessary to mitigate the impacts on local healthcare provision. The Section 106 HOTs have therefore been updated below in line with the NHS's comments with the figures included.

PCC Highways – No objection in principle, subject to adequate mitigation. However, despite the submission of some additional information, which has partially resolved some of the previous concerns raised, there still remain some outstanding technical issues still to be resolved around the highways mitigation, particularly the upgrade and signalisation of the Oundle Road, Orton Parkway roundabout and safety measures around Linden Gardens. Continue to recommend conditions and section 106 obligations.

Officer Comment: PCC Highways have set out clearly in their latest consultee comments what issues can be addressed by condition/section 106 and what additional information is required post committee to resolve the outstanding issues, should the Committee approve the applications. Officers and the LHA are satisfied that a workable solution to mitigate the highways impact of the development can be achieved and that it is not necessary for the issues to be resolved prior to Committee. The recommendation remains to approve subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement and resolution of the highways issue to the satisfaction of the LHA. An additional caveat has been added that if such a resolution has not been achieved within 6 months, that the application be refused.

Additional Representations from the Public

SPURR (Showground Plans Under Resident Review) – SPURR are a local residents group from the Orton Waterville Ward, set up following a public meeting arranged by Cllr Nicola Day. For the avoidance of doubt this is their official representation and any earlier representation claiming to be from SPURR is the view of an individual member rather than the group collectively. SPURR raise a number of concerns. Key concerns include:

- Lack of clarity as to why the overall scheme has been submitted as 2 applications rather than a single application
- Lack of public consultation by applicant
- Conflict with Local Plan policies including loss of showground
- Highway and traffic capacity
- Impact on local infrastructure – in particular education and health

Officer Comment: Most of these concerns have been addressed in the main report or in other sections of this report. The LHA has also responded to a number of SPURR's specific highways questions as below:

Q. Number of traffic movements for the whole proposal?

A. 1205 vehicles in the AM peak (2-way) and 1348 vehicles in the PM peak (2-way).

Q. What consideration has been given to a second access to deal with the anticipated larger traffic movements that will result on Joseph Odam Way and Oundle Road, such as off Bakewell Road?

A. None, the applicants' have not proposed a second access, and the traffic modelling has been carried out using solely the Joseph Odam Way access.

Q. What steps will be taken to ensure that the Dunblane Drive access will not become available as a 'rat-run' for the residents of the 650 (or 1500) dwellings, as it is recently being proposed as a bus route and for use by 'non-residential' vehicles?

A. An ANPR Controlled bus gate would be required if the route is to be used by buses. Until that point, a suitable mechanism for preventing vehicular access will be required.

Q. What building works will be undertaken to provide safe and effective systems of traffic control/movement from the proposal and the existing areas of Southgate and Northgate?

A. No vehicular traffic from the site would go directly into Orton Southgate, and the existing properties off Loch Lomond Way in Orton Northgate would have priority over vehicles leaving the proposal as the access is via the existing roundabout.

Q. Clarification by the AEPG and PCC as why a second, or even third, access road for such a large development hasn't been explored and/or excluded.

A. PCC can only consider what it submitted to them.

Q. Clarify and confirm the access proposals covering Dunblane Drive.

A. Pedestrians and cyclists, emergency service vehicles only to begin, then buses if a bus route is established through the site (this is controlled by the CPCA).

Q. What can be done to ensure timely completion of the spine road to an 'adoptable' standard?

A. A highways 'bond' within the S106 is possible. Unfortunately, even once there is a S38 agreement in place to adopt the roads, the LHA cannot force the developer to progress them to adoption

British Speedway Promoters – give background to the popularity of Speedway in the UK as a viable sport. Rebut the conclusions of the “Leisure and Community Impact Assessment” submitted with the application, asserting that it is misleading and ill informed. Make reference to the Coventry Appeal decision.

Officer Comment: These concerns have been addressed in the main report or in other sections of this report. For the avoidance of doubt, whilst some weight can be attached to the fact that speedway activities in Peterborough ceased in 2023 and the speedway track has been dismantled, meaning that effectively it no longer exists, that is not to say that it could not be easily rebuilt and remain a viable sporting venue – as the Coventry appeal decision makes clear. Further an application was made to designate the track as an “asset of community value” which was rejected on the grounds of a lack of information on how the track could become operational again. In any case, and notwithstanding the removal of the track and the arguments made in the Leisure and Community Impact Assessment, both applications are departures and contrary to the Local Plan, in part because they result in the loss of existing culture, leisure and tourist facilities and the planning balance acknowledges this.

150 further representations. These have mostly been joint objections to both applications. The issues raised have already been addressed in the main report or this report. The main issues raised relate to:

- Contrary to Local Plan
- Loss of showground and speedway track
- Highways and traffic
- Impact on local infrastructure
- Delivery of community facilities

Additional Information Submitted by the Applicant

- Latest letters of support -This is a compilation of letters of support from local businesses and organisations
- Highways Information -Additional information and clarification has been submitted relating to traffic modelling and proposed mitigation. This is discussed further in the highways section below
- Rebuttal to Open Space Officer Comments

Officer Comment: The number of letters of support does not in itself add any additional weight in the planning balance. However the economic benefits of the proposal, as expressed in some of the letters is a key factor in the planning balance and has been given due weight.

Updated Section 106 Heads of Terms

The Section 106 Heads of Terms set out below are necessary in accordance with Local Plan Policy LP14 – Infrastructure to Support Growth, read together with the Developer Contributions SPD, and the NPPF (paras. 57 and 58), to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is provided to mitigate the impacts of the development, primarily in this case related to affordable housing, healthcare, education, community facilities, open space, and upgrading highways. In accordance with reg 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (2010) and the policy tests of the NPPF, all section 106 obligations must be

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

A reduced level of Section 106 contributions would only be considered in exceptional cases, and only when the applicant is able to demonstrate through submission of an “open book” viability assessment that the full policy compliant level of contributions would make the development unviable. In this case, as no such assessment has been submitted, the full amount of section 106 contributions is due.

Officers have sought further clarification on the Section 106 financial contributions requested by PCC Education and the NHS in order to ensure that they fit the legal tests of Section 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, after the figures were questioned by the applicant. Their additional comments are summarised in the “Additional Consultee Comments” section above. Officers are satisfied that the above financial contributions and other obligations requested by PCC Education, the NHS and others are based on robust evidence and worked out using appropriate formulas and that the legal tests are satisfied.

The financial contributions below are approximate and based on the maximum number of dwellings being constructed. The Section 106 agreement could include either a requirement to pay lump sums at specified trigger points, or alternatively via a tariff based system i.e. worked out “per dwelling” and paid in instalments on completion of specified numbers of dwellings e.g. 10, but with a “long stop” date by which the full contribution must be paid in the event that development does not progress to completion and where PCC has forward funded and built infrastructure such as the school.

Should both applications be approved by Committee, a single Section 106 agreement will be sought to cover both sites, as they form 2 parts of the same wider development and are in the same ownership and have the same applicant. This will be the most effective way to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided in a timely manner to serve the site as a whole, and to avoid a scenario where only the residential element is built, especially given that the public benefits of the leisure and community facilities element carries significant weight in the planning balance. In the event that Committee were to approve 23/00400/OUT and refuse 23/00412/OUT, the associated Section 106 agreement would impose limitations on the number of dwellings that could be occupied until the community facilities have been provided elsewhere on the showground site at some future point.

The combined Section 106 requirements for 23/00400/OUT and 23/00412/OUT are set out below:

Housing

- 30% of all dwellings on site to be affordable housing with an expected provision of 70% affordable rented tenure and 30% intermediate tenure
- Minimum of 1% of all dwellings on site to be self or custom build

Education

- Early years financial contribution of £1,193,920
- Primary School financial contribution of £6,727,280
- Secondary School financial contribution of £13,712,795
- Provision of a serviced plot within Land B of 2.2ha for a 2FE Primary School – to be built by PCC. Note – alternatively the school could be built by the developer, to agreed specifications, in lieu of the early years and primary school contribution

Healthcare

- Financial contribution of £2,072,143 towards additional/enhanced primary care facilities on or off site. Serviced plot of land to be provided if on site.
- Financial contribution relating to the care village to be worked out using the formula set out in the “additional consultee comments” above, once exact scale and details of the care village is known
- Financial contribution towards PCC Bereavement Services of £29.33 per bedroom
- Financial contribution towards East of England Ambulance Service of £470,900

Community Facilities

- On site community facilities scheme to include but not limited to – community hall/space, shop to serve local needs, medical facilities, sports facilities, public house/restaurant, timetable for implementation
- In the event that 23/00400/OUT is refused and 23/00412/OUT is approved, a limitation on the number of dwellings on Land A that can be occupied before community facilities have been provided elsewhere on the showground site.

Open Space

- 6.53ha of Neighbourhood Parks
- 2.02ha of Natural Greenspace
- 1.39ha of Allotments
- 1 x NEAP
- 2 x LEAPs
- Management and maintenance strategy for public realm.
- Offsite contribution for upgrade of Skye Close Play Area (amount TBC)

Highways and Transport

- Travel Plans and monitoring fee(s)
- Speed limit changes to Joseph Odam Way / Orton Northgate, and Dunblane Drive area.
- Speed Limit changes on Orton Parkway.
- Financial Contributions to off-site highway schemes (including the ATF4 active travel scheme on Oundle Road, including mitigation at the Nene Parkway/Oundle Road junction, and mitigation at Junction 5 of Fletton Parkway (A1139))
- Financial Contributions to off-site cycleway infrastructure including wayfinding and lighting improvements on existing cycle network in the vicinity of the site (additional signage, markings etc. and street lighting)
- Trigger points for highway mitigation works
- Milton land vehicular access to be provided and maintained via Joseph Odam Way.
- New TAs for Reserved Matters applications to monitor the ongoing development and its impact and determine the level of highway mitigation required (if less than the worst case scenario).
- Bus service, trigger points, bus stop and bus gate (ANPR camera enforced) requirements.
- All on-site cycle routes to be a minimum of 3m width and accord with LTN 1/20.
- Shared-use footpath/cycleway connection to existing route between Fraserburgh Way and Kilbride Way to be provided.

- Installation of multimodal sensors to count trips (classified vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists)
- Additional highway modelling to be carried out at various stages (reserved matters) to determine whether the trigger points need to be amended, or alternative mitigation provided.

Updated Schedule of Conditions

Officers have further considered the recommended conditions for both applications which are set out below:

Time Limits and requirement for submission of Reserved Matters

- Outline Time limit
- Reserved Matters to be submitted
- Reserved Matters Time Limits

Approved Plans

- Site location Plan
- Access Plans

Scope of Permission

- Limit dwelling numbers to 850
- Limit Class E floorspace to 20,300 sqm of Class E [Class E (a), (b), (c), (d), (e),(g) (i)] and F1 floorspace of which not more than 1000 sqm of floorspace to be Class E (a) and not more than 1000 sqm of floorspace to be Sui Generis drinking establishment / drinking establishment with expanded food provision

Phasing and Design

- Submission of Design Codes/Briefs for residential and leisure elements of the development – incorporating updated Health Impact Assessment
- Submission of Phasing Plan

Reserved Matters Applications (REMs) to include

- REMs to be in broad accordance with parameters plans and illustrative masterplan REMs to be in accordance with Phasing Plan and Design Code
- REMs to be supported by a statement outlining how the scheme has incorporated sustainable materials, the use of renewable or low carbon energy and reused existing resources
- REM Layout to demonstrate incorporation of units compliant with Building Regulations Part M4(3)
- REM applications as a whole to deliver biodiversity net gain
- REMs to be accompanied by an updated TA to establish exact mitigation
- REMs to include details of lighting scheme
- REMs to include details of lighting scheme
- REMs to include details of bin collection points
- REMs to include details Vehicle tracking details to be submitted as part of reserved matters for Layout

Highways and Transport

- Submission of appropriate Construction Transport Management Plan
- Roads to be constructed to binder course prior to first use.
- Submission of details of construction, long term management and maintenance arrangements of all non adopted roads
- Access highway works to be carried out prior to occupation of first dwelling.
- Notwithstanding the Access and Parameters Plan, Dunblane Drive access to be for pedestrians, cycles, buses and emergency vehicles only

Ecology and Trees

- Submission of appropriate Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
- Submission of an Ecological Design Strategy
- Submission of appropriate Construction Environment Management Plan
- Submission of updated bat surveys and appropriate mitigation measures

- Adherence to recommendations/mitigation of Ecological Appraisal
- Submission of Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan

Drainage

- Submission of Surface Water Drainage Scheme
- Submission of Foul Water Drainage Scheme

Other

- Further archaeological investigation (WSI etc) completed prior to commencement
- Fire hydrants scheme
- Waste Management and Minimisation Plan to be submitted
- All dwellings to be compliant with Building Regulations Part M4(2),
- All dwellings to accord with water efficiency standard in Part G of building regulations.
- Contaminated land conditions as per PCC Pollution control comment

Update to Conclusions and Planning Balance

The additional comments and information received after publication of the Committee Report do not raise any issues of such significance as to change the overall planning balance.

Both applications are departures and do not accord with a number of policies in the Local Plan. However, there are a number of material considerations that are considered to, on balance, outweigh this conflict with policy, including (but not limited to) the lack of a 5 year land supply, significant economic benefits, provision of cultural/leisure facilities that to some extent offset the loss of the showground, and a significant contribution to housing provision in the area including 30% affordable housing. Subject to the full mitigation set out in the schedule of conditions and section 106 Heads of Terms, both applications are considered on balance to be acceptable.

Updated Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the conditions outlined in this report and completion of a S106 legal agreement, and resolution of outstanding highways issues to the satisfaction of the Local Highways Authority.

Final wording of conditions and section 106 agreement to be delegated to officers, subject to broad accordance with the schedule of conditions and Section 106 HOTs outlined above.

If either the required Section 106 legal agreement has not been completed or the outstanding highways issues have not been fully resolved within 6 months from the date of the committee meeting, and there are no extenuating circumstances which would justify a further extension of time, then the Committee delegates the issuing of a notice of refusal to the Executive Director of Place and Economy on the grounds that the development has failed to adequately mitigate its impacts.

3 .	24/00002/TPO	Land rear of 20 Gunthorpe Road, Peterborough, Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order 24/00002/TPO
-----	--------------	--

No Further Comments

4 .	24/01062/HHFUL	1 Silvester Road Castor Peterborough PE5 7BA. Existing dwelling with externally applied wall insulation with render finish similar to existing building
-----	----------------	---

Withdrawal from committee:

The application was referred to the committee by Castor Parish Council, who have since withdrawn their referral. The Parish council have done so in recognition of officer's advice, as outline in the officer report, that the works qualify as permitted development under Part 1 Class A Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. However, as per their original representation the Parish Council still holds the view that dwelling will be unsightly and harmful to the street scene.

5 .	24/01009/WCPP	Causeway Lodge The Causeway Thorney Peterborough, Variation of condition C1 (temporary consent) pursuant to planning permission 21/00326/FUL
-----	---------------	---

No Further Comments