

## NOTICE OF MEETING

MEETING	<b>PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE</b>
DATE:	<b>TUESDAY 26 JANUARY 2010</b>
TIME:	<b>1.30 pm</b>
VENUE:	<b>BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM - TOWN HALL</b>
CONTACT:	Gemma George <b>Telephone: 01733 452268</b> <b>e-mail address: <a href="mailto:gemma.george@peterborough.gov.uk">gemma.george@peterborough.gov.uk</a></b>
<i>Despatch date:</i>	<i>18 January 2010</i>

### AGENDA

	PAGE NO
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Declarations of Interest	
3. Members' Declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor	
4. Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 December 2009	1 - 10
5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters	
5.1 09/01186/R3FUL - Westwood Grange, Mayors Walk, West Town, Peterborough	11 - 22
5.2 08/01471/FUL - Werrington Centre, Staniland Way, Werrington, Peterborough	23 - 28
6. Peterborough Local Development Framework - Peterborough Site Allocations Document (Preferred Options Version)	29 - 64



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 Gemma George on 01733 452268.

## **MEMBERS OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE**

Councillor North (Chairman), Councillor Lowndes (Vice-Chairman), Councillor Thacker, Councillor Winslade, Councillor Todd, Councillor C Burton, Councillor Kreling, Councillor Lane, Councillor Ash and Councillor Harrington

Subs: Councillor C Day and Councillor Sharp

### **CASE OFFICERS**

Planning Delivery Team: Nicholas Harding, Theresa Nicholl, Dale Barker, Lee Collins, Andrew Cundy, Paul Smith, Mike Roberts, Louise Lewis, Janet Maclennan, Astrid Hawley, David Jolley, Louise Lovegrove, Vicky Hurrell, Amanda McSherry, Emmanuel Allanah

Minerals and Waste: Susan Marsh

Enforcement: Nigel Barnes, Anthony Whittle, Karen Cole, Julie Robshaw

### **NOTES:**

1. Any queries on completeness or accuracy of reports should be raised with the Case Officer or Head of Planning Services 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.

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee held at the  
Town Hall, Peterborough on 8 December 2009

Members Present:

Chairman - Councillor North

Councillors – Lowndes, C Burton, Todd, Kreling, Thacker, Winslade, Ash, Lane and Harrington

Officers Present:

Nick Harding, Planning Delivery Manager  
Simon Machen, Head of Planning Services  
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)  
Carrie Denness, Principal Solicitor  
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence received.

2. Declarations of Interests

- 4.2 Councillor Winslade stated that she knew the applicant, Mr Molyneux through a different project but this would in no way affect her decision.

3. Members' Declaration of intention to make representation as Ward Councillor

There were no declarations from Members of the Committee to make representation as Ward Councillor on any item within the agenda.

4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

4.1 09/00942/FUL – Use of land for one extended gypsy family consisting of two living caravans and one family room caravan and two communal facilities blocks, revised access, parking and facility block (part retrospective) at land south of A47 and east of Great North Road, Wansford

The application which was put forward to Committee was divided in to two parts. Area 1 was for a change of use from agricultural to residential use. This was to provide accommodation for one extended gypsy family. The accommodation would be comprised of two living caravans, one family room caravan and two communal facility blocks, consisting of a wash area and bin storage. Area 2 was for a proposed revision to an existing planning permission in relation to the adjacent marina which had already been implemented in part. A revised access, parking facilities and facilities block were proposed for the marina.

The site was located within an Area of Best Landscape, in the open countryside as defined by the Local Plan. It was also located within the Nene Valley, and the lower part of the site was an area of floodland/washland. The proposal was located within approximately 700m of Sutton Heath and Bog Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). A SSI was a national designation set up to protect areas that had been identified as having a special nature conservation interest.

The site was located on a no through road, which also served an Anglian Water compound, a lorry park with a burger van and a picnic area.

The site sloped steeply down to the river from the road. The bottom half of the site adjacent to the river was grass, with the top part of the site adjacent to the road having been excavated with alterations to the original site levels. The front hedge adjacent to the road had been retained, however all other trees on site had been removed.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal, specifically highlighting the position of the proposed gypsy accommodation and the points of access into the accommodation site and the marina.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. Additional comments had been received from Environmental Health on issues relating to noise and contaminated land. An assessment on the site had been requested by Environmental Health with regards to contamination, in response Planning Officers had questioned the Environmental Health Officers to establish where the source of the contaminated land was. It was established that there was no contamination in the locality therefore the requirement for the suggested condition was removed.

A further request for a condition relating to the testing of the imported materials, which were to be used to form the points of access, had also been requested by Environmental Health. Discussions had been held as to whether this request could be better dealt with by Environmental Health Legislation. The Committee was therefore informed that if it was minded to approve the application, it would be giving authority to approve the application subject to the issue of imported material testing being resolved with colleagues in Environmental Health.

The Head of Transport and Engineering had requested that adequate visibility splays be provided at access points and a condition was highlighted in the update report which was to be applied subject to the application being approved by Committee.

Two letters of objection had also been received, one of which had not been included in the update report. The main issues highlighted in this letter were:

- The proposal, if approved would open the door for similar applications
- The applicant should not be allowed to lay down accommodation wherever he saw fit
- The proposal would change the appearance of the valley
- The proposal, if approved would turn out to be phase one of further development on the site

Councillor Holdich and Councillor Lamb, Ward Councillors, addressed the Committee jointly. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The site lay within an area of outstanding natural beauty, the area of best landscape
- The site was adjacent to the Nene Way footpaths
- The site was virtually opposite one of Peterborough's leading tourist attractions, Sacrewell Farm
- The was within floodland
- The site was well out of the city centre, making management of the site difficult

- There were no facilities within walking distance of the site, for example schools and shops. The legislation for travellers stated that sites should be located near facilities
- The site was located on a no through narrow road and served as a lorry park for a considerable number of vehicles, there was also a burger van and a picnic area
- The site sloped steeply away from the road and upon casual inspection appeared to need some sort of reinforcement. There could be possible slippage, resulting in a health and safety issue
- There were signs along the A47 marking this area as a family picnic area
- There was no mention of connection of the site to mains electricity and was it feasible economically to connect this site to mains water and sewerage facilities?
- Should the Committee be minded to approve the application, it was requested that planning permission be pertinent to this applicant only and that planning permission be granted on a temporary basis for two years in the first instance so that the impact on the surrounding area and the community could be assessed
- There appeared to be no coordination between the two applications,
- The Committee had previously given planning permission for a hotel on the adjacent site
- Noise would be a problem, especially from the lorries parked overnight. This would not be conducive with family living
- The proposed site was next to a river, therefore there would be the possibility of pollution from material use

Councillor Richard Clarke, a Wansford Parish Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The apparent errors contained within the planning application itself including lack of definitions and the lack of dimensions on the drawings
- The new works that had been proposed did not fit in with the works that had already been undertaken on the site
- Inconsistencies in the planning application itself relating to figures
- Because there were no drawings available it was impossible to define how the site would be laid out
- There was no definition as to the size or type of caravans, a definition should be included
- The application was very confusing, it mixed previous and new applications together
- There should be a substantial effort to build the marina first before other facilities were included on the site

Mr Barry Nichols, the Planning Consultant speaking on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- Peterborough was an area in need of such sites, as identified by local and Government policy
- The consultants had had no control over what had already happened to the site
- Services such as electricity, were available on site and there were local amenities nearby in the Wansford village for example a doctors surgery, a hotel and a post office
- The site applicant was a genuine gypsy who would conform to any planning conditions if the application was approved
- The application had been submitted after many changes had been agreed with Peterborough City Council's Planning Department, hence the possible confusion surrounding the drawings

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and responded to several of the points that had been raised by the speakers. The Committee was also advised that a temporary planning consent could be granted for the application, however this was not advised as it could be viewed that pre conceived ideas regarding the applicants intended use for the site, had been formed. The Committee was further advised that flood risk was a problem in the lower portion of the site but the development site was situated well above the flood risk area.

It was also highlighted to the Committee that the link between the marina proposal and the gypsy proposal could not be forced. The Marina development already had an up and running planning consent, therefore was free standing. Reference to the marina proposal had been made in the presented application simply because the gypsy proposal sat on part of the previous planning proposal for the marina, therefore there was a need to provide alternative access and car parking to the marina proposal.

After debate and questions to the Planning Officer, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application subject to the imposition of temporary planning permission for two years. The motion was defeated by 4 votes against, 3 votes for and 2 abstaining.

Councillor Thacker was not permitted to take part in the vote due to a slight delay in her arrival at the meeting.

After further debate, a new motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application. The motion was carried by 6 votes, with 2 voting against and 1 not voting.

**RESOLVED:** (6 for, 1 against, 1 not voting) to refuse the application.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- The impact on the local landscape
- The distance of the development from local amenities
- Surface water run off and the risk of pollution there from
- Litter

Councillor Thacker left the meeting due to illness.

4.2 Change of use from A1 to A3 and A5 (restaurant and take away) at 1 Midgate, Peterborough

The building was currently in use as a retail unit, within use class A1 (shops). Planning permission was sought for change of use to A3 (restaurant) with an element of A5 (hot food take-away).

The application site was located within Midgate House on the junction of Midgate and Long Causeway within the City Centre.

The Long Causeway frontage formed part of the Primary Retail Frontage for the Central Retail Area. The application property was of 1980s design and was situated on a prominent corner plot. There were a variety of retail and non-retail units in the surrounding area.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. Members were informed that it was perceived that the change of use would in no way be detrimental to the vitality of the city centre.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. The Committee was advised that further comments had been submitted by Environmental Health requesting a revision to a condition 3 as highlighted in the Committee report.

Members were advised that a flue scheme had to be submitted as part of the planning consent and if the details did not protect the amenities of adjacent users then the business would not be able to open. A drawing was also required to be submitted before opening which delineates that part of the site which is to be used for takeaway purposes and that use would be limited to only that area, this would in turn prevent the whole of the floor area being converted to takeaway use.

The Highways Officer addressed the Committee and stated that he did not believe the traffic flow would be increased if the application was approved.

Mr Colin Molyneux, the registered speaker on behalf of the applicant was not in attendance.

After debate and questions to the Planning Officer, a motion was put forward and seconded to defer the application on the grounds of lack of information. Members requested that clearer floor plans be provided and further information on the impact and assessment of the proposed takeaway. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimously) that the application be deferred to a later date.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The Committee requested a deferral on the application in order that further information specifically relating to the floor plans and the impact and assessment of the proposed takeaway could be presented for consideration.

4.3 Proposed additional 21 car parking spaces at Aldi Foodstore, at Bretton Woods School site, Flaxland, Peterborough

The application related to the proposed additional 21 car parking spaces within the approved Aldi Foodstore.

The application site was the former Bretton Woods School at Flaxland, Bretton.

Planning permission (07/01697/FUL) was granted for the construction of an Aldi Foodstore with 76 car parking spaces and landscaping scheme. The sites main entrance was from Flaxland. The boundary treatment comprised of partly lined trees and soft landscaping. The front facing Flaxland boundary treatment comprised of 1.2m high hooped metal railing and the rest of the boundary treatment comprised of 2.5m high close board fence. The area was characterised by mixed use comprising of offices, retail outlets and residential buildings.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. Members were informed that the number of requested spaces fell in line with policy. Members were further informed that there had been no comments received from the Highways Department.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. it was highlighted that on 19 November 2009, Councillor Nick Sandford had sent an email to the Planning Department to confirm withdrawal of his objection, provided that the proposal complied with Local Plan Policy and PPG13 (Transport) as advised by the Planning Officer.

After a brief debate a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimously) to approve the application.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- In policy terms the proposed additional 21 car parking spaces were in compliance with both National policy and development plan policy contained in the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005. The empirical evidence from the survey that was carried out linking the number of pedestrians and vehicles visiting the Aldi suggested that this proposal was sustainable.
- The number of pedestrians shopping at Aldi during the initial opening days demonstrated that the location of the store and its users were considered sustainable and the additional 21 car parking spaces would not adversely affect traffic in the area. The proposal was therefore in accordance with policies T1, T9 and T10 of the Peterborough Local Plan, Agreed Travel Plan and PPG13.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

4.4 Construction of 10 two-bed and 4 one-bed apartments in three blocks (part retrospective) at 157-161 Fletton Avenue, Fletton, Peterborough

The proposal was for the provision of 14 apartments. 10 to be provided in the two blocks of two and a half storey high buildings positioned at the frontage of the site facing on to Fletton Avenue. 4 to be provided in a two storey high block positioned to the rear of these. Access to the site would be via a central access point from Fletton Avenue to a central courtyard containing 14 car parking spaces, bin storage areas and small areas of grass landscaping. Ten of the apartments would have two bedrooms, and four one bedroom.

Building works had commenced on site, but had stopped in view of the legal challenge to the approval of reserved matters issued under 08/01504/REM. The site was previously vacant and before that used as a second hand car sales garage with parking. The area surrounding the site was predominately two storey residential housing.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal, highlighting the main issues surrounding the application, namely the impact of the development on the street scene particularly on Fletton Avenue and the impact on residential amenities in relation to adjacent residential developments.

Members were further advised of the planning history of the site and the reasons for the refusal of the previous reserved matters scheme, namely the design, height and associated impact on the street scene and adjacent properties. The car parking layout and bin layout had also been considered to be awkward and detrimental to future occupiers of the scheme.

The applicant had applied for full planning permission due to part of the development having been constructed already, and the outline consent had lapsed. Although the outline planning permission had lapsed, the planning decisions were still material considerations.

The Committee was informed that consideration should be given as to whether there had been a change in circumstances in respect of policy, site characteristics, or whether or not new information had come to light that the Committee had not previously been aware of. Of primary importance with regards to this application was whether the siting, with regards to the fact that the building was situated further forward than was approved at outline, was such that it rendered the development unacceptable in terms of its impact on the street scene.



The application laid out before Committee was highlighted as being almost identical in layout to that which was presented to the Committee at reserved matters stage which had been approved. The only difference highlighted was the bin store area, which had caused a considerable amount of debate at an earlier meeting. The applicant had subsequently stated that he would arrange for a private bin collection to take place.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. Numerous objections had been received in the form of letters and comments and a petition had been submitted by Fair-Play for Fletton, a group of local residents. Wording had also been provided by the agent, Mr John Ratcliffe and a drawing which highlighted the outline siting.

Comments had also been received from the Senior Architectural Liaison Officer which highlighted parking issues.

Councillor Rush, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents and declared that he had no personal or prejudicial interest in the item. Councillor Rush responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- Many of the surrounding properties were two storey semi detached houses and the proposal would not be in keeping with these
- The development was approximately 1.5 metres forward of 155 Fletton Avenue, building lines should relate to the street pattern
- The impact of the development was not in keeping with the street scene
- The development would deprive adjacent properties of daylight and sunlight
- The development would have negative impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties and result in the overlooking of gardens
- The height and the windows to the rear of block c would result in a loss of privacy to a property located on Garrick Walk
- The application was contrary to the provisions of the Peterborough Residential Guide, and contrary to policies DA1, DA2 and DA6 of the Peterborough Local Plan. If the Committee were minded to approve the application this would mean that the Peterborough Residential Guide had been ignored
- The issues surrounding parking, namely that it was too cramped and would result in on street parking causing more congestion to already congested roads
- The issues surrounding the problem of dustcarts gaining access to the site
- The issues surrounding the refuse areas itself regarding impracticality

Mr Peter Lee, an objector speaking on behalf of Fair-Play for Fletton, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- How far should the history of the site be taken into account? Case law had established that previous decisions were material decisions, this being to ensure consistency in order to secure public confidence.
- There were good reasons for not regarding the original outline as a major constraint on the Committees decision. The permission had time expired, so was no longer capable of implementation. The original outline was also granted contrary to Peterborough City Council's established policies. The original outline was also different from the current application.
- The development would cause excessive light loss to surrounding properties
- The development would cause overshadowing to neighbouring properties
- The development would overlook numerous properties
- The line of the development was measured as being 2.1 metres forward, not 1.5 as previously mentioned

- The building would be substantially taller than any of the surrounding buildings
- The issues surrounding parking, including the potential for noise disturbance and exhaust fumes

Mr John Ratcliffe, the Planning Consultant speaking on behalf of the applicant and agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the main issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The partly implemented scheme accorded with the scheme that was implemented by the Planning Committee
- The bin storage areas would be managed by a private contractor
- The two frontage blocks facing Fletton Avenue had front elevations which had been designed to appear as two pairs of semi detached houses, to reflect the design and appearance of the adjoining dwellings
- The block at the back would be two storey only and had been designed to reflect the designs of the properties in Garrick Walk
- The materials used in development would be in keeping with the area
- Shrubs and grass were proposed for the front of the development as a buffer between the development and Fletton Avenue
- There would be no loss of trees as the area was a brown field site
- The scheme had been designed to complement the existing houses
- There would be no direct overlooking of existing properties
- The on site amenity space accounted for 22% of the site area

The Highways Officer addressed the Committee and stated that if the building was set forward by 2.1 metres, this was deemed acceptable for a pedestrian splay.

After debate, and comments from the Head of Planning, a motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application. The motion was carried by 8 votes, with 1 voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (6 for, 1 against) to refuse the application.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- Due to the extent to which the proposal stood forward of the established building line on Fletton Avenue
- The proposal would appear out of keeping with the street scene, consequently, the proposal was contrary to the policies DA1 and DA2 of the Peterborough Local Plan

Councillor C Burton left the meeting.

**4.5 E1 – Enforcement Action in Northborough Ward**

The Committee unanimously agreed to the exemption and members of the press and public left the meeting.

The Committee received a report requesting it to note the situation in respect of the unauthorised development listed in part 1 of the report and to agree the proposed action plan as detailed in the report, namely that no enforcement action be taken but a subsequent letter be sent to the owners advising them that the decision not to take enforcement action in no way condoned their actions.

After debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to agree to the recommended actions as detailed in the Committee report. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (Unanimously) to agree to the recommended actions as detailed in the Committee report.

**Reasons for the decision:**

It was established that there were three breaches of planning control which were not to be condoned. However, a breach ought not inevitably lead to enforcement action if the breaches were not considered to be harmful. The fact that the development had not been built in accordance with the approved plans, presented a problem for the owner, should the property be sold, refinanced or used as collateral, in that the whole of the development was unauthorised, but this could be addressed by a retrospective planning application.

13.30 – 15.21

This page is intentionally left blank



**LOCATION PLAN 09/01186/R3FUL**

Westwood Grange, Mayors Walk, West Town

**Scale** 1:2500 **Date** 11/1/2010 **Name** MKB **Department** Planning Services

This map is reproduced from or based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Peterborough City Council. 100294266\_2009

PCC GIS



This page is intentionally left blank

09/01186/R3FUL: FLOODLIT ALL WEATHER SPORTS PITCH, IMPROVED LOCAL PLAY AREA AND CAR PARKING AT WESTWOOD GRANGE, MAYORS WALK, WEST TOWN, PETERBOROUGH

VALID: 2 NOVEMBER 2009

APPLICANT: PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

AGENT: BARKER STOREY MATTHEWS

REFERRED BY: HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

REASON: MAJOR APPLICATION

DEPARTURE: NO

  

CASE OFFICER: MISS L C LOVEGROVE

TELEPHONE: 01733 454439

E-MAIL: louise.lovegrove@peterborough.gov.uk

---

---

## **1 SUMMARY/OUTLINE OF THE MAIN ISSUES**

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Sports pitch design and impact on visual amenity
- Impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties
- Highway implications and car parking
- Landscaping implications
- Flood risk

The Head of Planning Services recommends that the application is **APPROVED**.

## **2 PLANNING POLICY**

In order to comply with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies set out below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **Development Plan Policies**

Relevant policies are listed below with the key policies highlighted.

#### **The Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement)**

- T1 Transport Implications of New Development**
- T2 Development Affecting Footpaths and Public Rights of Way**
- T3 Accessibility to Development – Pedestrians and those with Mobility Difficulties**
- T5 Accessibility to Development – Cyclists**
- T7 Public Transport Accessibility to Development**
- T8 Connections to the Existing Highway Network**
- T9 Cycle Parking Requirements**
- T10 Car and Motorcycle Parking Requirements**
- T11 Motorists with Mobility Difficulties**
- DA1 Townscape and Urban design**
- DA2 The effect of Development on the Amenities and Character of an Area**
- DA7 Design of the Built Environment for Full Accessibility**
- DA11 Design for Security**
- DA12 Light Pollution**
- LNE9 Landscaping Implications of Development Proposals**

## **National Planning Policies**

### **Material Planning Considerations**

Planning Policy Statement 1 (*PPS1*) 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (2005)

Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 (*PPG13*) 'Transport' (2001)

Planning Policy Guidance 17 (*PPG17*) 'Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation' (1991)

Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 (*PPG24*) 'Noise' (1994)

Planning Policy Statement 25 (*PPS25*) 'Development and Flood Risk' (2006)

## **3 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL**

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a new all weather floodlit sports pitch, relocated children's play area and associated car parking. The application scheme is similar to that which Members resolved to grant planning permission for as part of the outline application 07/01946/OUT. This outline application originally sought permission for residential development, an all weather floodlit sports pitch and associated car parking. However, due to changes in priority, Peterborough City Council is now seeking to construct the sports pitch, children's play area and car parking prior to the erection of the residential dwellings and as such, the scheme was removed from the residential application and the current planning application submitted.

The proposed all weather pitch would be enclosed by 4.5m high steel mesh fencing and built to the specification of the Football Association for a '3<sup>rd</sup> generation' pitch. The lighting columns will stand at 14 metres in height and consist of three floodlighting lumieres angled at the horizontal. Access to the pitch itself would be gained directly from the existing changing rooms on the site.

The children's play area is proposed to be relocated from its existing position to the north east of the site and will provide more modern play equipment as well as a central seating area. The existing foot and cycle path which runs north south through the application site will be realigned and given a sinuous shape to connect the proposed new play facilities to the proposed residential development to the north east.

The proposal also seeks permission for a new 117 space car park which will formalise the parking arrangements for the site. It is proposed that a new access will be created to the north east of the site which will allow vehicular access through the proposed residential development and ultimately off the Atherstone Avenue roundabout. The current access from Mayors Walk is proposed to be retained on a temporary basis pending the approval and construction of the residential development.

## **4 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The site is centrally located within an established residential area that comprises a mix of post war and modern residential dwellings. The character of the surrounding area is predominantly two storey dwelling houses with some single storey and three storey dwellings/flats. The site itself is bound to the north by two storey semi-detached properties (Ledbury Road) and to the east and south by detached residential dwellings (Grange Road and Thorpe Park Road respectively). To the east of the site is located the Westwood Grange Allotments which are accessed off Mayors Walk and to the north east by the vacant parcel of land which was recently granted outline planning permission for residential development under application reference 07/01946/OUT.

The application site is comprised of a total of seven grass football pitches and managed by Netherton Football Association and is in the ownership of Peterborough City Council. There are existing facilities including an informal parking area, children's play area, changing rooms and pavilion. Access is currently granted from Mayors Walk and is shared by pedestrians and vehicles.

In July of 1992 approximately 2.5ha of land to the north-east of the application site was declared surplus by the Leisure Services Committee, the land was subsequently designated for residential use within the PCC Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005.



PCC decided to reopen the surplus land and by way of consolidation and relocation create a well defined and more manageable allotment area. Statutory notices were served on the existing plot holders with compensation being paid and relocation to the newly reconditioned plots on the former surplus lands or to other sites to those that wanted to continue. PCC in consultation with plot representatives have carried out various improvements to the new allotment area taking into account the relocation of plot holders, future allotment use and the current waiting list.

A new boundary fence delineating the 'new' allotment site has been erected and other enhancements include DDA accessibility and plot provision, new access roadways, car parking, composting areas and on site secure storage. This new boundary fence forms the eastern boundary of the application site.

## **5 PLANNING HISTORY**

Application Number	Description	Date	Decision
07/01946/OUT	Residential development	05.01.10	PER

## **6 CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS**

### **INTERNAL**

**Head of Transport and Engineering** – A full assessment of the application cannot be made until a Transport Statement has been provided. The applicant has now submitted a Transport Statement and consultation is ongoing with the Transport and Engineering Department. Comments will be provided in the Update Report to Members.

**Environmental Protection Officer** – Lighting should meet the Institute of Lighting Engineers Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light. With regards to noise, there is no standard to which comparison may be made with regard to spectator or participating sports persons for the purpose of setting decibel level limits. If an arbitrary figure is set in comparison to background levels, Leq, L90 and L10, it will be a matter of opinion as to whether this arbitrary level will be acceptable. Also, given the nature of the anticipated noise, impact events are those which are most likely to cause concern. Such events have no recognised noise limits for control and cannot be adequately controlled by time based noise limits. In such circumstances where the Local Authority is minded to grant consent for the application, hours of use should be considered to minimise the impact of such noise levels.

**Rights of Way Officer** – No objections to the proposal.

**Landscape Officer** – No objections to the proposal. The survey accurately represents the trees on the site, none of which are worthy of a Tree Preservation Order.

### **EXTERNAL**

**Cambridgeshire Police** – Area is currently poorly lit and there have been several incidences of anti social behaviour from groups of youths congregating. Lighting, fencing and landscaping will be important factors to prevent incidences of crime and planting should not restrict views of the play and parking areas. Requests the provision of CCTV and details of any entrance barrier to be used.

**Sport England** - No objections subject to imposition of a condition requiring the associated sports use being available for community use. Sport England is satisfied that the proposal meets exception E5 of their playing fields policy and acknowledge the benefits of the provision of a new 3rd generation floodlight football pitch.

**Environment Agency** – Comments are awaited and will be provided to Members in the Update Report.

## **NEIGHBOURS**

**First consultation** – 11 letters were received (9 in objection and 2 stating no objections to the principle of development, but associated concerns). The objections to the proposal were based on the following grounds:

- Poor/inadequate access would generate traffic and highway safety problems along Thorpe Park Road/Mayor's Walk
- Increased traffic generation
- No need for the children's play area to be moved
- Affect on trees and wildlife
- Proposed acoustic fence would prevent access from the gardens of properties along Thorpe Park Road
- Impact on views from rear gardens
- Increased risk of flooding as The Grange is a flood plain
- Inadequate parking levels proposed
- Concern that the AWP would not be for public use and would exclude all user groups
- Light spillage causing a nuisance
- Noise impact
- Public disorder issues due to the extension of operation hours into the evening
- Loss of green playing field space

**Second consultation** – 7 further letters were received from earlier objectors. No new issues were raised.

## **COUNCILLORS**

No comments received.

## **7 REASONING**

### **a) Principle of development**

Planning Policy Guidance 17 'Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation', requires that when development of playing fields is proposed, and no robust assessment of need has been provided, development should not be allowed unless the proposal is for an outdoor sports facility of sufficient benefit to the development of sport to outweigh the loss of the playing field. In this instance, the proposal only seeks the loss of one of seven grass playing fields within The Grange and will be replaced with a modern 'third generation' all weather football pitch (AWP). The pitch is seen as a priority need for the wider city by the Football Association and Peterborough City Council by allowing sporting activities on the site to continue throughout the year and at evenings which is currently not possible.

It is proposed by Netherton Football Club who currently manage the playing fields, that the development of the new AWP will enhance the capacity of the football club to provide additional coaching capacity and consolidate this function at one location. In addition, it seeks to provide a centre for coaching and refereeing within the city and will be available for training purposes.

In addition, Sport England has not raised any objection to the proposal, on the basis that a condition be appended to any approval requiring the submission of a Community Use Plan relating to the community use of the pitch outside of season. Sport England has examined the proposal against their own exception policy E5 which seeks to prevent the loss of playing fields to development. It has however been concluded that subject to the AWP being built in accordance with guidance set out by the Football Association, the proposed facilities will be of benefit to the wider provision of sports facilities throughout Peterborough and as such is acceptable.

On balance, whilst the loss of an open grass playing field is not desirable, the introduction of a new 'third generation' AWP will generate significant benefits not only to Netherton Football Club, but the wider community.

It will provide facilities that can be used to engage the wider community in sports and will consolidate coaching and refereeing facilities throughout the city area. As such, the principle of development is acceptable.

b) **Sports pitch design and impact on visual amenity**

The AWP is proposed to be located to the south of the site and replaces one of the existing adult grass pitches that are laid out on the site. The AWP is proposed to be located directly adjacent to the existing changing room facilities in accordance with guidance set out by the Football Association. It is proposed that in line with this guidance, a fenced forecourt area will be provided between the changing rooms and AWP which will be for the purpose of team collection prior to accessing the pitch and is required to prevent contamination of the surface and to assist in management and maintenance.

The AWP itself is proposed to be enclosed by 4.5 metre high metal mesh fencing and the applicant has provided an example of the type of fencing in the submitted Design and Access Statement. The materials to be used are similar in appearance to those recently installed at John Fisher School. The six lighting columns will stand at each corner of the pitch with two either side of the halfway line.

It is acknowledged that these lighting columns and indeed the 4.5m high fencing will be a prominent feature within the site and visible from all areas. At present, The Grange is a large area of open grassland and the construction of the AWP will appear visually prominent from all aspects, as well as from the residential properties surrounding. However, it is considered that the design of the pitch and its prominence is to be expected from a sporting facility. The lighting columns, whilst taller than the surrounding built form and visible from much of the area, will not appear unduly obtrusive within the streetscene and as such, will not detract from the visual amenity of the locality. Their appearance will be shielded from much of the surrounding residential area by the existing landscaping and much of the open space of The Grange will be retained.

With regards to the pitch, the distance from the nearest residential dwellings will stand at approximately 40 metres and as such, will not appear unduly prominent to occupants. The impact of the 4.5 metre fencing can be mitigated along the boundary of the site with Thorpe Park Road/Mayors Walk by boundary planting and soft landscaping.

c) **Impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties**

*Noise impact*

A Noise Assessment Report has been submitted as part of the application submission and provides details of ambient noise levels without football activities, during a match played on a grass pitch to the north of the proposed location and also at a similar type of AWP located at Bushfields Sports Centre. The report indicates that without football activities, noise levels at Ledbury Road and Thorpe Park Road between 20.00-22.00 hours averaged at 48.7 and 48.3dB LAeq,T respectively due to the distant road traffic noise. Noise levels were also measured during a match played on one of the grass pitches to the centre of the site between 18.35 and 20.10. These have shown that the noise levels 10m from the pitch were 54.7dB and at 85m 52dB. In comparison, the levels measured during a football game at the Bushfields Sports Centre AWP show that between 20.05 and 20.50 the average noise levels 10m from the pitch were 55.8dB and at 40m 49.4dB.

The properties along Thorpe Park Road/Mayors Walk are those which most closely relate to the proposed AWP and are located approximately 30-40 metres from the side of the proposed pitch. The report concludes that the AWP in use until 22.00 would represent a small increase of 3.4dB to the neighbouring properties. These measurements relate to the overall noise impact felt upon the neighbouring properties. However, it will be the incidences of high impact noise such as referee's whistles, players shouting and balls hitting the metal fencing that will be of greatest concern to surrounding residential properties.

The proposed use of the pitch is to be extended beyond the existing hours of operation (currently until nightfall) to 10pm. It is considered that this would result in disturbance to surrounding residential properties, namely those along Thorpe Park Road and Mayor's Walk during times at which they would normally benefit from a quiet and peaceful environment.

As such, it is considered appropriate that in order to mitigate against any significant detrimental impact, the hours of use be restricted to 8.00pm. This time is considered appropriate for a sporting facility of this type within a residential area and will ensure that surrounding residential properties retain their amenity into the evenings.

Furthermore, the application scheme has proposed a 2metre high acoustic boundary fence along the boundaries with residential properties along Thorpe Park Road and Mayor's Walk. It has been raised at the recently held public meeting that local residents do not want the acoustic fence as it would prevent access from the properties that has been enjoyed for over 30 years. Whilst it is acknowledged that these accesses are unauthorised, it is considered that the amenity impact upon imposing such a fence would be significant to the surrounding residents. As such, and in line with the local residents, it is proposed to remove this fence from the proposal as it will not generate a significant reduction in the noise impacts felt to surrounding residents. In the event that reasonable complaints of noise are received, noise mitigation measures can be implemented.

#### *Light spillage and intrusion*

It is proposed that the lighting columns, at a height of 14m, will have the lumieres set to horizontal in order to prevent outward light spillage to the surrounding area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the lights will be powerful (300 Lux), the applicant has provided a light spillage diagram with indicative lighting levels spilling out of the site. This diagram clearly shows that some spillage will occur as a result of the proposals 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 1 Lux. This level is in line with the Institute of British Lighting engineers Guidance for light intrusion into residential properties. The area is considered to fall within category E2 (dark urban areas) as at present, the area of The Grange is unlit but has some sky glow by virtue of the street lighting to the residential area. 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 applicant has stated that cowls and shields can be fitted to the lumieres in order to prevent backwards and other light spillage and this is stated in the Lighting Assessment Report submitted as part of the application. Whilst the lighting as proposed would not significantly impact upon the amenity of surrounding residents, it is considered that the imposition of a condition requiring cowls and shields to be fitted would further mitigate against any unnecessary and preventable spillage. Furthermore, the floodlights would be conditioned in order to prevent their usage beyond 8.30pm. This is before the standard curfew of 11pm as set out in the ILE Guidance.

#### **d) Highway implications and car parking**

##### *Car parking*

It was originally proposed that the application scheme would provide car parking for 86 vehicles of which 2 would be available for disabled users. Following neighbour consultation and assessment as part of the Transport Statement this has now been increased to 101 including 2 disabled spaces. It is considered that this level of car parking will reasonably accommodate the demand generated at weekends and evenings as a result of the AWP and will provide sufficient capacity when all pitches on the site are in use. The formalised arrangements will be a significant improvement to the current parking facilities.

With regards to coach and mini bus parking, these are not currently accommodated on the application site and the proposal does not make provision for such facilities. It is proposed that the existing arrangement where players and spectators are dropped off at the site and collected later will continue.

##### *Trip generation*

The applicant has now submitted a Transport Statement following a request from the Transport and Engineering Officer. This is currently out to consultation and full comments from the Transport and Engineering team will be provided in the update to Members. It is anticipated that Saturdays and Sundays will be the most busy as these are traditionally when most organised match games are played.

On these days and based on the number of cars visiting the site, vehicle movements range between 35 to 90 dependent on timing, weather conditions and whether matches are at home or away.

#### *Access*

Significant concern has been raised from neighbouring residents regarding the inadequacy of the access to the site and the delay in completion of the scheme with regards to the proposed new access through the new residential development to the north. The Council's Transport and Engineering Department has raised similar concerns with regards to the use of the existing access for construction traffic and the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. It has been suggested that a separate construction access be created further to the east along Mayor's Walk which will provide access through the allotments to the east of the site. Following discussion with the applicant, it has become clear that this is an unviable option as it would involve disruption to several of the retained allotment plots during the construction period. The applicant has provided further details of implementation of the proposed temporary access which involves the separation of pedestrians and vehicular traffic through the use of fencing and the widening of the existing vehicular entrance. It is considered that this will significantly improve the safety during the construction period and the widened access will be able to accommodate the proposed trip generation. These details are currently out to consultation with the Transport and Engineering Department and further comments received will be provided to Members in the Update Report.

However, a condition is to be imposed that will require full details of the widening of the access to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. Further to this, details regarding the integration of the temporary access with the proposed car park will need to be provided. These measures will ensure that during the period between the implementation of the AWP and the construction of the permanent access through the new residential development to the north, highway and pedestrian safety will be maintained and impacts on surrounding residential areas as a result of traffic movement will be mitigated.

#### *Construction Management*

Concern has been raised from local residents regarding construction vehicle movement into and out of the application site. As part of the submitted Transport Statement, the applicant has provided outline details with regards to the management of construction traffic. Furthermore, the revised access drawings submitted and out to consultation currently detail how construction traffic and pedestrian movements will be separated. These drawings show how the existing access can accommodate the required construction traffic and comments from the Transport and Engineering Department will be provided to Members in the Update Report. Further to this, a condition will be imposed requiring a full Construction Management Plan to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of any development. This will ensure that the LPA has control over the construction methods implemented in order that they impact upon the existing highway network and residential properties as little as possible.

#### e) **Landscaping implications**

There have been no detailed proposals submitted as part of the application with regards to the landscaping of the site. It is considered that this can be adequately dealt with by condition, requiring the applicant to provide full details of landscaping proposals and planting schedules. Landscaping will be an important element of the scheme which will serve to soften the hard appearance of the proposals and assist in assimilating the children's play area and car park with its surroundings. At present, there is little soft landscaping to the existing children's play area, car park, playing rooms and pavilion.

In addition, the Landscape Officer has not raised any objections to the proposal. Whilst the trees on the site are of a local benefit to the visual amenity of the site, none are worthy of a Tree Protection Order. The scheme proposes the removal of one no. Cherry Tree and a small group of Ash Trees. Whilst the loss of trees is not desirable, any landscaping scheme can include their replacement within the site.

#### f) **Flood risk**

At present, no comments have been received from the Environment Agency and these will be provided in the Update Report to Members.

## 8 CONCLUSIONS

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal is acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighting against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The AWP will contribute towards the provision of sporting facilities within the city area
- There will be no detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential or retail properties
- There will be no unacceptable impact on the character or appearance of the area
- There will be no unacceptable impact upon the highway network or highway safety.

The proposed development is therefore in keeping with Policies T1, T2, T8, DA1, DA2, DA12 and LNE9 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

## 9 RECOMMENDATION

The Head of Planning Services recommends that this application is APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- C1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**  
Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- C2 The floodlights hereby approved shall not be illuminated before 08.00 and after 22.00 Monday to Friday; and before 08.00 and after 20.00 at weekends and Bank Holidays.**  
Reason: In the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy DA2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).
- C3 Development shall not commence until a means of improvement of the temporary vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access from Mayor's Walk has been constructed in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The use of this access for vehicular traffic shall cease upon first use of the access to the north as indicated on drawing no. 132-B-102-Rev07 or other such time as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**  
Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).
- C4 The temporary access to Mayor's Walk shall be permanently closed to vehicular traffic upon first use of the access to the north as indicated on drawing no. 132-B-102-Rev07 or other such time as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details of the means of closure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**  
Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).
- C5 The use of the sports pitch shall not be commenced until details of a temporary area for car parking have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include layout of the parking spaces, connection to the temporary access from Mayor's Walk and surfacing materials. That area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles, in connection with the use of the site.**  
Reason: In the interest of Highway safety, in accordance with Policies T7, T9 and T10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

- C6** Upon first use of the access to the north as indicated on drawing no. 132-B-102-Rev07 or other such time as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the area shown for car parking on the approved drawing shall be drained and surfaced in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles, in connection with the use of the site.  
Reason: In the interest of Highway safety, in accordance with Policies T7, T9 and T10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).
- C7** The use of the sports pitch shall not be commenced until space has been laid out within the site for 20 number bicycles to be parked, in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of cycles.  
Reason: In order to promote sustainable modes of transport, in accordance with Policies T7 and T9 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).
- C8** Before development commences, a Construction Management Statement shall be prepared which will set out the timescale for development, measures to secure the minimum of disturbance to the existing open space and surrounding residential properties whilst construction is underway, and temporary facilities clear of the public highway for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of all vehicles visiting the site during the period of construction. The statement will include the provision for site cleaning and measures to ensure that no mud or other detritus is deposited on the footpath or the adjoining public carriageway. Development shall not take place other than in complete accordance with the approved statement.  
Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policy T19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).
- C9** Prior to the commencement of development or other such time as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, details of the hard and soft landscaping works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include the following elements:-
- i) a landscape management plan including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedule;
  - ii) planting plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants, plant sizes and densities;
  - iii) all means of enclosure and site boundary treatments;
  - iv) all hard surfacing materials;
  - v) any minor structures(e.g. furniture, signs etc); and
  - vi) proposed and existing functional services above and below ground.
- The hard landscaping works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of the sports pitch, and the soft landscaping shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details no later than the end of the first planting season following first occupation of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: To ensure that the development is landscaped in the interests of the visual character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policies DA2, LNE9 and LNE10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).
- C10** If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place in accordance with the provisions of the approved landscape management plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory implementation of the landscaping scheme, in accordance with policies DA2, LNE9 and LNE10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

- C11 Details of the lighting to the car parking area and footpath shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the use hereby permitted commences. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and provided prior to the car park being brought into use.**

Reason: In the interests of community safety and in order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policies DA11 and DA12 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005.

- C12 Details of the barrier to the northern access shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the access coming into use, or other such time as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and implemented prior to the access coming into use.**

Reason: In the interests of community safety and in order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policies DA11 and DA12 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005.

- C13 The use of the columns for lighting the all weather pitch shall not exceed the obtrusive light limitations for sky glow, light into windows, source intensity and building luminance specified in the Institution of Lighting Engineers document "Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution (Revised) (2005). The applicant shall be required to demonstrate compliance with this condition, e.g. by measurement or calculation, in circumstances where reasonable concern arises from resultant lighting levels.**

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of surrounding residents in accordance with Policies DA2 and DA12 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

Copy to Councillors SJ Dalton, MJ Dalton, Arculus





**LOCATION PLAN**      **08/01471/FUL**  
 Werrington Centre, Staniland Way, Werrington, Peterborough

**Scale 1:2500 Name MKB Department Planning Services**



This page is intentionally left blank

08/01471/FUL: DEED OF VARIATION TO THE FIRST AND SECOND SCHEDULE OF THE S106 AGREEMENT FOR THE PHASE 1 REGENERATION OF THE WERRINGTON CENTRE - PLANNING APPLICATION REF 08/01471/FUL

APPLICANT: HPG DEVELOPMENTS LTD  
AGENT: SAVILLS L P LTD  
REFERRED BY: HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES  
REASON: ITEM OF PUBLIC INTEREST  
DEPARTURE: NO  
CASE OFFICER: MRS J MACLENNAN  
TELEPHONE: (01733) 454438  
E-MAIL: janet.maclennan@peterborough.gov.uk

## 1 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks approval for a deed of variation to the First Schedule 'Car Parking Provision' and Second Schedule 'Public Art' of the S106 Agreement for the regeneration of the Werrington Centre (application reference 08/01471/FUL).

The Head of Planning Services recommends that the proposed deed of variation to the S106 Agreement is **APPROVED**.

## 2 PLANNING HISTORY

Most relevant history:

Ref	Description	Status	Closed Date
08/01471/FUL	Phase 1 regeneration of Werrington Centre	PER	12.06.09
09/00713/FUL	Construction of Community Car Park	PER	27.08.09

## 3 BACKGROUND

### Community Car Park

Planning permission was granted on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2009 for the regeneration of Werrington District Centre (ref. 08/01471/FUL). The planning consent was subject to a S106 agreement which included a requirement to provide a community car park; defined in the agreement as follows:

*"... a car park of between 80-100 spaces to be provided by the Owner or the Council within the vicinity of the Development for the use of members of the community generally including (but not limited to) staff pupils and visitors as appropriate at the Ken Stimpson School the Werrington Library and the Werrington Sports Centre and Bowls Club"*

In summary, the S106 provides for an 80-100 space car park to be provided to replace the present spaces at the car park at the Werrington Centre used by the Ken Stimpson School, the Werrington Library and the Werrington Bowls Club. Prior to the implementation of planning permission for the regeneration of the Werrington Centre the owners would apply for planning permission to construct the community car park and would progress through a series of 4 options as required by the S106 agreement. The options are as follows:

### Option 1 –

To submit a planning application for the construction of the car park at the Ken Stimpson School. If the Council fails to determine the application within 11 weeks or refuses the application then the owners would progress to Option 2.

#### Option 2 –

To submit an application for the construction of the community car park at the Werrington Bowls Club. If the Council fails to determine the application within 11 weeks or refuses this application then the owners would progress to Option 3.

#### Option 3 –

To submit an application to construct the community car park on Council owned land within 500 metres of the boundary of the Werrington Centre. The Council to identify such land within 4 weeks of the owners informing it in writing that it intends exercising this option.

#### Option 4 –

If the Council fails to identify such land within the time scale or fails to determine the application within 11 weeks or refuses the application then the owners shall pay the Community Car Park Contribution of £177,000 for the Council; to provide the car park within 5 years of its receipt. Any money left over from the contribution would be put towards Public Art. If the Community Car Park Contribution has to be paid under such circumstances the owners will not provide any car parking at the existing Werrington Centre Car Park for use by Ken Stimpson School, the Library and the Bowls Club.

Failure to meet options - If the owner fails to provide the car park or to pay the Community Car Park Contribution by the time of the implementation of the planning permission then the owners will provide the Community Car Park Contribution as above and will provide 100 free car parking spaces at the existing car park for the use of the Ken Stimpson School, Library and Bowls Club for a period of 5 years or if the Council can show that they have made reasonable endeavors to provide the new park until such time as the new car park has been brought into use. In respect of all 3 potential planning applications above the Council is under an obligation to provide all necessary consents and licenses to enable the owners to go upon Council land and do the necessary works.

#### Public Art

The Second Schedule to the S106 agreement provides for a contribution to Public Art. Within 5 working days of implementation of the development the owners are to pay a public arts contribution of £50,000, this is in addition to any money which might be left over from the community car park contribution if it has to be paid.

A planning application was submitted on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2009 and approved under the Chairman's list procedure on 27<sup>th</sup> August 2009 for the construction of the community car park at the Ken Stimpson Community School site (Option 1) (ref. 09/00713/FUL). The car park would have been located to the far north east of the sports centre on the existing tennis courts and accessed from the existing school entrance. The proposal also included the relocation of the tennis courts to the rear of the sports centre. The proposal was acceptable in all planning respects, however, the applicant has not been able to implement the scheme; primarily due to the PFI interests on the school land which was not explored at the time of drafting the S106 agreement. The provision of the car park would involve a variation of the PFI contract and would incur significant cost implications for the Council along with a lengthy negotiation process and where, at the present time, there is no guarantee that the variation of the contract would be supported by those involved. In addition, the applicant underwent a tendering process and the estimated cost for the provision of the car park and relocation of the tennis courts is estimated at £420,000. The owner is committed to pay £177,000 as a contribution under the terms of the S106 agreement which represents a significant shortfall. The figure was arrived at through discussion with Council Officers and using Spons Civil Engineering and Highway Works Price Book 2009.

The owner envisaged commencing work on Phase I of the regeneration of the Werrington Centre by Spring 2010 and is currently unable to implement the scheme until the community car park issue has been resolved. Although planning permission was granted for the construction of the car park at Ken Stimpson School (Option 1) this option is no longer feasible due to the constraints posed by both the PFI contract and the additional cost involved. Option 3 of the S106 agreement cannot be realised as there is no Council owned land within 500 metres of the Werrington Centre.

## **4 PROPOSAL**

In order to avoid any further delay to the implementation of the scheme for Phase I of the Regeneration of the Werrington Centre it is proposed that a variation to the S106 agreement is approved to allow the owner to progress to Option 4 and for the owner to make the contribution of £177,000 to the Council. The delay to date is not the fault of the applicant and it seems unreasonable to delay further the start of the development. The Council could then provide the car park at the Bowls Club Site (Option 2) subject to budget provision to make up the shortfall. The owner also offers that the claw back be extended from 5 to 10 years.

Internal meetings have taken place and an indicative scheme has been produced by Strategic Property. The scheme is considered acceptable and has been agreed in principle by the Highways Section and Landscaping Team.

The Asset Management Manager had requested funds to provide a car park at the Ken Stimpson School (Option 1) to be identified within the 2010 to 2011 budget, up to the value of £500,000. The provision of the community car park has been highlighted as a priority and would cover all issues including PFI costs. The estimated cost of providing a 100 space car park at the Werrington Bowls Club (Option 2) is £360,000, however this proposes a high specification construction which could be reduced. Discussions are continuing with Strategic Property. It must also be acknowledged that while costs can be reduced, long term maintenance/management of the car park must be considered. It is envisaged that the car park will be managed by City Services. However, these are matters that are the responsibility of the Council rather than the owner.

The owner has always maintained that it cannot enter into an agreement to allow the community car park to form part of the new Centre Car Park as the third party purchaser will not agree to this restriction. However, the owner has made an undertaking that there is no intention to introduce any changes to the present management of the car park in the immediate future while it remains in the ownership of the Howard Group.

Furthermore, it is proposed that the Second Schedule for a contribution of £50,000 to public art to be amended to read 'public art or community projects'. This will enable flexibility and allow for monies to benefit community projects as identified.

## **5 EVALUATION**

Planning permission was granted for Phase I of the redevelopment of Werrington Centre on 12 June 2009. This is a major scheme which will deliver significant benefits to the Werrington area, not least the provision of a roundabout on David's Lane which is known to be a particular accident black spot. The owner entered into a S106 agreement in good faith for the additional car park facility to address concerns raised by Members and the Werrington Neighbourhood Council that the Centre car park would no longer be available for use by the school, sports centre, Library, and so on. In planning terms there was no policy requirement for additional car parking however, the provision of the car park or the contribution by the owner would provide a means to offset any potential parking problems and is a benefit to the users of the community facilities.

At the present time the Centre car park is available for use by these facilities albeit in an informal capacity. The land is not owned by the City Council and this agreement can be revoked at any time or the owner may impose a parking charge. Indeed, if the regeneration of the centre were to be abandoned there is no legal requirement for parking to be provided by the present owner of the Centre car park.

The constraints posed by the planning application process were always considered as a major risk to the owner, hence the 11 week deadline caveat being built into the S106. This gave the owner comfort that within 33 weeks all three applications/options would have been progressed until finally arriving at option 4 whereby the contribution of £177,000 would be paid to the Council. The Council would have a period of up to five years to construct the car park. Had the owner progressed along this route to option 4 there would have been no responsibility for the owner to provide 100 spaces within the Centre.

In accordance with the requirements of the S106 parking provision for 100 spaces within the Centre car park would only be retained should the owner default and commence work without progressing through the various options. It was never the intention of the owner to provide car parking within the Centre for use by the facilities.

It is proposed that the Council provide the car park and deal with the planning process to prevent further delay in the implementation of Phase I. This will also enable the Council to determine the specification of the car park. In any event the contribution of £177,000 will not cover the cost of the car park and so the delivery of the car park will be dependent on funding allocated and agreement within the 2010-2011 budget. The owner is not required to make up the shortfall. It is also acknowledged that the Bowls Club Site (Option 2) is designated as 'Community Related Asset' land and may incur a claw back charge. However, as the land would remain in community use and there will be no financial gain to the Council through charging, it is hoped that the claw back will not apply. Discussions are currently underway with the Homes and Communities Agency and Strategic Property.

The Werrington Neighbourhood Council (WNC) raises no objection in principle to the proposal to construct the car park on the Bowls Club site (Option 2) however, concern is raised over the proposal for the Council to take over full responsibility for its provision and the obligation on the owner being removed from the S106 agreement. WNC argues that the users of the community facilities could be left without parking facilities in the interim period, whilst the original proposals envisaged that the new facility would be in place prior to construction of the store. The situation has now reached an impasse. Option 1 is undeliverable, option 2 will require additional funding and option 3 is not feasible as there is no Council land within 500m of the Centre. The owner has worked closely with Council Officers and has attempted to progress through the options, however it has been demonstrated to the Officers' satisfaction that it will not be possible to provide the car park under the terms of the S106. It was always the intention for the owner to progress to option 4 and to resist the responsibility for providing car parking within the Centre as this would prejudice the overall development.

In addition WNC has no confidence that the Council will deliver the car park and further issues could arise during the planning application process for Option 2. As noted above funds have been identified within the 2010-2011 budget, although the final budget will not be decided until February 2010. Substantial progress has been made on working up an acceptable scheme which has the approval from the Highways and Landscaping Sections. The final specification for the car parking is currently being considered with the objective of making reasonable reductions to the cost without compromising the longevity and subsequent maintenance costs.

## **6 CONCLUSIONS**

The Head of Planning Services recommends that this proposal is APPROVED:

- Variation to the First Schedule 'Community Car Park' to allow the developer to progress to option 4 and make the contribution of £177,000 to the Council; and to the Second Schedule 'Public Art' to include 'Public Art and Community Projects' to the S106 Agreement for Phase I of the regeneration of the Werrington District Centre (ref. 08/01471/FUL)
- The City Council to deliver the Community Car Park on the Werrington Bowls Club Site (Option 2) (subject to final budget being agreed).
- To allow the owner to commence development on Phase I of the Regeneration of Werrington District Centre without undue delay providing benefits for the Werrington Community and the City as a whole.

Copy to Councillors J R Fox, J A Fox, Lane

<b>PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM No. 6</b>
<b>26 JANUARY 2010</b>	<b>PUBLIC REPORT</b>

Cabinet Member(s) responsible:	Councillor Piers Croft - Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning, Growth and Human Resources Councillor Peter Hiller - Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Housing and Community Development	
Contact Officer(s):	Gemma Wildman	Tel: 863824

**PETERBOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - PETERBOROUGH SITE ALLOCATIONS DOCUMENT (PREFERRED OPTIONS VERSION)**

<b>R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S</b>	
<b>FROM:</b> Deputy Chief Executive	<b>Deadline date:</b> N/A
Members are asked to offer any comments on the draft Peterborough Site Allocations Development Plan Document - Preferred Options before it is submitted to Cabinet for approval for the purposes of public participation.	

**1. ORIGIN OF REPORT**

1.1 This report is submitted to Committee following approval of the Council's Local Development Scheme by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

**2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT**

2.1 The purpose of this report is to enable the Committee to comment on the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Preferred Options Version) (hereafter referred to as the 'Site Allocations Document') before it is presented to Cabinet on 8<sup>th</sup> February for approval for public consultation in March 2010.

2.2 The latest draft of the Site Allocations Document is available on the Council's web site at <http://democracy.peterborough.gov.uk/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=Site+Allocations+Document&ID=255&RPID=93187&sch=doc&cat=12992&path=12992> and copies have been placed in the Members group rooms.

2.3 Attached to this report at Appendix A is list of all sites submitted to the council including a summary of comments received during the Issues and Options consultation in October 2008.

2.4 This report is for the committee to consider under its terms of reference No. 2.61.5 of part 3, section 2, of the Constitution "To be consulted by, and comment on, the Executive's draft proposals for Local Development Documents within the Local Development Framework at each formal stage in preparation".

### 3. **TIMESCALE**

Is this a Major Policy Item/Statutory Plan?	<b>YES</b>	If Yes, date of relevant Council Meeting	<b>Late 2010 or early 2011 (but not this version of the Document)</b>
		Date of Submission to Government Dept	<b>Spring 2011</b>

### 4. **PETERBOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: PETERBOROUGH SITE ALLOCATIONS DOCUMENT (PREFERRED OPTIONS VERSION)**

#### **Introduction**

- 4.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced a new system of plan-making, which is known as the Local Development Framework (LDF). One of the documents that the Council must produce as part of the LDF is the Site Allocations Document, which itself sits beneath (and takes its lead from) the 'Peterborough Core Strategy'.
- 4.2 The Core Strategy, which Members will recall is well advanced in its preparation, sets out the vision, objectives and overall strategy for the development of Peterborough up to 2026, together with a limited number of policies that are core to achieving or delivering that strategy. The Core Strategy is accompanied by a 'key diagram' which shows pictorially some of the key elements of Peterborough's development strategy, but it does not have a 'proposals map' drawn on an Ordnance Survey base. This is the primary role of the Site Allocations Document.
- 4.3 Thus, the detailed site boundaries of all allocations (for example, housing, employment, safeguarded land, district centres, and many more) are being proposed through the Site Allocations Document.
- 4.4 There is, however, one exception to this rule: all land within the City Centre is excluded from the Site Allocations Document as any detailed allocations for new development in this location will be determined via the forthcoming City Centre Area Action Plan (CCAAP).

#### **Preferred Options**

- 4.5 The regulations and guidance on the preparation of documents within the LDF provide for various stages, with differing opportunities for public involvement at each stage. More recently, Government has relaxed some of those regulations, making it more flexible when and how LDF documents are prepared and consulted. Nevertheless, whilst not strictly required, it is common practice for LDF documents such as the Site Allocations Document to reach a key stage known as the 'Preferred Options'. At this stage, the Council must show what options for allocating land have been considered, which land is its preference for allocating, and why. In effect, this gives consultees a clear idea of where the Council is heading in terms of its finished Site Allocations Document, subject to consideration of all the responses that are received on the 'preferred options' version.

#### **Summary of the Recommended Preferred Options**

- 4.6 Many of the recommended Preferred Options for the Site Allocations Document are derived from the Core Strategy, but a great deal of additional work has been undertaken by Planning Officers in direct consultation with stakeholders, other Council Departments, Government agencies, utility companies and private individuals. It is a statutory requirement that policies must be subject to formal sustainability appraisal (incorporating strategic environmental assessment), and, if necessary, Habitats Regulations Assessment, and this is a continuing, iterative process that also contributes to decisions on the recommended preferred options. In summary, the outcome of all of this work is a Site Allocations Document which stems from the Core Strategy agreed by the Council.



- 4.7 In this section some of the key features of the Preferred Options are summarised.
- 4.8 **Housing** – The Core Strategy requires the Site Allocations Document to identify ‘new’ land (i.e. in addition to land already committed for development, such as Hampton and Paston Reserve) to accommodate 16,200 dwellings between 2009 and 2026. Only land capable of accommodating 10 or more dwellings are allocated (with all smaller sites classed as ‘windfall’ sites and not officially allocated in advance on a Proposals Map).
- 4.9 Whilst numerous sites are proposed, some of the larger and/or potentially contentious allocations include:
- Great Haddon – 5,350 dwellings (Broadly identified through the Core Strategy)
  - Norwood – 2,300 dwellings (Broadly identified through the Core Strategy)
  - District Centres - 1,000 dwellings in total (Bretton, Hampton, Milfield, Orton and Werrington)
  - St Augustines walk/Oundle Road Allotments – 45 dwellings
  - Felton High Street Allotment Land – 154 dwellings
  - Land off Itter Crescent – 25 dwellings
  - East of Eye Development Area – 250 dwellings
- 4.10 **Employment** – In order to provide a degree of flexibility and variety of sites for potential inward investors, the Core Strategy requires a range of 95.5 to 125.5 hectares of ‘new’ land capable of accommodating new employment development. A significant amount of this land has been broadly identified in the Core Strategy through the urban extensions of Great Haddon (65ha) and Norwood (2ha). The Core Strategy also identified the Regional Freight Interchange at Stanground, though this is a ‘regional’ allocation rather than an allocation to meet our local targets.
- 4.11 The Site Allocations DPD is therefore required to (a) identify the precise boundaries of the above Core Strategy broad allocations; and (b) identify a further 23 – 53 ha of ‘new’ land.
- 4.12 The principal locations for this new employment development are recommended to be:
- Red Brick Farm - 30.0 ha (approx)
  - Oxney North – 8.0 ha
  - Perkins North - 3.4 ha
- 4.13 **Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople** – The Regional Spatial Strategy requires Peterborough to provide 55 permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches between 2006 and 2021. Eight pitches are committed and a further 30 pitches have been identified through the Core Strategy (15 at Great Haddon and 15 at Norwood). Therefore the Site Allocations Document must identify sites for the remaining 14 pitches. Through detailed assessments the following sites are recommended:
- East of Eye Development Area - 10 Permanent Pitches, and 6 travelling showpeople pitches (part of a wider housing and employment allocation)
  - Land West of Peterborough Road, Farcet – 4 Permanent Pitches (part of a wider housing allocation)
  - Land adjacent to Norwood Lane – A Transit site able to accommodate 10 plots.
- 4.14 **Safeguarding Land** - To deliver the growth proposed in the Core Strategy and identified through the Site Allocations Document will require the provision of key infrastructure such as new roads and junction improvements. Some of this infrastructure may not be viable in the short term but is likely to be crucial to the future development of the City, therefore it is vital that the land required to provide this infrastructure is safeguarded from other forms of development.

4.15 It also safeguards land as 'green wedges', safeguards the Hampton Country Park, and introduces three new allocations to be known as 'Character Areas' (Wothorpe, Thorpe Road and Ashton) where additional conservation principles will be applied.

4.16 **Other allocations (summary)** - As well as allocating land for future development, this document also identifies (or reconfirms existing) boundaries for:

- The Urban Area
- The City Centre (CCAAP boundary)
- The District Centre
- Local Centres
- The Villages (Village Envelopes)

## **5. CONSULTATION**

5.1 Consultation on the Issues and Options report has been touched upon above and can be summarised as:

- October 2007 – developers and land owners asked to suggest sites and land for development
- October 2008 – January 2009 – Issues and Options consultation on all sites submitted to the council

Detailed site assessments have then been carried out by officers in the Planning Policy Team and the emerging recommendations have been considered by the Local Development Framework Scrutiny Group (17<sup>th</sup> December 2009). Comments from that Scrutiny Group have been considered in the final preparation of the Document, though none were of a fundamental nature (i.e. they were predominantly matters of detail or site specific).

## **6. ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES**

6.1 It is anticipated that the Committee will offer comments on the draft document, with such comments presented to Cabinet. Cabinet will then be requested to approve the Site Allocations Document for public consultation in March 2010.

## **7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.1 Committee is recommended to make its comments known to assist Cabinet in reaching its decision.

## **8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

8.1 It is a statutory requirement to produce the Site Allocations document therefore the alternative option of not producing this document was rejected.

8.2 Alternative sites could have been recommended for development, but this would have meant such sites were either or both: (a) contrary to the Core Strategy, and (b) contrary to sustainable development principles.

## **9. IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 The Site Allocations will have implications for all sectors of the community throughout the Local Authority area.

9.2 **Legal Implications** - The Council must follow due Regulations in preparing the Site Allocations Document. Eventually, once the final development sites are adopted in 2011, the Council has a legal duty to determine planning applications in accordance with those allocations.

9.3 **Financial Implications** - There are no immediate financial implications flowing from the approval of the Site Allocations (Preferred Options Version), simply because this is not the 'final' plan. However, Members should be aware of two future financial implications:

- (a) The Council, as landowner, submitted a number of possible sites for development. Following an open and transparent appraisal of all sites, some of those sites are been recommended for development whilst others have been rejected (normally for reasons of loss of open space in an area with deficiencies). To be clear, all Council (Estates Section) promoted sites have been appraised and treated like all other developer and landowner suggested sites. The allocation or not of each Council owned site could have a financial implication on the value of that site.
- (b) there could be indirect financial implications arising from the development of sites (e.g. provision of infrastructure and services for the new residents, s106 arrangements, and increased council tax or other receipts).

## 10. **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

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

- Peterborough Local Development Framework Site Allocations Document (Issues and Options October 2008)
- Peterborough Core Strategy Proposed Submission Version (as approved by Council December 2009 and scheduled for publication in January 2010).

This page is intentionally left blank

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
<b>Housing Sites</b>							
H001	Barnstock and Essendyke Sites	3.95	City	Overwhelming objection to this site. Includes general objection to all sites proposed in Bretton and overall levels of development. Majority of objections focus on loss of open space (Bretton Park), loss of ancient woodland and school playing fields. Concerns that local infrastructure will not be able to support new development, especially schools, if playing fields are lost. More people will increase the need for more open space. Size and shape of site not appropriate for housing and would lead to problems of overlooking.	Withdrawn	Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010.	208
H002	Marholm Road South	1.08	City	Overall objection for this site, some support for use as housing but would be more appropriate to remain in employment use. Main objections include: noise from trains; overhead pylons; loss of employment use; and poor access to community facilities as site is clearly separated from main residential area. Support for site as it meets requirements of Core Strategy; it is close to a number of bus routes; good access across railway bridge to Voyager school; and existing screening from railway line.	Rejected	Site rejected due to poor access to community facilities and shops. Also if site was allocated for housing it would result in a loss of employment land. Other issues include contaminated land which may affect the deliverability of the site, there is also an overhead power line running through site.	46
H003	Bretton Industry	4.59	City	Slight objection to this site. Some support for use of site as housing but would be more appropriate to remain in employment use. Main objections include: noise from trains; overhead pylons; loss of employment; and poor access to community facilities as site is clearly separated from main residential area. Support for site as it meets requirements of Core Strategy and encourages redevelopment of disused brownfield site. It is close to a number of bus routes, there is good access across railway bridge to Voyager school and there is existing screening from railway line.	Rejected	Site rejected due to poor access to community facilities and shops. Also if site was allocated for housing it would result in a loss of employment land. Other issues include contaminated land which may affect the deliverability of the site, there is also an overhead power line running through site.	172
H004	Watergall and Pyramid Centre	3.36	City	Overwhelming objection to the inclusion of this site as it could result in the demolition of existing properties. General consensus that pyramid centre is in need of significant regeneration, but not	Withdrawn	Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010.	136

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H005	Land North of Eyrescroft School	1.46	City	through demolition. Overwhelming objection to this site, main concerns include: loss of play facilities (adventure play area) at Crofts Corner; loss of 2/3 of school playing field; loss of woodland; affects on the main pedestrian/cycle rout through Bretton. Local infrastructure could not support the development. Poor access to the site will constrain development	Withdrawn	Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010.	62
H006	Bretton Way Oak Tree Site	1.38	District Centre	Almost 50/50 split with one more comment in support than in objection. Support because site has been vacant for many years; preferable to employment use; and close to Bretton district centre. But many people suggest mitigation including, appropriate landscaping, respect of woodlands and Oak tree. Most comments want to see low density housing on this site. Objections: loss of employment allocation; balance of growth of housing with employment; loss of views of the open countryside; and archaeological remains have been reported on the site	Preferred allocation		69
H007	Ellindon and Pyhill Green	1.27	City	Overwhelming objection to any development on this site because it will result in loss of quality open space within Bretton Park and the loss of the paddling pool. Development would add to traffic and parking.	Withdrawn	Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010.	54
H008	Heltwate	0.61	City	Some support for this site as area is seen to be in need of regeneration including the improvement of the community facilities and shops in the area. However, overall majority of comments in opposition to the inclusion of this site.	Rejected	Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues. The site could form part of wider regeneration plans for the area for mixed use development. Development includes existing properties. The site does not need to be allocated if wider regeneration schemes come forward at a later date.	26
H009	Land adjoining Watergall Primary School	1.06	City	Overwhelming objection to this site and the encroachment on to Bretton Park and associated loss of open space. Two comments in support both suggest that site could come forward as part of wider master plan/regeneration of Bretton.	Withdrawn	Site withdrawn form assessment process by Bretton 2010.	45

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H010	Bretton Woods Community School	1.93	District Centre	Some level of support for this site, however, the majority of comments are in opposition. Many of the comments in support are because the site is thought to already have planning permission for 150 dwellings. Many objections relate to school closure and loss of community facility.	Preferred allocation		143
H011	Land adjacent to Ravenside Retail Park Maskew Avenue	3.42	City	Objections due to access issues and poor links to local facilities. There could be issues with noise from the railway line. Further investigation into potential archaeological remains also required. Site should remain as employment or would be better suited for retail rather than housing.	Rejected	Site has been rejected due to poor access and links to community facilities, the site is separated from main residential area by Bourges Boulevard and is located close to railway line. Site is more suited to remain in employment use. Part of site is located within Minerals and Waste protection zone for transport, which is in place to protect potential future rail infrastructure.	128
H012	Land off Bourges Boulevard, Maskew Avenue	0.38	City	Some support for use of site for residential development, but there are concerns relating to access. Several objections, including Sport England regarding the loss of open space.	Rejected	Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues. The site is currently in use as a well used community centre	19
H013	Craig Street Car Park	0.28	City	Objections to this site due to car parking issues in area. There could be archaeological remain on site and this would require further investigation.	Withdrawn	Site withdrawn form assessment process. Now Considered as part of City Centre Area Action Plan	14
H014	New England Complex, Lincoln Road	0.74	City	Objection to this site due to loss of community/social facilities and historic buildings considered to have important local value.	Rejected	Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues. The site is currently in use by a number of community organisations. Allocation would result in loss of well used facility.	44
H015	Welland Allotments, Bluebell land	1.58	City	Majority of comments against loss of allotment area especially with the increasing demand for allotments in the city.	Rejected	Site rejected as it would result in loss of open space in an area of open space deficiency. If allotments are surplus to requirements site should remain as public open space. Site is also located within proximity of an area of critical drainage issues.	67
H016	John Mansfield	1.11	City	Mixed response, concerns that there should be no	Rejected	Now considered as wider school site	50

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
a	School			overall loss in community facilities. Planning application outstanding for this site.			
H016 b	John Mansfield school building and playing field	4.06	City		Preferred allocation		140
H017	Hereward Community College	6.73	City	Most comments refer to outstanding planning application on this site. Concerns about loss of school and loss of school playing field/open space.	Rejected	Part of site has been rejected as no longer available for housing development. Remainder of the site is being consider through H017b below.	230
H017 b	Hereward Community College	1.15	City	Most comments refer to outstanding planning application on this site. Concerns about loss of school and loss of school playing field/open	Preferred allocation		40
H018	St Augustines Walk/Oundle Road Allotments	1.05	City	Objection due to loss of allotment site. There is a high demand in the area. If development does go ahead there should be provision made on alternative site.	Preferred allocation		45
H019	Site off New Road Woodston (EH Lee Ltd)	0.98	City	Mixed response. Proposed use as a housing site is seen as more appropriate than current use.	Preferred allocation		41
H020	Peterborough WEB, Oundle Road	2.66	City	No objection or support only comments requesting more information.	Rejected	Site rejected on deliverability issues. In use as an employment site. Almost half of site located within flood zone 2, site more suited to less vulnerable uses such as employment.	100
H021	Fletton Avenue/Whittlesey Road (adjacent to cemetery)	0.69	City	Mixed response – overall support for site however there are concerns relating to proximity to conservation area and the importance of high quality design if development goes ahead.	Preferred allocation		29
H022	Galvanising Works, Oundle Road	1.44	City	Support for site as it is located close to city centre. Concerns relating to flooding and poor access from Oundle Road. Mixed use development considered as more appropriate use than purely residential scheme.	Rejected	Site has been rejected because of deliverability issues. Site is in active use as an employment site with no current reason to relocate. Almost half of site is located in flood zone 2 so is more suited to development that is less vulnerable such as employment	61
H023	Guild House,	1.46	City	Mixed response, concerns relating to the loss of	Preferred		62



Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
	Oundle Road			open space that fronts on to Oundle Road and how development would fit with the surrounding character of the area.	allocation		
H024	Land North of Wesleyan Road	1.69	City	Site already under construction.	Withdrawn	Site withdrawn from assessment process as it has now been built.	72
H025	Lady Lodge Goldhay Way	0.71	City	Opposed to loss of Lady Lodge Arts centre and loss of community facility. Site should be retained as a community facility.	Preferred allocation		30
H026	Land in front of Matley Primary School	0.59	City	One objection and one informative received for this site. Site contains archaeological remains which should be investigated prior to any construction taking place.	Preferred allocation		25
H027	Land South of Oundle Road	3.24	City	Opposed to development as site forms an important gateway to city and should remain as open land. Access issues from Oundle Road.	Preferred allocation		122
H028	Land at Rose Court, Yaxley	0.94	City	Support for site allocation but concerns regarding access issues and potential ransom strip. Site is on the catchment boundary between the Environment Agency's (EA) Stanground Lode and the Commissioners' system. The site is outside the floodplain shown on the EA Flood Map and is not within an area shown to be susceptible to flooding. However both receiving watercourses are known to be close to capacity and are within the floodplain and in an area susceptible to surface water flooding. Both the River Nene and the Great Ouse CFMP would apply to this site. The Commissioners would require the provision of a FRA for this site.	Preferred allocation		27
H029	Orton Brick works South of Hampton Vale off London Road	15.10	Urban Extension	Site provides a logical and sustainable link to Hampton, however there are a number of concerns raised as the site is located adjacent to Orton Pit (SSSI/SAC) need to fully consider ecological impacts and mitigation measures.	Preferred allocation		453
H030	Woodston Point, Shrewsbury Avenue	1.40	City	One comment in support for use as housing.	Preferred allocation		60

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H031	Land West of Hampton Vale "Triangle Land"	6.47	Urban Extension	Mixed response some support for site as it provides a logical and sustainable extension to Hampton and a better location for growth. However, there are a number of concerns raised as the site is located adjacent to Orton Put (SSSI/SAC). Need to fully consider ecological impacts and mitigation measures.	Preferred allocation		243
H032	Bus Depot, Lincoln Road	0.50	District Centre	General support for site because it is within the District Centre. Development could help to strengthen the centre, however, there are a number of concerns linked to access and traffic implications in the Millfield area. Site used as tram terminal, could be used if city installed new light railway system.	Preferred allocation		30
H034	Norwood Lane, Caravan Park	1.93	Urban Extension	General support for this site as it will link to the development at Paston reserve. A replacement site for Gypsies and Travellers would be required as there is already outstanding need. Concerns that the loss of a large site would increase demand in surrounding areas.	Rejected	Site has been rejected as it is in use as a Gypsy and Travellers permanent site. Loss of this site would require a replacement and would be contrary to RSS and Core Strategy. Part of site Allocated for Gypsy and Travellers transit site	82
H034 a	Norwood Lane, Caravan Park	0.76	Urban Extension	N/A	Preferred allocation	Existing Gypsy and Travellers site to be extended to include 10 transit pitches	
H035	Land off Cathwaite	0.67	City	Concerns about the loss of open space and landscape; poor access to site; and noise from A 47. Suggestions that site may be better used for retail or leisure.	Rejected	Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues. There is no access to site or any realistic options to access the site. There are also likely to be issues with noise and air quality from A47. If this site was allocated it would result in loss of open space.	28
H036	Honey Hill Primary School	2.41	City	Some support for this site especially if the PACT becomes redundant. However, there are still concerns regarding the loss of educational facilities, community use and open space.	Rejected	Site has been reduced to only include playing fields. Site H036a is now a preferred site	90
H036 a	Honey Hill Primary School	1.68	City	N/A	Preferred allocation		50

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H037	Hampton Car Park, Westwood Centre	0.44	City	Agree with site unless it undermines vitality of existing Westwood facilities. Needs to preserve parking and views into existing scheme. May be better suited as a mixed use scheme. Disagree to site as it is too small and located too close to bus route.	Rejected	Now forms part of wider mixed use redevelopment site M020	19
H038	Hampton Court Shops	0.55	City	General support for development of this site; could be a mixed use scheme to incorporate the existing post office, pharmacy and GP surgery.	Rejected	Now forms part of wider mixed use redevelopment site M020	24
H039	Hampton Court Shops	0.32	City	Agreement for this site providing shopping facilities remain. Site should be used for mixed use development rather than housing. Car parking must be provided.	Rejected	Now forms part of wider mixed use redevelopment site M020	16
H040	PPDC, Cottesmore Close	0.85	City	General agreement that part of site is suitable for housing development provided that the former RAF officer mess is protected as it forms an important part of the city's history. It is suggested that site could be refurbished and used as a community facility.	Preferred allocation		36
H041	Fletton High Street Allotments	2.73	City	Object to loss of statutory allotment site especially as there is evidence of rising demand. Also concerns over poor access from Fletton Avenue.	Rejected	Now forms part of larger site H041a which incorporates sites H042 and site H047.	102
H041 a	Fletton High Street Allotment Land Combined Site	4.12	City		Preferred allocation		0
H042	Fletton High Street Former Allotments	1.04	City	Object to loss of open space. Suggest site could be reused as allotment site especially as there is evidence of rising demand. Also concerns over poor access from Fletton Avenue.	Rejected	Now forms part of larger site H041a which incorporates sites H041 and site H047.	44

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H043	Former Garages behind Coneygree Road	0.42	City	Mixed response to site. Objections to loss of car parking area and current access through site to allotments. The site is on the catchment boundary between the Environment Agency's (EA) Stanground Lode and the commissioners' catchment. The site is outside the floodplain shown on the EA Flood Map and is not within an area shown to be susceptible to flooding. However both receiving watercourses are known to be close to capacity and are within the floodplain and in an area susceptible to surface water flooding.	Rejected	Site has been rejected as access would be required through site to allotments; this reduces the net developable area and would result in the provision of 3 or 4 dwellings. This is below the site size threshold set as a housing allocation. However, this site could still come forward as a planning application and if approved would be classed as windfall development.	18
H045	Land off Wessex Close, Tenterhill	0.75	City	Majority of comments objecting to the inclusion of this site because of flooding issues. Part of the site is located within flood zone 3 and would require sequential approach. Site may be acceptable if overall area is reduced. Concerns about loss of open space, and question whether the site could be used as allotments.	Preferred allocation		32
H046	67 South Street Stanground	0.32	City	Site currently has outline planning permission.	Withdrawn	Site withdrawn form assessment process as site has been developed.	16
H047	Former Fletton Goods Yard	1.28	City	Oppose site on grounds of poor access. Also site may form part of a wider habitat network complementing Fletton Lake CWS and other nearby valuable habitats. Question whether the habitat potential & value of this brownfield site been assessed.	Rejected	This site would be rejected if considered in isolation due to access issues and deliverability issues. However this site now forms part of wider site H041a which also includes sites H041 and H042. Access can be achieved through other sites making this site more deliverable in the future.	55
H048	Roman and Saxon Court, Congsby Road	0.76	City	Opposition to the site due to uncertainty regarding what type of development would come forward on this site.	Rejected	Site not allocated for development. Any future development of the site would be considered against the general development plan policies.	32
H049	Stanground Stables	0.82	City	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Preferred allocation		35

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H050	Peterborough Road, Farcet	0.82	City	Object because site is located adjacent to former landfill site. Support is sites comes forward as part of wider site with H051, H052	Rejected	Now forms part of larger site H137a, and combines H050, H051, H052 and H137	35
H051	Peterborough Road, Farcet	1.36	City	Object because site is located adjacent to former landfill site. Support is sites comes forward as part of wider site with H050 H052	Rejected	Now forms part of larger site H137a, and combines H050, H051, H052 and H137	58
H052	Land adjacent to 197 and rear of Old Mill, Farcet	0.94	City	Object because site is located adjacent to former landfill site. Support is sites comes forward as part of wider site with H050 H052	Rejected	Now forms part of larger site H137a, and combines H050, H051, H052 and H137	40
H053	Windsor Avenue	1.97	City	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Preferred allocation		84
H054	Land off Itter Crescent	1.86	City	Objection to loss of allotments, some support for use as a care home.	Preferred allocation		25
H055	Land at Foxcovert Road	6.86	City	Some support for allocation, other suggestions for use as open space and allotment land	Rejected	Site has been rejected as it falls within protection zone of gas pipeline. Allocation of this site would be against HSE advice.	257
H057	Land at rear of 467 Fullbridge Road	1.67	City	Overwhelming objection to allocation of site, site should remain in use as allotments	Withdrawn	Site has been withdrawn from assessment process as it is now to be used for allotments	71
H058	Land on North side of Mayor Walk, The Grange	5.70	City	Objection to loss of allotment site	Rejected	Site now based on application as shown for site H058b	214
H058 a	Land on North side of Mayor Walk, The Grange	6.90	City		Rejected	Site now based on application as shown for site H058b	259
H058 b	Land on North side of Mayor Walk, The Grange	5.01	City		Preferred allocation		173
H059	Land at the Grange	2.50	City	Objection to loss of allotment site	Rejected	Site rejected as site is to be used as allotment land and area to north H058b is to be developed for housing.	94

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H060	Railworld	1.88	City	Object due to poor access from river lane as well as loss of safeguarding site for railway. Support for development on derelict city centre site.	Withdrawn	Site withdrawn from assessment process. Now Considered as part of City Centre Area Action Plan	112
H061	Rebus Software ltd, Thorpe Road	2.32	City	Object due to affects on setting of listing building and historic gardens. Also concerns about archaeological remains within site	Rejected	Site has been rejected due to deliverability issues and the loss of high quality employment site. Site is also located adjacent to Thorpe hall and any development could have an impact on the building and setting	87
H062	Bretton Gate Sports ground	5.49	City	Objection to loss of sports facility including objection from Sport England	Rejected	Site has been rejected due to loss of open space /playing fields and loss of community facility. This site is not well connected to existing residential areas.	206
H064	Tasman Caravan Park	0.64	Key Service Centre	Objection as site is in use as a caravan site	Rejected	Site is rejected as it is currently in use as a mobile home caravan park, this raised issues over availability and deliverability of the site particularly as the site was allocated in 2005 Local Plan. Part of site falls within flood zone 3b and Minerals and Waste consultation area. However, the site falls within existing village envelope. This means the site could come forward as a planning application if site becomes available in the future. More appropriate sites have been identified in the village of Eye.	16
H065	Land off Thorney Road, Eye	4.05	Key Service Centre	Concerns relating to: nature reserve; transport infrastructure; and lack of infrastructure.	Rejected	Site now forms part of site H150 East of Eye Development Area. Combining sites H071 and H142 H149	91
H066	Land at Eye Green (North of A47)	3.39	Key Service Centre	Concerns relating to: impact upon nature reserve; safeguarding for road network expansion; and flood risk.	Rejected	This site has been rejected as larger site H075a has been identified as a preferred allocation, which overlaps this site.	76
H067	Land South and west of Crowland Road, Eye	0.99	Key Service Centre	Concerns relating to: impact upon nature reserve; flood risk; and relationship with existing built form.	Rejected	Site has been rejected as almost half of site falls within flood zone 3, part of site may be suitable but there are still issues relating to deliverability as site	25

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
	Green					was allocated in 2005 Local Plan and there has been limited interest in the site. There are also issues with access to this site.	
H068	Banks Grain, Eye	5.80	Key Service Centre	Concerns relating to: relationship with existing built form; impact upon SSSI and nature reserve; flood risk; utility capacity; transport impacts; issues with access; and joining up with urban area.	Rejected	Site has been rejected as it is remote from main village, part of site falls within flood zone 3. Site is also located within close proximity to Dogthorpe Star Pit SSSI and the allocation of this site would raise objections from Natural England.	130
H069	Hodney Road, Eye	3.09	Key Service Centre	Concerns relating to: relationship to existing built form; impact upon nature reserve; need to safeguard any potential to expand the a47; impact on road network; drainage and water pressure; flood risk; and joining up with urban area.	Rejected	Site has been rejected as it is remote from main village and part of site falls within flood zone 3. Site is also located within close proximity to Dogthorpe Star Pit SSSI and the allocation of this site would raise objections from Natural England.	69
H070	Land off Crowland Road, Eye Green	3.81	Key Service Centre	Concerns relating to: relationship to existing built form; impact upon nature reserve; need to safeguard any potential to expand the a47; impact on road network; drainage and water pressure; flood risk; convalescence; ground water; and vulnerability zone.	Rejected	Site has been rejected as the site encroaches on to Eye Green Gravel Pit SSSI. The allocation of this site would result in objection from Natural England. The site is also considered too large a scale of development for village of Eye Green and would not fit with overall character of the village.	86
H071	Cranmore Bungalow, Eye	1.23	Key Service Centre	Concerns relating to: impact on Eye Green nature reserve; impact upon road network; and flood risk.	Rejected	Site now forms part of site H150 East of Eye Development Area. Combining sites H065, H142, and H149.	31
H072	Land at Eye (off Peterborough Road)	4.46	Key Service Centre	There are potential access issues. Proximity to the landfill site could require further assessment. Question relationship to the existing urban built form.	Rejected	Site rejected due to poor access to site which is separated from main village of Eye by Car Dyke. Also site falls within Minerals and Waste Consultation area.	100
H073	Land adjacent to Dalmarak Group, Eye	0.88	Key Service Centre	Objections to the site include concerns regarding the relationship of the site to the urban area; impact on the nature reserve; and the importance of S10 (any sites coming forward should include adequate facilities); impact upon transport	Rejected	Site rejected as it is separated from main village. Although other preferred allocations H065 extended east of the village there would still be a significant gap between this site and the Village.	22

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H074	Edgerley Drove, Eye	0.35	Key Service Centre	infrastructure and any future widening of the A47. There are three references in support of the site. Objections raise concerns about flood risk; impact on landscape character (countryside); and the relationship with the urban area.	Rejected	Site is rejected as it falls within functional flood plain and is also within Minerals and waste consultation area.	11
H075	Land South of Nature Reserve, Eye Green	1.44	Key Service Centre	Objections to the site include concerns regarding the loss of employment land, infrastructure capacity and potential flood risk. There are also several references to the impact on the local nature reserve and the ability of development to mitigate the effects.	Rejected	Site boundary has been reduced to limit any adverse effect on the Country Wildlife site. This is now shown as site H075a	37
H075 a	Land South of Nature Reserve, Eye Green	2.44			Preferred allocation		0
H076	Horlock Land, Station Road, Thorney	2.27	Key Service Centre	Objections to the site include concerns regarding the loss of employment land; infrastructure capacity and potential flood risk.	Rejected	Site rejected as a housing allocation as it is located within flood zone 3a. More suitable for less vulnerable uses such as employment. This allocation would result in loss of rural employment site.	51
H077	Land off Gas Lane, Thorney	6.87	Key Service Centre	Objections to the site include concerns regarding the site being dependant upon other sites being allocated; loss of agricultural Greenfield land; and flood risk concerns.	Rejected	Site rejected as it is located within Flood zone 3a. There area also issues around deliverability as site is reliant on H076, H080 and M009 coming forward to provide appropriate access.	154
H078	Site off Sandpit Road, Thorney	2.79	Key Service Centre	Objections to the site include concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land; negative impact upon the character of the village; the generation of traffic; and concerns regarding drainage capacity. There is also a mention of support, suggesting that the site fits better than others in the locality.	Rejected	Site rejected due to limited access, more appropriate sites identified within the village.	63
H079	Site Adjacent to Dark Close and Park Crescent, Thorney	1.60	Key Service Centre	Objection to the site include concerns regarding the loss of agricultural land; negative impact upon the character of the village; the generation of traffic; and concerns regarding drainage capacity. There is also a mention of support, suggesting that the site fits better than others in the locality.	Rejected	Site rejected as 94% of the site falls with flood zone 3.	41



Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H080	Site off Gas Lane, Thorney	0.44	Key Service Centre	Concerns relating to greenfield/brownfield, access, flood risk issues and traffic impact. Comment of support for the site, stating that it has good access to facilities in the village.	Rejected	Site rejected as over half of the site falls within flood zone 3a. There is also poor access to the site.	11
H081	Land at Woburn Drive, Thorney	3.41	Key Service Centre	Loss of agricultural land and suggestion that contrary to the site description access to social and physical infrastructure is limited. Comment in support of Thorney being designated as a Key Service Centre and also suggests that the numbers could be expanded. Road network would be a constraint.	Rejected	Site rejected due to poor access to site. Could come forward with site H131 however this would result in a development that would be too large scale for the village.	77
H083	Land South of Ginton Road, Helpston	2.05	Limited Growth Village	Concerns relating to traffic, loss of agricultural land; and lack of community infrastructure and capacity in schools etc. Impact upon the character of the village, particularly the John Clare Heritage, drainage capacity and the difficulty of improving this infrastructure. There is no gas supply in Helpston.	Rejected	Site rejected due to limited access. More appropriate sites identified within the village.	46
H084	Land Adjacent to 29 Maxey Road, Helpston	0.32	Limited Growth Village	Objections to the site. There are detailed comments on the extent of wildflowers and protected birds. Concerns relating to drainage, traffic, rail crossings, quantum of recently constructed houses. Impacts upon the conservation area (John Clare heritage), infrastructure capacity, economic climate, landscape impact are all raised as concerns.	Preferred allocation		10
H085	Land North of Ginton Road, Helpston	2.30	Limited Growth Village	Major concerns regarding access off Golden Drop which is considered to be a narrow track and passes between two listed buildings; transport infrastructure; community facilities particularly school places and services; impact upon the rural settlement; drainage; lack of employment opportunities; railway crossing; and impact upon the overall character of the site. There are some concerns that development will be at a higher scale. There is also reference to the challenge of delivery in the current economic climate.	Rejected	Site rejected due to limited access. More appropriate sites identified within the village.	52
H086	Land between Helpston Road	0.42	Limited Growth	A number of objections to this site, concerns relate to the impact on the character of the conservation	Preferred allocation		11

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
	and Main Street, Alisworth		Village	area; traffic impact; access; severe drainage issues; and the implications on the wildlife habitats.			
H087	Clay Lane, Castor	1.67	Limited Growth Village	Comments raise concerns about the impact on adjacent County wildlife site. There is a suggestion that this site currently has outline permission. Archaeological remains remain a concern.	Preferred allocation		42
H088	Land at Clay Lane, Castor	1.30	Limited Growth Village	Comments raise concerns similar to the other sites in Castor, potential issues with physical and social infrastructure, character, and the cumulative effects of any further allocations in addition to site H087. There are specific references to the national importance of the potential for archaeological remains associated with the Roman settlement of Praetorium.	Rejected	Site rejected due to deliverability issues. The access routes to this site are not adopted highway this has affected the site coming forward. Also adjacent to County Wildlife Site. More appropriate sites identified within the village	33
H089	Land at Clay Lane, Castor	1.84	Limited Growth Village	Comments raise concerns that the site is not a natural extension to the village. Concerns that the cumulative effects of this site combined with site, (H087) which has outline permission, would have negative implications on the character and capacity of the village.	Rejected	Site rejected as it is separated from main part of village by open fields	47
H090	Land at Peterborough Road, Castor	0.89	Limited Growth Village	There are concerns that development on this site would not be consistent with the character of the village. There are also concerns regarding the access. Capacity in physical (water) and social infrastructure has also been raised as a potential issue.	Rejected	Site rejected as it is removed from main part of the village. More appropriate sites identified in the village.	23
H091	Land Adjoining the Surgery, Glington	1.09	Limited Growth Village	There are some objections to this site with the main concern being how a new development in this location will be in keeping with the existing character of the village. Comments of support also reflect these reservations. There is also a specific concern about the loss of an adult education facility.	Preferred allocation		28
H092	No. 59 Helpston Road, Glington	1.00	Limited Growth Village	Main reason for objection is the proximity to the bypass and the implications of any access. There are also references to the proximity to the gas pipeline and the implications of HSE legislation. A	Rejected	Site rejected as it almost half of site is located within flood zone 3a. Site is also located within 600m of the gas compressor station. Allocation would	25

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
				note of support considers that the site could easily mitigate any of the negative implications that arise in the assessment.		be against the HSE advice	
H093	Land Off Lincoln Road, Adjacent to Playing Fields, Glington	7.54	Limited Growth Village	Concerns relating to allotment land, traffic issues, quantum of housing, community infrastructure, frequent references to convalescence and the importance of maintaining a 'green wedge' between the urban boundary of Peterborough. There is also a reference of support for this site, detailing why it is the most suitable out of the sites.	Rejected	Site rejected as it is within 600m of the gas compressor station and would be against HSE advice. Access would not be permitted from the main road. Smaller area of site considered (H139) this is not within Gas compressor zone but rejected due to access issues.	170
H094	Land South East of Glington	17.53	Limited Growth Village	Opposition to this site. Concerns regarding the loss of allotment land, convalescence and the importance of a green wedge, the lack of community facilities and the potential for archaeological remains.	Rejected	Site rejected as located within gas compressor zone and allocation would be against the advice of the HSE. The scale of development would not be appropriate for a limited growth village.	315
H095	Glington Glebe Land	38.95	Limited Growth Village	Opposition to this site. There are a number of concerns featuring the prospect of convalescence, the proximity to the gas compression site, transport and school places. The site lies in an area of high flood risk and there may be archaeological features on the site.	Rejected	Site rejected as scale of proposed development would not be suitable for a limited growth village and would be contrary to the Core Strategy. Site is located within close proximity to gas compressor station and development would be against the advice of the HSE. Approximately 20% of the site is located within flood zone 3a.	701
H096	Allotments, Wittering	1.55	Limited Growth Village	There is strong opposition to this site. There are references to the biodiversity on the site including sightings of Badgers and Long Eared bats. There is strong opposition to the loss of allotment land. There are also frequent references to the unsuitable transport infrastructure. Further issues including surface water flooding, and the lack of community infrastructure and services.	Rejected	Site rejected due to deliverability issues and access to site. Also objections on ecological and biodiversity issues. More suitable and deliverable sites identified within the village.	40
H097	Land at Towns End, Wittering	4.67	Limited Growth Village	There is strong opposition to this site. As with the other sites in Wittering, there are repeated concerns regarding the impact of any further development on the road network. Other concerns include the loss of agricultural land, loss of	Rejected	Site rejected as half of site is within the explosion zone of RAF base; this limits access to the development. More appropriate sites identified in the village.	105

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H098	Land off Trent Road and Parker Road, Wittering	19.56	Limited Growth Village	allotment land, and capacity in the sewerage infrastructure; lack of employment in the locality, school capacity, wildlife, proximity to RAF base and the resulting noise pollution. The overall lack of community infrastructure is also a concern. Concerns relating to site access, transport, local amenities, archaeological interest, Sewage treatment capacity, schools capacity.	Rejected	Site H098 has been rejected due to large scale of development which would not be appropriate for a limited growth village. A number of options have been assessed. Site now allocated as H098e	352
H098 a	Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering	4.25	Limited Growth Village		Rejected	As per reasoning for H098	0
H098 b	Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering	5.26	Limited Growth Village		Rejected	As per reasoning for H098	0
H098 c	Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering	4.07	Limited Growth Village		Rejected	As per reasoning for H098	0
H098 d	Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering	5.99	Limited Growth Village		Rejected	As per reasoning for H098	0
H098 e	Land off Trent Parker Road, Wittering	4.49	Limited Growth Village		Preferred allocation		0
H099	Willow Drive, Newborough	0.47	Limited Growth Village	Concerns relating to sewerage, departure from ribbon development settlement pattern, transport constraints, flood risk.	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	12
H100	Peterborough Road, Newborough	0.67	Limited Growth Village	Opposition to the site, references to biodiversity including a barn owl, concerns over the loss of agricultural land and the departure from ribbon development settlement pattern. Flood risk is also raised as an issue.	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	17
H101	Land South East of Newborough	19.21	Limited Growth Village	Opposition to the site, concerns include the impact upon wildlife including bats, importance of farmland, sewerage capacity, the level of facilities	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	346

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
				and services, and transport infrastructure. There could also be flood risk issues. The representations drew attention to the potential for a gas main.			
H102	St Martins Road, Newborough	2.43	Limited Growth Village	Opposition to the site. Concerns regarding flood risk, the loss of agricultural land, transport and community infrastructure.	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	55
H103	St Martins Road, Newborough	0.65	Limited Growth Village	Strong opposition to the site. There are concerns over the loss of agricultural land and infrastructure capacity.	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	16
H104	St Martins Road, Newborough	1.87	Limited Growth Village	Majority of the reps have concerns about the site. There are several references to a barn owl who frequently visits the site. The site is currently used as a field and not 'disused' as suggested in the description. There are also references to the limited capacity of the rural roads.	Preferred allocation		48
H105	Land rear of Gunton's Road, Newborough	1.02	Limited Growth Village	Predominately opposition to the site, however there is notable support. Four of the reps recognise this site as the most suitable (out of those in Newborough).	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	26
H106	North St Martins Road, Newborough	0.52	Limited Growth Village	As above, strong opposition to the site. Main issues referring to the size of the development sites and the impact on the village. Concern about the impact on existing community.	Rejected	Site rejected as half of site is located within flood zone 3a. Remaining area would result in a scale of development that does not meet the minimum threshold of the Site Allocations DPD.	13
H107	Land South of Maxey Road, Northborough	1.31	Limited Growth Village	As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites) with the addition of concerns over the lack of facilities/services in the village. Also a concern about the cumulative impact of sites (H107,H109,H110)	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	33
H109	Land Rear of Lincoln Road, Northborough	6.71	Limited Growth Village	As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites) with the addition of concerns over the lack of facilities/services in the village. Also a concern about the cumulative impact of sites (H107,H109,H110)	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	151
H110	Land South of B1162,	4.73	Limited Growth	As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites) with the addition of concerns over the lack of facilities and services in the	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	106

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
	Northborough		Village	village.			
H111	Land Rear of Deeping St James Road, Northborough	4.85	Limited Growth Village	As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites)	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	109
H112	Rippons Drive, Northborough	0.41	Limited Growth Village	As above (same comments have been copied and pasted to the sites)	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	10
H113	Land off Pingle, Northborough	2.65	Limited Growth Village	Strong opposition to the site. Issues include: loss of agricultural land, flood risk, local and wider transport concerns.	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	60
H114	Land West of Pasture Lane, Northborough	3.49	Limited Growth Village	Strong opposition. There are concerns regarding many issues including the loss of agricultural land, flood risk, building on green field land, the potential for archaeological remains, co-ordination with the Core Strategy. There are further concerns regarding the local and wider implications of transport demands.	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	79
H115	Land East of Pasture Lane, Northborough	0.44	Limited Growth Village	Strong opposition to this site: a lack of services, high flood risk, located outside village boundary, lack of sewage capacity, possibility of archaeological remains, impact on transport, local services all cited as reasons for this opposition.	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	11
H116	Bainton Road, Ashton	0.37	Small Village	General opposition to the site; Reasons include site is outside the village envelope, would be better used as an allotment, Mature trees occupy the site, concerns about road capacity.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	11
H117	Plants Eggs, Bainton	0.96	Small Village	General opposition to the site; Reasons include poor relationship to existing settlement, negative impact upon the character, appearance and setting of Baines conservation area.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	24
H118	Land at rear of First drift, Wothorpe	0.87	Small Village	Objection to the site. Suggestion that the site would deliver very few plots.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	22
H119	Croft Farm, Thornhaugh	0.31	Small Village	General opposition to the site. Consideration should be given to the conservation area. An amendment to the village envelope would be	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	9

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
				required.			
H120	Manor Farm, Sutton	0.44	Small Village	General opposition to the site on the grounds that part of the site is outside the village envelope. There is also some support provided that there is careful consideration of the conservation area.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	11
H121	Little Chef, Wansford	0.46	Small Village	General opposition to the site. Concerns regarding access and proximity to the A1.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	12
H122	Land at Old Leicester Road, Wansford	7.53	Small Village	General opposition to the site. Reasons include; Site is not in proportion to existing settlement, site lies adjacent to SSSI and ecological effects should be considered.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	169
H123	Werrington Bridge Road, Milking Nook	1.50	Small Village	Opposition to the site; Reasons include: out of context with the existing settlement (isolated site) and flood risk issues.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	38
H124	Deeping Road, Peakirk	4.57	Small Village	General opposition to the site. Reasons include: remoteness of the site and conflict with Etton minerals extraction designation.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	103
H125	Nos.75, 77, 79 Riverside, Deeping Gate	0.37	Small Village	Concerns about the detrimental impact on visual amenity and local services. Comments that development should be on Brownfield land.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	11
H126	West End Depot, West End Maxey	0.50	Small Village	Objection states that the site would not conform with the Core Strategy	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	13
H127	Land North of Etton	3.03	Small Village	General opposition to the site. Reasons include; the site is too remote from existing settlement, located within Flood Zone 3 (high risk) and located within close proximity to high pressure gas pipeline.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	68
H128	Briggs Farm, Willow Hall Lane, Thorney	0.68	Small Village	General opposition to the site. Reasons include; Remote location would increase car use, inadequate foul sewage capacity, access to A47 is poor.	Rejected	Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside, the site is not well connected to existing settlement and is therefore against National and Local planning Policy	17
H129	Monkhams Hurn Road Werrington	1.73	City	General opposition to the site. Reasons include; the site being too remote from the adjacent settlement, encroachment into open countryside	Rejected	Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside, the site is not well connected to existing settlement and	44

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
				and issues regarding access.		is therefore against National and Local Planning Policy	
H130	The Forge House, Great Road	1.01	City	Generally points of note are highlighted by statutory bodies; the site is within 1.km of Orton Pit; there is a need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site"; and the site should follow standard brownfield contamination land process.	Preferred allocation		43
H131	Land of Whittlessey Road	6.25	Key Service Centre	Limited opposition to the site. Reasons include; increased traffic through the village and more appropriate sites within the village (e.g. M009).Advised of need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site", and need fro detailed assessment of potential impacts on conservation areas and listed buildings. Site is within 4km of Nene washes designations.	Preferred allocation		141
H132	Land at Green Road/Woolfellhi Il Road Eye	6.61	Key Service Centre	Objections include, intrusion into the countryside, traffic impacts, unsustainable location, more appropriate locations available at Thorney. Advised of need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site", and the site lies within 300m of Dogsthorpe Star Pit SSSI.	Rejected	Site rejected as part of site is located within in flood zone 3a. Site is located north of the A47 and not well connected to existing village and associated community facilities.	137
H133	Land at 7 Heath Road, Helpston	0.37	Limited Growth Village	Widespread support, for a single dwelling, based on site being considered within the confines of the village and enhancing the approach to the village. Objection based on unnecessary and unsuitable extension to village envelope. Advised that site lies within 2.5km of Castor Hanglands SSSI.	Rejected	Site rejected as it is located in open countryside and not connected to existing settlements; this is against the Core Strategy.	11
H134	Middle Road/Guntons Road, Newborough	0.82	Limited Growth Village	General opposition based on site lying beyond the village envelope and site H104 being preferred by the Planning Inspector. Advised that the site lies within Flood zone 3, is within 2.5km of Dogsthorpe Star Pit SSSI and is crossed by gas pipelines.	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	21
H135	Field off Gas Lane, Thorney	1.22	Key Service Centre	Objections based on loss of allotment land, poor access, and more suitable site being available at M009. Advised that the site lies within flood zone 3; within 5km of Eye Gravel Pit SSSI; need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on	Rejected		31



Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H136	Land at Eyebury Road, Eye	8.95	Key Service Centre	housing site"; and to follow standard contaminated land process. Generally points of note are highlighted by statutory bodies; the site is within 1.5km of 4 designated (natural) sites; there is a need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site". Concerns are raised that visual access to the primary school should be restricted. Objections based on the site intruding into the countryside, and support for the site being adjacent to existing services and complimenting the village boundary. The site is also crossed by gas pipelines..	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	201
H137	Land West of Peterborough Road, Farcet	1.55	City	Advised that the site lies within 2.4km of Orton Pit, is proximate to Stanground Nature Reserve and CWS, and that the site should consider sustainable transport links to amenities such as Great Fen in Cambridgeshire.	Rejected	Site now considered as part of wider area combining sites H050, H051 and H052. the boundary is show as site H137a	66
H137 a	Land West of Peterborough Road Farcet	3.11	City		Preferred allocation		0
H138	Off penwald Court/Rear of 37 - 43 St Pega's Road	0.54	Small Village	Advised that; the site may have increased traffic impacts, poor access and detrimental affect on wildlife; social housing with amenity space and parking would be preferred; and that contaminated land process should be observed.	Rejected	Site Rejected as the Core Strategy does not propose any further allocations within Small Villages	14
H139	Land off Lincoln Road, adjacent to playing fields,	3.27	Limited Growth Village	General opposition based on non accordance with the IGS and Core Strategy, site falling outside the village envelope, protecting the principle of non-coalescence, traffic impacts and gas protection zones. Support based on accordance with the IGS and Core Strategy. Advised that the site lies within 3km of Deeping Gravel Pits SSSI, and the capacity of the site to help deliver appropriate open space.	Rejected	Site rejected as there is limited access to the site	74
H140	Hampton Court Shops and Garages	0.75	City	Advised that the site is within 1km of Grimshaw Wood LNR; and should follow contaminated land process.	Rejected	Now forms part of wider mixed use redevelopment site M020	32
H141	Broadweel	1.98	Limited	Strong objection to the site based on poor access,	Preferred		51

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
	Road, Helpston		Growth Village	detrimental impacts on school, residents and village character, the site lying beyond the village envelope, and the recent approval of a 43 dwelling scheme in the village which should be regarded as contributing sufficiently to rural growth targets. The Council have intimated recent growth is sufficient for the village; the site lies within 4km of Barnack Hills and Holes designated site.	allocation		
H142	Tanholt Farm, Eye	37.32	Key Service Centre	General points of note are highlighted by statutory bodies; the site is within 500m of a SSSI and adjacent to a PROW. Advised of need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site", and need for detailed assessment of potential impacts on conservation areas and listed buildings. Objections centre on intrusion into the countryside, the scale of the development, and traffic impacts. Support is based on the scope of the development to deliver a critical mass necessary to deliver substantial sustainability benefits. The site is also crossed by gas pipelines.	Rejected	Site rejected as the scale is considered to be too large for the village. Small area now forms part of wider East of Eye development Area H150	672
H142 a	Tanholt Farm Eye Part of H142 but a smaller site	7.03	Key Service Centre	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	Site rejected as it is considered too larger scale for village. Small area now forms part of wider East of Eye development Area H150	0
H142 b	Tanholt Farm Eye Part of H142 but a smaller site	2.64	Key Service Centre	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	Site rejected as it is considered too larger scale for village. Small area now forms part of wider East of Eye development Area H150	0
H143	Land at rear of 39 Station Road, Thorney	0.58	Key Service Centre	Objections centre on poor access and availability of more appropriate site, M009. Advised of need for "full and detailed evaluation of transport impacts on housing site" and to follow contaminated land process.	Rejected	Site rejected as lies within flood zone 3a	15
H144	84 Eyebury Road, Eye	0.98	Key Service Centre	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	Site could link with Site H136, but not consider appropriate to deliver growth for the village.	25
H145	Hurn Road Werrington	14.46	Open Countryside	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside and against National and Local Planning Policy	260

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
H146	Land at Junction of Lincoln Road, Deeping Gate	5.80	Open Countryside	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside and against National and Local Planning Policy	0
H147	Land North of Werrington Lincoln Road 1	5.76	Open Countryside	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	Site Rejected as it is located in Open Countryside and against National and Local Planning Policy	130
H148	John Mansfield remote playing field	3.20	City	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009	Preferred allocation		150
H149	Tanholt Farm Eye Part of H142 and H136	16.00	Key Service Centre	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009	Rejected	Now forms part of wider East of Eye development Area H150	288
H150	East Of Eye Development Area	18.42	Key Service Centre	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009	Preferred allocation		200
L001	Stanground closed landfill site	0	City	Consideration should be given to nearby CWS, SSSI and SAC sites, and the Public Right of Way to the northern boundary maintained.	Rejected	Not considered necessary to allocate for these uses	
L002	Showcase Cinema, Boongate	4.035	City	Consideration should be given to nearby SSSI, SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites.	Rejected		
<b>Mixed Use Development</b>							
M001	Land adjacent to Thorpe Wood House, Thorpe Wood	2.48	City	Recommendations for the site to be used for retail and hotel uses, and not housing. Consideration should be given to the nearby CWS and SAM sites.	Preferred allocation as an employment site		
M002	Land South of Eye	19.28	Key Service Centre	The site is supported for its location, suitability and sustainability credentials. Opposition is focused on coalescence and the loss of the Green Wedge. Consideration should be given to flooding issues and the use of the site for residential and business use.	Rejected	Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern	
M003	Land South of Eye	11.96	Key Service Centre	The site is supported for its location, suitability and sustainability credentials. Opposition is focused on coalescence and the loss of the Green Wedge. Consideration should be given to flooding issues	Rejected	Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern	

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
				and the use of the site for residential and business use.			
M004	White Post Farm, Eye	3.98	Key Service Centre	Opposition focused on proximity to SSSI and CWS, coalescence, increased traffic, loss of amenity, below capacity utilities and flooding.	Rejected	Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern	
M005	Land to the East of Woolfellhill Road, Eye	6.21	Key Service Centre	Opposition focused on proximity to SSSI and CWS, coalescence, increased traffic, loss of amenity, below capacity utilities and flooding.	Rejected	Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern	
M006	Whitepost Farm East, Eye	4.92	Key Service Centre	Opposition focuses on the loss of open land. Consideration should be given to the nearby LNR and CWS, the viability of housing on the site is undermined by the A47 separating the site from the village. The site should be safeguarded for any future expansion of the A47	Rejected	Site partially located within flood zone 3a, other sites considered more suitable to deliver employment land in the villages	
M007	Eye, Thorney Road	3.17	Key Service Centre	Site is supported for its location, accessibility, sustainability and deliverability. The site is opposed due to its separation from the village. Consideration should be given to the nearby LNR and CWS. The site may require its own amenities, and may be suitable for small scale retail/business and residential.	Rejected	Now forms part of wider east of Eye Development Area H150	53
M008	Station Road, Thorney	20.54	Key Service Centre	Opposition focuses on the use of Greenfield land; maintaining the identity of the village; the disproportionate scale of the site on the village; the flood risk of the site; and the availability of more appropriate locations elsewhere. EA objects in principle on flooding grounds. Consideration should be given to the impact on the conservation area; and the possibility of a housing only site, with ancillary amenities.	Rejected	Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern. The site is also located within flood zone 3a.	
M009	Land North of Wisbech Road, Thorney	20.83	Key Service Centre	Support came primarily from one respondent, highlighting location, access, sustainability issues, also pressing for site to be viewed as brownfield. Opposition focused on excessive size, disproportionate scale, negative impact on identity of the village and increased traffic. Consideration should be given to the conservation area,	Rejected	Site rejected due to the scale of the site and detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern. The site is also located within flood zone 3a.	

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
M010	Land at Market Deeping Bridge	30.51	Small Village	complementing existing community facilities and the suitability of just the western end of the site for housing. Strong opposition focused on non-compliance with the Core Strategy; costs of services/amenities will be born by South Kesteven DC; flood risk; loss of open countryside; and detrimental affect on Conservation Area. Most objections also relate to M011. Consideration should be given to connectivity with other settlements, and a full impact assessment required for effects on character, amenities and services. Support from Milton Estates.	Rejected	The site is remote from the urban area or villages, part of the site is also with functional flood plain	
M011	Land at Market Deeping Bridge	57.66	Small Village	Strong opposition focused on non-compliance with the Core Strategy; costs of services/amenities will be born by South Kesteven DC; flood risk; loss of open countryside; and detrimental affect on Conservation Area. Most objections also relate to M010. Consideration should be given to connectivity with other settlements, and a full impact assessment required for effects on character, amenities and services. Support from Milton Estates.	Rejected	The site is located too far away from the urban area or villages, part of the site is also with functional flood plain	
M012	Notcutts Garden Centre	2.71	City	Consideration should be given to nearby Local Nature Reserves	Rejected	Unclear what the landowner was seeking for the site. Council not promoting any alternative use other than as at present, but this does not prevent the landowner submitting proposals to the Council via the planning application process.	
M013	Lovers land, Crowland road, Eye Green	0.35	Open Countryside	Consideration should be given to nearby SSSI. One objection based on remoteness of site from village envelope, one recommendation for site to be employment/office use to complement surrounding agricultural uses.	Rejected	This site is too small to be effective as a mixed use site. May come forward as a planning application.	
M014	Horsey Grange	29.11	Open Countryside	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	Issues are finely balanced for this site; overall because this is an Urban extension, together with issues such as transport, habitats, archaeology	

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
M015	Land North of Peterborough Werrington	16.50	Open Countryside	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	and uncertain linkage with the Regional Freight Interchange, the site has been rejected.	0
M016	Land North of Werrington Lincoln Road 2	1.26	Open Countryside	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	Site rejected as it is within 600m of the gas compressor station and would be against HSE advice.	0
M017	Land North of Werrington Lincoln Road 3	17.95	Open Countryside	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	Site rejected as it is within 600m of the gas compressor station and would be against HSE advice.	0
M018	Land at Milking Nook	32.98	Open Countryside	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	The site is too remote from the urban area and key service centres.	0
M019	Mancetter Square, Land at Lincoln Road, Peterborough	10.90	City	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	The site is rejected as part of the site lies within an area of a high probability of flooding (3a). The site is located within the urban boundary and may still come forward through a planning application	245
M020	Hampton Court Shops. Includes sites H140, H037, 38	1.40	City	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009	Preferred allocation		25
<b>Retail Sites</b>							
R001	Werrington District Centre	3.76	City	General support for the site. The car park should be removed from the boundary. Areas to the North and Southwest should be included. The boundary should be redrawn in line with the current planning application. The site could be designated for mixed use to include housing.	Rejected	Site already within district centre, not necessary to allocate for retail.	
R002	Land off Bourges Boulevard, Maskew Avenue	3.42	City	The site is supported as a natural extension of the Brotherhood and Maskew Retail Parks; proximity to transport links; and broadening the retail offer. Strong opposition is focused on placing retail appropriately within the retail hierarchy; using the site for housing or rail uses; intensifying traffic problems and undermining the North Westgate	Rejected	Rejected - site not suitable for retail as outside designated retail centre and against Local and National Policy	

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
<b>Employment Sites</b>							
E001	Oak tree site, Bretton	1.38	Urban and adjoining area	Use of the site for housing would be strongly supported, although some parties would prefer retail use. Respondents keen to ensure sensitive treatment of the ancient woodland and draw attention to the County Wildlife Site.	Rejected	The employment land review recommended that this site was de-allocated. No significant interest has been forthcoming since this study so the site is being considered for alternative uses.	
E002	Stirling Way, North	6.73	Urban and adjoining area	The EA have objected in principle as part of the site lies in the functional floodplain (E003 may be used in conjunction to alleviate floodrisk to the site). General support from other parties.	Rejected	A large part of this site is within Functional floodplain, this is an absolute constraint. The site will be considered for safeguarding as a 'making space for water site'.	
E003	Stirling way, extension	5.22	Urban and adjoining area	Objection based on incursion to open country. Site may offer flood storage to assist site E002. Development should not adversely affect the power station.	Rejected	Due to the E002 not being allocated, there would be no access to this site. The site is therefore rejected on deliverability grounds.	
E004	Land at Dogsthorpe, (paston parkway/wellan d road)	1.47	Urban and adjoining area	David Locke Associates request to withdraw the site. Allocation can complement Norwood urban extension. Site is opposed for interfering with safeguarded waste site. Site is within 250m of Dogsthorpe Star Pit SSSI. Land may be contaminated; follow guidance in PPS23.	Rejected	The site is located within a Mineral and Waste Safeguarding area.	
E005	Land at Dogsthorpe (Paston Parkway/ Peterborough Rd)	1.72	Urban and adjoining area	Opposed on grounds of coalescence. The site also received support because it is adjacent to a mix of commercial uses, has good access, and the allocation of Norwood sets a precedent for Green Wedge development.	Rejected	The site is located within a mineral and Waste safeguarding area; it also has an area of functional floodplain running down the South-Eastern boundary. This site was therefore rejected on deliverability grounds.	
E006	Oxney South	3.40	Urban and adjoining area	No objections to the site, however any development should not adversely affect the power station.	Preferred allocation		
E007	Perkins North	4.23	Urban and adjoining area	Object on grounds of loss of facility, which is contrary to Sport England's policy and PPG17. Proposer suggests changes as laid out in representations document December 2008. Any development should not adversely affect the power station.	Preferred allocation		

Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
E008	Perkins South	2.77	Urban and adjoining area	Objection received on grounds of loss of the sport facility, which is contrary to Sport England's policy and PPG17. Proposer suggests changes as laid out in representations document December 2008. Any development should not adversely affect the power station.	Preferred allocation		
E009	First Drive	2.22	Urban and adjoining area	Proximity of site to Nene Washes requires any proposal for development to fully consider any ecological impacts and associated mitigation measures. Any development should not adversely affect the power station. Extensive consultation with council undertaken to determine appropriate additional information.	Rejected	Site rejected as located within Flood Zone 3. Other sites provide better scope for mitigation measures.	
E010	Third Drive	4.56	Urban and adjoining area	Any development should not adversely affect the power station. Further information is required with regards floodrisk and proximity to the Nene washes.	Rejected	Site rejected as located within Flood Zone 3. Other sites provide better scope for mitigation measures.	
E011	Oxney North	7.88	Urban and adjoining area	The eastern and western parts of the site should be treated differently in accordance with the archaeological interest on site. Any development should not adversely affect the power station.	Preferred allocation		
E012	Lynchwood (south)	0.97	Urban and adjoining area	No objections to the site, though as with all brownfield sites the EA requires further information with regards potential contamination issues.	Preferred allocation		
E013	Lynchwood (North)	1.29	Urban and adjoining area	No comments	Preferred allocation		
E014	Shrewsbury Avenue	0.96	Urban and adjoining area	No comments	Preferred allocation		
E015	Northam Works, Eye Green	2.16	Villages	Site is supported for being within the village envelope and for its good access, but should also be considered as a mixed use site in conjunction with H066 and H075. Opposition to the site based on proximity to Nature Reserve. Site should be safeguarded for A47 expansion. Site is within 400m of Eye Gravel Pit SSSI	Rejected	The site is located within close proximity to a county wildlife site. Other sites were considered more suitable to deliver employment land in the villages	
E016	Edgerley drain	17.08	Urban and	Site is opposed because of its proximity to listed	Rejected	A Site rejected as it is within 600m of	



Site ID	Site Address	Site Area (ha)	Settlement Hierarchy	Summary of comments from Public Consultation	Allocation	Justification (summary only)	Total housing
	road		adjoining area	buildings at Oxney Farmhouse, and its separation from the main urban area. Site is supported for its proximity to major roads, other industrial uses, and the power station and for being a more appropriate use of land on poor quality soils. The suitability of the site is affected by major gas pipelines in the vicinity. Any development should not adversely affect the power station.		the gas pipeline. The site is also remote from the existing urban boundary and would have a detrimental impact upon the existing settlement pattern	
E017	Station Road Thorney	1.00	Villages	Support for site as employment use to complement predicted housing growth in village. The parish council generally support the planning application for housing at H076 rather than having the site for employment use.	Preferred allocation		
E018	Regional Freight Interchange (Magna park)	124 (approx)	Urban and adjoining area	Significant conflicting issues at stake. Negative impacts on locality set against broader benefits and wider suitability and sustainability factors, also potential for site to deliver sustainable local benefits. Further information required by various statutory bodies before support can be given. Key issues include; democracy (election of councillor who'd stated opposition); requirement for EIA; further flood risk information required; potential need for Appropriate Assessment; inclusion of freight navigation would be in line with RSS14; mineral extraction restoration proposals have been agreed; brickclay (mineral) is safeguarded; potential negative impact on archaeological features.	Preferred allocation	This site is being considered through the Core Strategy. The Site Allocations DPD defines the boundary of the site.	
E019	Leedsgate Farm, former RAF Kings Cliffe	1.90	Villages	No comments	Rejected	The site is too remote from the urban area and villages	
E020	Land off Lincoln Road (Glinton)	14.2	Urban and adjoining area	Site submitted after additional site consultation in January 2009.	Rejected	This site is rejected due to potential access issues and detrimental impact on the existing settlement boundary.	
E021	Redbrick Farm	30 (approx)	Urban and adjoining area	Site not consulted on at Issues and Option stage	Preferred allocation		

This page is intentionally left blank