

Public Document Pack



Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 23 March 2010

Members Present:

Chairman - Councillor North

Councillors – Todd, Kreling, Winslade, C Day, Ash, Lane and Harrington

Officers Present:

Nick Harding, Planning Delivery Manager
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)
Peter Heath-Brown, Planning Policy Manager (Item 6)
Amanda McSherry, Principal Planner (Item 6)
Emma Latimer, Strategic Planning Officer (Item 6)
Carrie Denness, Principal Solicitor
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lowndes, Thacker and Councillor C Burton.

Councillor C Day attended as substitute.

2. Declarations of Interests

5.1 Councillor Lane declared that he was a representative on the Cross Keys Board and would leave the room for the duration of the item.

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

Councillor Ash declared that he would be making representation as a Ward Councillor for agenda item 5.1, Cerris Road.

4. Minutes of the Meetings held on:

4.1 26 January 2010

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2010 were approved as a true and accurate record.

4.2 23 February 2010

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2010 were approved as a true and accurate record subject to the following points of clarification:

- The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and stated that on the last page of the minutes it was written that "after brief discussions Members highlighted

concerns regarding the speaking times being weighted in favour of Parish Councils, Members were advised that further consultation was being undertaken on this point". For clarification, the issue at that time was whether it was an equitable situation with objectors, Parish Councillors and Ward Councillors all speaking against an application and receiving three separate time slots as opposed to only the supporter, namely the applicant, speaking in favour of an application and receiving only one timeslot.

- For further clarification, Members were advised that discussions had taken place at the last Parish Council Liaison meeting and the speaking time for Parish Councillors at the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee would remain the same.

5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

The Committee agreed to vary the order of the agenda and to allow agenda item 5.4, Hyholmes Bretton, to be the next item of business.

5.4 10/00133/NTEL – Installation of a 15m high streetworks monopole with 6 No. shrouded antennas and 2 No. equipment cabinets located adjacent to the monopole on the grass verge adjacent to Hyholmes, Bretton Way, Bretton, Peterborough

The site was part of the highway verge along Bretton Way. It was approximately 29 meters wide and was comprised of a grass verge of approximately 13 meters and a belt of trees before the rear gardens of Hyholmes. To the opposite side of Bretton Way there was a bus lay-by and a narrower verge before the rear gardens of houses in Essendyke. There was no footway at the proposed location.

The proposal was to erect a monopole telecoms mast, 15 meters high which would incorporate two cabinets, one of which would be 1.5 meters tall and the other 1.3 meters tall.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the main issues including the size of the mast in relation to the adjacent street lighting and the distance of the siting of the pole in relation to the surrounding dwellings.

Members were advised that the application had to be either approved or refused at the meeting, a deferral would not be possible, the reason being that the application had been made under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2001 which provided set time scales for an application to be determined, otherwise consent would automatically be granted to erect the monopole mast. The date for expiration of determination of this application was 5 April 2010.

Members were further advised that the application could only be determined on the grounds of its siting and its appearance, consideration could not be given to any health implications relating to the proposal, the reason for this being that these issues were covered by specific health and safety legislation and not planning legislation and as such could not be considered as material planning considerations.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. Twenty three emails from local residents had been submitted via Councillor Fitzgerald, a Ward Councillor for Bretton North. The main issues highlighted in the emails were that the mast would be aesthetically unpleasant, there were numerous other areas where the mast could be erected, there had been inadequate consultation with local residents, the de-valuation of surrounding property, the mast would be hazardous to locals and road users, the potential damage to health, the mast could

attract vandalism, the area was used as a footpath and the erection of the mast would mean that a proper footpath could not be laid in future, the mast was not needed and it would have a detrimental impact on wildlife.

Numerous photographs had also been submitted showing the levels of vandalism in the local area.

A further two letters had been received from local residents stating that the mast was not required as telephone reception in the area was good. However, if the mast was to be erected there were other locations better suited for the proposal such as the adjacent roundabout, the Sainsbury's site and other wasteland in the vicinity. The masts prominent location would downgrade the area to visitors and would attract vandalism.

A letter had also been received from the applicant's agent responding to suggestions made by local residents that the proposed location of the mast was unsuitable. The alternate locations that had been suggested were addressed and it was highlighted that they were not feasible. In the first instance there would be a difficulty in supplying power to these locations due to the nature of their siting, particularly in the case of the roundabout location. The suggestions made that the mast could be located at the Sainsbury's site or at the Bretton Centre were also addressed and it was stated that these suggested sites were in the wrong area and would not provide the coverage needed. Existing coverage was also being provided in those areas by existing masts.

Councillor Wayne Fitzgerald, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The proposed mast would be extremely prominent
- The proposed mast would be a third higher than the two lamp posts it would be sited in between
- Numerous local residents were against the proposal
- No coverage plots had been provided by O2 showing whether this site would be the best location for the proposed mast or highlighting signal strength
- No technical parameters stating why the proposed location was the most suitable had been provided
- The application was a "lazy application", meaning that the applicant had chosen the best site for them and not the best site for the local area
- There was a problem with vandalism in the area
- Item C in Policy U11 stated that "there was no alternative site available, satisfactory in technical and operational terms". Operational terms had appeared to be covered in the response from the applicant, however the lack of signal plots did not support the argument
- Unless it was absolutely necessary, why was the mast proposed for this location?

Mr Allan, an objector and local resident, addressed the Committee on behalf of the residents of Gullymore in Bretton and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The proposed site of the mast was used regularly by pedestrians as the underpass was often flooded, with low lighting and offensive graffiti
- There was no objection to the need for new technology
- Vandalism was rife in the area and the mast and cabinets would surely to be targeted
- There was a risk of creating a precedent with these masts down Bretton Way

- This was a cheap way of providing the service needed, as this was not the original location looked at for the mast
- There was an issue with access as a cherry picker would be needed to access the proposed mast if it required maintenance

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and advised Members that in the original application a statement from O2 had been provided which incorporated a series of plans showing existing coverage and weak points. The coverage required was in a predominantly residential area, therefore the proposed site had been chosen as the best site in proximity to the surrounding dwellings.

After debate and questions to the Planning Officer regarding the maintenance access and the proposed siting of the mast, a motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application. The motion was carried by 7 votes, with one Member abstaining.

RESOLVED: (7 for, 1 abstaining) to refuse the application:

Reasons for the decision:

The application was refused for the following reason:

- It would unacceptably harm the living conditions of residents or the character and appearance of the surrounding area, particularly in terms of size, design, prominence, or relationship to surrounding buildings, spaces or landscape.

Councillor Ash and Councillor Lane left the meeting for the following item.

5.1 09/01317/FUL – Construction of eight, two bedroom affordable houses including associated external works and parking at garages to the south of the recreation ground, Cerris Road, Dogsthorpe, Peterborough

Full planning permission was sought for the construction of eight, two bedroom affordable houses, with associated external works and parking. The properties would be arranged in two, two storey high terraced blocks, each containing four houses. Plots one to four would be accessed from Western Avenue and plots five to eight from Cerris Road. Eight car parking spaces were proposed, one for each property, together with five visitor car parking spaces.

The site was located within a predominately residential area, consisting of two storey high residential properties. The site was bounded on three sides by the rear gardens of the properties on Western Avenue, Birchtree Avenue, and Cerris Road and to the north by an existing recreation/play area. The access to the recreation ground was through the application site.

The site covered an area of 0.21 hectares and was a former residential garage court. The garages that remained on the southern boundary of the site had been boarded up, with only one still in use. The garage buildings that were positioned on the northern boundary of the site had all been removed. The access from Western Avenue currently had bollards in position preventing vehicle access. The access roads had kerb and footways.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal and highlighted the main issues including access to the site, car parking, the distance between properties and the windows located on the side elevations having frosted glass.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. There had been a public meeting held on the 15 March 2010 where a number of issues had been raised, one of these being the safety of the access to and from the recreation ground. Members were informed that the plan had been amended so that the footpaths along either side of the access now continued along the side of the entrance all the way to the park, in addition to this a condition had been proposed which required a scheme of barriers to be put in along the edge of the footpath to prevent vehicles from mounting the curb and being a danger to pedestrians.

A further concern had been expressed regarding access for refuse vehicles, Members were further advised that the development would not be served by the Local Authority but by a private service. Other concerns highlighted were the restricted access for fire engines, the overbearing impact of the development and the insufficient details of boundary treatment. There had also been a request for construction to commence after the school holidays however, this was not a request that could be conditioned.

Comments from the Senior Recreation Officer had also been received stating that the only concern was to ensure that children and other users of the recreation ground were able to enter and leave the recreation ground safely.

A letter of support had been received stating that the proposal was a good idea and affordable housing was needed. A further three letters had been received in objection to the application, including one from the Old Dogsthorpe Residents Association.

Comments had been submitted from the Head of Transport and Engineering and an amendment to condition C10, as highlighted in the committee report, had been suggested making reference to the fact that existing streetlights would need to be relocated as part of the scheme.

Councillor Chris Ash, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The fact that some of the major concerns of the local residents had not been addressed
- The residents of Birchtree Avenue who backed on to the proposed development were used to a low outlook and they were concerned about the appearance of the proposal and the prospect of possibly losing the rear access to their properties. Would the developer consider allowing those residents to keep their rear access?
- The main concern of the residents in the area was the safety aspect
- The removal of the garages was not an issue as they were considered unsightly
- Had the concern highlighted by the Recreation Officer in update report been addressed and was the Recreation Officer happy with the answer given?
- The access road on the Cerris Road side was not straight, therefore seeing a waiting vehicle maybe difficult
- Cerris Road was not particularly wide and therefore vehicles wishing to turn into the site may have to wait for a while if another vehicle was coming out of the site
- The Highways Officer had recently responded to a question regarding a similar garage site that had no recreation area within in, by saying that they were concerned about the sub access and they would have rather that planning permission had not been granted due to pedestrian visibility. Therefore, why was this not a similar concern with this proposal?
- The site had not been well used as a garage site for some time, therefore local residents had got used to not having large amounts of traffic travelling into the site

- More consideration should be given to the Recreation Officer's comment and the local residents' comment regarding construction traffic. Would the safety issues be properly addressed?

Mr Robin Wild, an objector and local resident, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The local residents felt that it was unjustified to build eight houses on top of a children's recreation ground
- The concerns regarding the safety aspects of the accesses
- The comments made by the Highways Authority at a previous meeting, stating that they believed the accesses were substandard in their width
- Over the last few years there had been minimal traffic travelling into the site, therefore an increase in traffic to new houses would be a safety issue for the children using the site
- The accesses were too narrow for fire engines
- The normal refuse vehicles could not be used due to the narrowness of the roads
- The people who had lived here for many years had been used to the area being an open space
- The local residents agreed that the garages were an eyesore and should be pulled down, however the recreation ground should be expanded instead of building houses

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and responded to several of the points that had been raised by the speakers. Members were advised that the properties with existing access to the garage court had provision in the proposal for that access to continue. Members were further advised that the Recreational Officer had not seen the latest amended plan which indicated a complete footpath network. This would mean that any children using the park would be kept off the highway. Whilst it had not been confirmed that the Recreational Officer was happy with the amendment, it was likely that he would be satisfied with the proposal as it met the needs stated.

It was highlighted to the Committee that although the garages situated on the site were at that time very rarely used, the use could start up again without the need for any planning consent and therefore consideration had to be given as to whether the amount of traffic the garages could generate would be less than, equal to or more than that which would be generated by the current proposal. Comments had been received from the Highways Officer stating that seven dwellings would be more appropriate for the site however, there was no specific evidence that could be used to state that eight was inappropriate.

The Committee expressed concern regarding the access to and from the site for emergency vehicles and after debate and questions to the Planning Officer and Highways Officer a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, subject to a satisfactory response from the emergency services, particularly the fire service, stating that they had no issues with the access to and from the site. The motion was carried unanimously.

Members were informed that if there were concerns highlighted by the emergency services, the application would be brought back to the Committee for determination.

RESOLVED: (unanimously) that the application be approved subject to:

1. The emergency services, in particular the fire service, confirming in writing that they had no issues with the access to and from the site

2. The prior satisfactory completion of an obligation under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for a financial contribution to meet the development needs of the area
3. The conditions numbered C1 to C12 as detailed in the committee report
4. The amendment to condition C10 as detailed in the update report
5. The informative number 1 as detailed in the update report
6. An additional condition stating that obscure glazing must be in place at all times in the windows on the side elevations
7. If the S106 has not been completed within 6 months of the date of this resolution without good cause, the Head of Planning Services be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason R1 as detailed in the committee report.

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, 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:

- It was considered that the siting, scale and design of the proposed development was acceptable and could be accommodated on the site without harm to surrounding residents or the character or appearance of the surrounding area. This was in accordance with Policies DA1 and DA2 of the Local Plan. On balance it was considered the traffic movements of the eight houses would be comparable with the former traffic generation on site, therefore the substandard accesses could accommodate the development proposed.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

Councillor Ash and Councillor Lane rejoined the meeting.

5.2 09/01384/FUL – Construction of 50 bed care home and new access at land north of Matley Primary School, Matley, Orton Brimbles, Peterborough, PE2 5YQ

Full planning permission was sought for the construction of a fifty bed care home, with a new access and associated car parking. The accommodation would be provided in a three storey L-shaped building positioned on the western half of the site. The new access from Matley was on the eastern side of the site, leading to the car parking area which had increased in size from fourteen to thirty two spaces in the amended plans.

The site was located within a predominately residential area, consisting of two storey and one and a half storey residential properties. The site was positioned to the north of the Matley Primary school site and to the south of a small local centre, which contained some shop units and a community centre. It was also positioned to the south of some two storey residential houses. To the west of the site was a busway and beyond this further two storey residential housing. The residential houses on Matley Road to the east of the site were one and a half storey.

The site covered an area of 0.56 hectares and was currently vacant land that had become overgrown. The site was currently well screened from surrounding sites by mature hedge and tree landscaped boundaries.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal, highlighting the main issues surrounding the application, namely the impact of overlooking, the appearance of the application from the street, the proposed car parking, the elevation levels of the site, the loss of part of the hedge surrounding the

site and the vegetation to be retained namely the boundary hedge owned by the school.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report.

The Head of Transport and Engineering had originally had issues with the scheme with regards to car parking, the pedestrian link and visibility splays. All of the issues had been addressed in the amended plan and a number of conditions had been proposed and were highlighted in the update report. Members were advised that a number of these conditions could be amalgamated together and incorporated into the conditions highlighted in the committee report.

Three letters of representation had been received highlighting concerns as previously raised in the committee report. Additional concerns were also highlighted in one of the letters with regards to the impact of construction vehicles on the area and the amount of traffic that was generated by the local shop and dentist.

Mrs Suzanne Jones and Mrs Shirley Stapleton, objectors and a school governor and the Head Teacher from Matley Primary School, addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The safety of the children and the staff at Matley Primary School
- The traffic that would access Matley during construction and during occupation of the site, namely staff and visitors accessing and leaving the site
- The proposed access pathway may encourage people to walk along that area and then to cut across the road in front of the opening to the facility
- There was a problem with illegal parking in Matley which had been reported to the police on numerous occasions
- The pressure on primary school places in the area and the number of children currently on role at the school which could rise substantially, this would lead to further increased congestion in the area
- The possibility that increased parking along Matley may hinder emergency vehicles
- The school had a resource provision for physically impaired children and required the access to the school site be clear at all times for emergency vehicles, specifically ambulances
- The possibility that there may be insufficient car parking spaces on the proposed site
- The nearest evacuation site for the school would be the Matley Community Centre therefore, would the double gates leading onto the proposed site still be available for use as the route to the

Mr Paul Ingle, an Architect from Portess and Richardson the agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- A number of parking spaces had been added to the original proposal
- The proposed path was a requirement of the Highways Authority and if it was not required then it could be removed

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and responded to points raised by the speakers. Members were advised that the site had pending planning consent for twenty five dwellings and the only point outstanding was the signing of the legal agreement, this should be taken into consideration by the Committee. The applicant had also submitted a transport assessment which had been considered by the Highways Officers and they were satisfied that safe access could be provided to and from the

proposed site. Members were further advised that with regards to the gates being used as an emergency exit point for the school, the land was third party private land and the arrangement would have to be agreed between the two parties involved and was not an issue that could be reasonably considered in the determination of the application.

The Highways Officer addressed the Committee and stated that he believed the traffic generation to the site would be less than that generated by the school. The provision of a pedestrian link, in this case being the footpath, would also reduce vehicles entering and exiting the site.

The Committee questioned whether the number of disabled parking spaces proposed for the site was adequate. The Planning Officer responded to the query and stated that a check would be made against the standard and if additional disabled spaces were required the issue would be resolved.

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

RESOLVED: (unanimously) that the application be approved subject to:

1. No objections from the Head of Transport and Engineering
2. The prior satisfactory completion of an obligation under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for a financial contribution to meet bus stop improvements, travel plan and monitoring cost needs of the area
3. The conditions numbered C1 to C10 as detailed in the committee report
4. The conditions numbered 1 to 10 in the update report being amalgamated together and incorporated into the conditions highlighted in the committee report
5. The informatives numbered 1 to 7 in the update report
6. An additional condition requiring the disabled parking spaces to be hard surfaced
7. An additional condition requiring the proposed fence to be on the inside of the hedgerow instead of on the outside

Reasons for the decision:

Subject to the imposition of the conditions, 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:

- It was considered that the siting, scale and design of the proposed development was acceptable and could be accommodated on the site without harm to surrounding residents or the character or appearance of the surrounding area. This was in accordance with Policies DA1 and DA2 of the Local Plan. The new access was acceptable in highway safety concerns, and subject to the final comments of the highway engineers the amended car parking provision appeared to be acceptable.

5.3 10/00099/FUL – Additional parking area within approved garden centre – retrospective – at Peterborough Garden Park, Peterborough Road, Eye

Retrospective planning permission was sought for the additional 84 car parking spaces already provided on site, to be used in association with the Garden Centre development. This was an approximate 20% increase to the car parking compared to the 412 spaces that were originally approved. The area of land of the additional car

parking was originally approved as a picnic area for visitors to the site under planning reference 07/00011/OUT.

The site was located on the north east edge of the City. The site was positioned within the urban area boundary of the city, with its northern boundary marking the settlement edge. The site was to the north of the Eye/Peterborough Road and A47 Paston Parkway roundabout. The site was previously used as a sports ground by the Parkway Sports and Social Club.

The site covered an area of 5.94ha and contained the Garden Centre development and associated car parking, which recently opened on 5 February 2010.

The northern boundary was edged by an existing drainage dyke. To the north and west of the site were the Dogsthorpe Landfill site and a Household Waste Recycling Centre. Eye village lay to the north east. Trees and shrubs bound the site to its Paston Parkway frontage. Immediately to the east of the site was a petrol filling station containing a Somerfield convenience food store and a Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) restaurant. The site was separated from existing residential areas by Paston Parkway and Parnwell Way.

The site was accessed via a vehicular access road leading off Eye/Peterborough Road. A footpath along the southern boundary from the roundabout provided further access to the site.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal and the main issues. Members were advised that the applicant had stated that the additional spaces were required, the primary reason being that given the nature of the goods sold at the development (primarily bulky goods) a higher vehicle visitor rate was expected. Additional spaces were also needed to cover busy periods and the applicant had also identified, through research, that this proposal provided less car parking than its competitors. In addition the applicant had stated that if they were to apply the car parking standards from the existing local plan more spaces could be provided.

Mr John Holmes, from Gregory Gray Associates the agent, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The application would sustain the £22 million invested in the Peterborough Garden Park
- The scheme was getting busier by the day and it was believed the scheme would get even busier as the weather improved
- The land was designated as a picnic area and through a bird survey it was deemed to be unsuitable for that purpose due to the landfill site nearby
- It was important to provide adequate parking
- Garden centres had peak periods, particularly around bank holidays and seasonal times, therefore additional parking was required
- The Peak periods had not been reached and adequate facilities were required
- The development was an important investment for Peterborough

The Highways Officer addressed the Committee and stated that the increase in car parking spaces was not likely to increase the number of visitors to the site, there was a travel plan for the site and for any future applications travel planning should be taken into consideration.

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

RESOLVED: (unanimously) that the application be approved unconditionally.

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:

- The additional 20% increase in car parking on site was considered to be acceptable, and would assist in providing for the demand in customer parking, particularly at busy periods. The Travel Plan already approved should be fully implemented to help encourage the use of sustainable travel modes, where possible. As the proposal did not create additional retail floorspace therefore it would not in itself generate any additional traffic, as so could not be deemed harmful impact to the transportation network. The proposal was therefore acceptable in accordance with policies T1 and T10 of the Local Plan.

6. Peterborough Local Development Framework – The Peterborough District Hospital Site Draft Supplementary Planning Document

A report was presented to the Committee which sought its comments on the draft Peterborough District Hospital Site Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) before its submission to Cabinet for approval for the purposes of public participation.

The Peterborough District Hospital site was to be vacated by the end of 2011 following the transfer of remaining medical services to the new city hospital on the Edith Cavell site. The site would become vacant and would require comprehensive regeneration. The purpose of the Hospital Site SPD was to provide detailed guidance to prospective developers as to the type and level of development the Council would expect to see come forward on the site, and in turn meet the objectives of the Local Plan, the emerging Local Development Framework, the Local Area Agreement and the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

The Hospital Site SPD had been prepared jointly by King Sturge (acting on behalf of the Peterborough and Stamford NHS Trust) and Peterborough City Council Officers. However, as the SPD would become official Council planning policy once adopted (post consultation), the final text as presented to the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee (PEP) was that as recommended by Peterborough City Council Planning Officers.

The draft Hospital Site SPD set out the Council's ambition to see a mixed-use development incorporating residential, community, local retail and ancillary uses on the Peterborough District Hospital site. This would help to meet one of the key priorities of the Sustainable Communities Strategy to deliver substantial and truly sustainable growth.

Members were advised that it was anticipated that Cabinet, at its meeting due to be held on 29 March 2010, would approve the draft Hospital Site SPD for public consultation in April 2010 and it would be assisted in its decision by any comments made by the Local Development Framework Scrutiny Group and the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee.

Members were invited to comment on the District Hospital Site SPD and the following issues and observations were highlighted:

- Members questioned how much of the memorial wing was to be retained. Members were advised that the core of the building was locally listed and to be

retained. The remainder of the building was comprised of later extensions and was not to be retained.

- Members further questioned whether the community site located on the plan, comprising the memorial wing and the surrounding area, could be utilised for the war memorial site. Members were further advised that the community area had no specified use at that stage.
- The Committee commented that there appeared to be no church or chapel provision on the site and this point was to be relayed to Cabinet.
- The Committee further commented that there also appeared to be no provision for a nursery or school on the site. The Committee was informed that the education department had been consulted on the need for a school and it had been stated that the development would not generate the need for a school. There would however be an education contribution sought to meet the needs of the residents.
- Members expressed concern at the lack of school provision on the site and further commented that there were no suitable schools in the local vicinity. Members were advised that, in local policy, the proposed site did not generate enough school places to request that a new school was provided.
- The Committee expressed further concern at the lack of school provision on the site and the lack of schooling in the area. These concerns were to be relayed to Cabinet.
- Members commented on the parking provision at the site and questioned whether it would be possible to implement underground parking for high rise apartment buildings. Members were advised that the site would need to incorporate a range of parking opportunities and some of that could include underground parking.
- Members further commented on the provision of homes for life at the site as it was felt that there was a need for this type of property rather than multi storey accommodation.
- The Committee questioned the size of the proposed retail outlet on the site, would it be sustainable in the future as it was relatively modest size. The Committee was advised that the retail aspect of the site had been looked into and it was important to provide a retail outlet that suited the area. Because of the sites proximity to the city centre, it was important not to provide a retail outlet that competed with the outlets in the city centre. There was also the possibility of future retail development in the station quarter.
- Members commented that retailing should not be located around site 1 on the plan as the viability of a retail outlet on this site may not be as strong as if it was located elsewhere. There were a number of other local retail outlets in this area therefore it would be better suited to site 4. Members further commented that making the retail outlet visible from the road may increase the flow of traffic into the site.
- Members requested that their concerns be noted regarding the possible additional traffic that may be generated by the proposal and going forward, with the development of the station quarter, the access onto Thorpe Road.
- Members requested it to be noted that they felt more open communal space was needed on the development.
- The Committee commented that the focus for the site could be an education quarter for the city. Going forward, it was important to provide development that the people of the city required and was sustainable for the future. Members requested that the possibility of the site being utilised for the university campus be looked into.
- Members commented that the design and scale of the development should be sympathetic to existing buildings.

In summary, Members requested that the issues to be relayed to Cabinet were around schooling provision in the area, parking, communal gardens, using part of the site as the university campus, homes for life, the possible provision of space for a church, the exploration of underground parking for high rise buildings and access onto Thorpe Road particularly at the city centre end.

RESOLVED: to comment on the draft Peterborough District Hospital Site Supplementary Planning Document before its submission to Cabinet on 29 March 2010 for approval for the purposes of public participation.

13.30 – 16.55
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank