

NOTICE OF MEETING

MEETING	CABINET
DATE:	MONDAY 8 NOVEMBER 2010
TIME:	10.00 am
VENUE:	BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOM - TOWN HALL
CONTACT:	Alex Daynes Telephone: 01733 452447 e-mail address alexander.daynes@peterborough.gov.uk
Despatch date:	29 October 2010

AGENDA

	PAGE NO
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Declarations of Interest	
3. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting held 29 September 2010	1 - 8
STRATEGIC DECISIONS	
4. Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy*	See Separate Book
5. Site Allocations Development Plan Document	9 - 92
6. Future of Westcombe Engineering	93 - 96

Circulation

Cabinet Members, Scrutiny Committee Members, Directors, Heads of Service, Press

*Any agenda item marked with an * is a 'key decision' involving the Council making expenditure or savings of over £500,000 or having a significant effect on two or more wards in Peterborough. These items have been advertised previously on the Council's Forward Plan (except where the issue is urgent in accordance with Section 15 of the Council's Access to Information rules).*



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 Alex Daynes on 01733 452447.

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF CABINET MEETING HELD 29 SEPTEMBER 2010

PRESENT

Cabinet Members:

Councillors Cereste (Chairman), Dalton, Elsey, Hiller, Holdich, Lee, Seaton, Scott, and Walsh.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Benton and Lamb.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting – 14 June 2010

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2010 were approved and signed as an accurate record.

4. Youth Council / Youth MP

Cabinet received a presentation from the current Chairman of the Youth Council Tom Trevarthan, and the Youth MP for Peterborough, Lorna Cartledge. Members were advised that schools would shortly be invited to elect representatives to the Youth Council and that it was hoped there would be two representatives from each of the schools across the city.

It was emphasised that the Youth Council was keen to develop links with elected Members in order to promote understanding amongst young people of the role and responsibilities associated with being a Councillor and to promote Peterborough. All elected Members were welcome to attend Youth Council meetings in order to help promote and encourage interest in local democracy amongst young people.

The Cabinet Member for Resources confirmed that the views of the Youth Council would be sought in respect of the Council's draft budget proposals, which were due to be considered by Cabinet in November 2010.

Cabinet noted the valuable work being undertaken by the Youth Council and emphasised that all Cabinet Members would welcome discussions with its representatives and were happy to be approached to provide advice and support where necessary.

ITEMS FROM SCUTINY COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

5. Revised Biodiversity Strategy

Cabinet received the City Council's revised Biodiversity Strategy. Members were advised that the updated Strategy had been developed by a working group of officers and Councillors and had been considered by the Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee.

Members' attention was drawn to the Vision Statement developed by the Working Group and the associated Action Plan, which outlined specific actions and possible methods of delivery. The incorporation of biodiversity into many of the Council's functions and services would continue to be achieved within existing resources (providing that these were maintained), however Members' attention was drawn to Appendix C of the Strategy, which identified the additional resources that would be required in order to ensure compliance with the legal duty the City Council now had with respect to Biodiversity.

During debate, a query was raised with regard to the creation of new woodland. The Cabinet Member for Environment Capital advised that the focus would initially be on existing woodland in order to ensure that any restorative work required on ancient woodland was undertaken and that existing woodland was well managed.

CABINET RESOLVED TO:

- (i) endorse the Biodiversity Strategy prior to its consideration by Council on 13 October 2010 as part of the Major Policy Framework; and
- (ii) consider the requirement for additional resources during the development of the Council Budgets alongside other budget pressures.

REASONS

To update the City Council's Biodiversity Strategy to take account of the Biodiversity Duty introduced by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act S40 and Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs Guidance to Local Authorities with respect to this Duty.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

To retain the City Council's 2004 Biodiversity Strategy. This was rejected as it would not adequately reflect legislative requirements that have come into force since its adoption.

6. Progress on Delivery of the Environment Capital Portfolio

Cabinet was asked to consider the proposed 'Home of Environment Capital Policy 2010' and comment upon the communication and marketing approach for its implementation. Members noted that the Council's current Environment Policy (2000) was now out of date and did not adequately take into account Peterborough's growth targets or global environmental challenges. In addition, it did not reflect the wide range of policies, plans and strategies which had been developed since 2000.

Cabinet noted that the Environment Capital Scrutiny Committee had considered the draft policy at its meeting of 9 September 2010 and recommendations from the Committee had been incorporated. The Cabinet Member for Environment Capital emphasised that the 'Home of the Environment Capital' Policy was strongly linked to other Council strategies and its adoption would ensure that environmental considerations were placed at the heart of all

Council policies, strategies and services and embedded throughout the organisation. An internal launch campaign was planned for the autumn and local stakeholders, residents and business would be engaged via planned marketing activities.

CABINET RESOLVED TO:

- (i) recommend that the draft Home of Environment Capital Policy 2010 policy be submitted to Council on 13 October 2010 for adoption as part of the Major Policy Framework; and
- (ii) support the Home of Environment Capital communication and marketing approach for implementation subject to the adoption of the Major Policy by Council.

REASONS

The Council's current Environment Policy (2000) was now out of date and did not adequately take into account Peterborough's growth targets or the global environmental challenges now faced. Nor did it take into account the wide range of policies, plans and strategies, developed since 2000, which contribute to environmental improvement. The adoption of the Home of Environmental Capital Policy ensured that environmental considerations were placed at the heart of all Council policies, strategies and services ensuring that Peterborough grew both substantially and sustainably. The communication and marketing approach would ensure local, national and international recognition for the emphasis it placed on environmental quality and performance.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Peterborough's environmental reputation and, most recently, its ambition to create the UK's Environment Capital was already widely known both locally and nationally. It was therefore considered appropriate to build on this reputation to move forward. The Council could decide to maintain Peterborough's existing Environment City focus but it was considered that the agenda, both in terms of the environmental challenge and the future growth target, had changed substantially since the designation was awarded in the early 1990s. Home of Environment Capital substantially updated the approach in line with these considerations.

STRATEGIC DECISIONS

7. Health White Paper – Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS

Cabinet was asked to agree the City Council's response to the Government's White Paper: 'Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS' and its associated consultation documents. Denise Radley, Director of Adult Social Services presented this report on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care. Members were advised that as well as setting out proposed changes to the NHS, the White Paper contained significant implications for local authorities, including increased responsibilities.

A comment was raised emphasising the need for clear division between the role of health scrutiny and that of the Wellbeing Board and it was suggested that the Council's response should be strengthened in order to ensure this view was made clear.

CABINET RESOLVED TO:

- Submit the response to the government's White Paper: 'Equity & Excellence: Liberating the NHS' and its associated consultation documents.

CABINET FURTHER RESOLVED TO:

Strengthen the wording in the Council's response to emphasise the need for health scrutiny to remain separate from Well Being boards.

REASONS

It was important that the City Council made its views on the proposed changes known as part of the consultation process.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

The City Council could choose not to submit a response to the consultation. However, due to the significance of the proposals, the Council's views should be contributed.

8. New Executive Arrangements under Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007

This report was presented to Cabinet following consideration of the new Executive Arrangements by Full Council at its meeting of 26 July 2010. Council had resolved to undertake a public consultation exercise in respect of this matter, which was due to close on 30 September 2010.

The Solicitor to the Council raised the following points:

- To date, 22 respondents had expressed a preference for the Strong Leader and Cabinet model and 36 for the Elected Mayor model;
- There would be a cost implication associated with the Elected Mayor option due to the need to hold an election;
- The Strong Leader and Cabinet Member would provide maximum flexibility to utilise changes the Government may introduce at a later date.

CABINET RESOLVED TO:

Recommend to Council that it adopts the Strong Leader and Cabinet style of Executive Arrangements - to take effect from May 2011.

REASONS

The Council had a legal obligation to change to one of the two models currently permissible by December 2010.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Adopt the Elected Mayor and Cabinet model: this was not recommended as the Council would need to incur the cost of holding an election for the position of elected mayor. Also, a mayor would be elected for a period of 4 years and this may limit the Council's ability to take advantage of additional changes to executive arrangements which are anticipated in the Government's Localism Bill in the autumn.

Retain the status quo: this option was rejected because the Council's current executive arrangements of the old style leader and cabinet model would not be valid after December 2010. If the Council did not select one of the two models available, the Secretary of State would impose one of the two models.

9. Proposal to Change the Name of Fletton Ward to Fletton and Woodston Ward

Cabinet considered a request to change the name of Fletton Ward to Fletton & Woodston Ward to reflect the fact that Fletton ward is made up of the Fletton and Woodston areas.

CABINET RESOLVED TO:

Recommend to Council that it agrees to consult all appropriate persons on the proposed change of name for Fletton Ward to Fletton & Woodston Ward.

REASONS

The Council had a legal obligation to consult with appropriate persons about proposed changes to the names of electoral areas.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

There were no alternative options in order to change the name of an electoral area.

10. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Council's agreed Annual Budget Framework required Cabinet to consider the Council's budget and financial strategy and to set provisional cash limits for the forthcoming year.

The Cabinet Member for Resources presented this item. The report provided an update on the likely financial situation of the Council for the next five years and illustrated the possible impact on the Council of the national finance position. It further outlined a range of grant scenarios in order to enable each department to work towards preparing the budget options for each of the years 2011/12 to 2015/16.

The Cabinet Member for Resources advised Members that following the change in Government in May 2010, a series of meetings had been held with officers to develop proposals to address the forthcoming reduction in local government funding. On release of these proposals, all elected Members would be given an opportunity to provide input, along with the other relevant stakeholders.

CABINET RESOLVED TO:

- (i) note the potential impact of the state of national public finances on the Council's future grant settlements and its implications for the medium term financial strategy;
- (ii) approve plans to consult with Scrutiny and Stakeholders on the medium term financial strategy earlier (one month) than previous years, reflecting the scale of the challenge facing the Council;
- (iii) approve the approach that is proposed for the budget process incorporating the medium term financial strategy (MTFS);
- (iv) approve the grant scenarios for departments to enable them to finalise options for financial years 2011/12 through to and including 2015/16 for further consideration; and
- (v) note that proposals will need to be considered for implementation during the current financial year to address the grant reductions announced for 2010/11.

REASONS

The Constitution required Cabinet to outline its approach to developing the MTFS. The challenges facing the Council mean it is sensible to publish these proposals earlier than usual to allow extra time for consultation and discussion on these proposals. These steps would help to ensure that the Council achieves a balanced budget, aligned to corporate priorities.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

Some Councils were waiting until the Local government settlement is known before releasing proposals. Whilst this would mean greater certainty over funding levels for the council, it would reduce the time available for consultation and discussion, so proposals had been developed to meet the resource scenarios outlined.

MONITORING ITEMS

11. BUDGET MONITORING - FINAL OUTTURN 2009/2010

Cabinet was asked to note the final financial performance for revenue and capital at 31 March 2010 and the performance information on treasury management activities, the payment of creditors in services and collection performance for debtors, local taxation and benefit overpayments.

CABINET RESOLVED TO:

- (i) Note the final outturn position (based on expenditure at the end of March 2010) on the Council's revenue and capital budget;
- (ii) Note the performance against the prudential indicators;
- (iii) Note the performance on treasury management activities, payment of creditors in services and collection performance for debtors, local taxation and benefit overpayments; and
- (iv) Note the financial uncertainty of local government financing in future years and how this could impact the Council.

REASONS

The monitoring report for 2009/10 financial year formed part of the process for producing the Statement of Accounts.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

None required at this stage.

12. OUTCOME OF PETITIONS

Cabinet noted the progress being made in response to petitions in accordance with Standing Order 13 of the Council's Rules of Procedure.

CABINET RESOLVED TO:

Note the actions taken in respect of petitions presented to Full Council.

REASONS

Standing Orders require that Council receive a report about the action taken on petitions. As the petition presented in this report has been dealt with by Cabinet Members or officers it is appropriate that the action taken is reported to Cabinet, prior to it being included within the Executive's report to full Council.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Any alternative options would require an amendment to the Council's Constitution to remove the requirement to report to Council.

Meeting closed at 10.13 a.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET	AGENDA ITEM No. 5
8 NOVEMBER 2010	PUBLIC REPORT

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

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

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

1. ORIGIN OF REPORT

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

2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT

2.1 The purpose of this report is to enable Cabinet to consider and recommend to Council a document which forms part of the major policy framework – namely the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (Proposed Submission version). If it is approved by Council, it will be published for public consultation and then submitted to the Secretary of State.

2.2 The recommended Site Allocations DPD (Proposed Submission version) is available at Appendix 1, with the exception of the accompanying 'Proposals Map' which is available on the Council's website <http://democracy.peterborough.gov.uk> and copies have been placed in each of the Members Group Rooms.

2.3 This report is for Cabinet to consider under its Terms of Reference No. 3.2.4, 'to promote the Council's corporate and key strategies and Peterborough's Community Strategy and approve strategies and cross-cutting programmes not included within the Council's major policy and budget framework'.

3. TIMESCALE

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

4. PETERBOROUGH SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD (PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION)

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

- Unlike an earlier draft, it no longer includes any **Gypsy and Traveller** sites other than the proposed transit site at Norwood.

- 4.5 Cabinet should be aware that the Site Allocations DPD has been prepared on the **assumption that the Core Strategy is found ‘sound’** by the Core Strategy Inspector (with or without relatively minor changes). The Core Strategy Hearing sessions closed on 15th October 2010, and we hope (but no guarantee) that the Inspector’s Report will be with us in December, ideally for Council on 8 December.
- 4.6 If the Inspector finds major fault with the Core Strategy (either finding the plan ‘unsound’ or making significant changes to the plan to make it ‘sound’), then the Site Allocations DPD is likely to require changes or even a complete re-think. This may subsequently result in the Site Allocations DPD: (i) being pulled from Council on 8 December 2010, reconsidered by Cabinet, and submitted to Council at a later date; (ii) adjustments made to the Site Allocations DPD directly by Council to ensure it remains in line with the Core Strategy; or (iii) a delegated authority to amend the Site Allocations DPD in advance of Council in December to ensure it remains in line with the Core Strategy. We regard any of these scenarios to be unlikely (because officers believe we defended robustly the content of the Core Strategy at the Hearing sessions), but there is a small risk that one will occur. The recommendations at the head of this report hopefully enable an efficient procedure to be put in place so as not to unnecessarily hold up the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.
- 4.7 For clarity, Cabinet should also note that the Site Allocations DPD covers the entire unitary area of the authority **except the City Centre**. The City Centre is subject to its own equivalent plan (the City Centre Area Action Plan) which is due in 2011.

5. CONSULTATION

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

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

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

Consideration prior to Cabinet

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

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

Future consultation

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

6. ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

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

7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

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

8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

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

9. IMPLICATIONS

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

values, usually positively but not always. However, plan making decisions of the Council must not take into account any financial gain or loss of its property holdings, other than (as with all development sites) consideration as to whether the proposed use is deliverable. A key aspect of this test is whether the landowner (i.e. the Council in some cases) is willing to develop the site for the intended proposed use. We understand that all sites affected by the Site Allocations DPD which the Council has a direct interest in are 'deliverable', and that satisfies that particular plan making test. No assessment of whether this would result in a financial book gain or loss to a Council asset has been undertaken by planning officers, nor would it be taken into account if it had.

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

10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

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

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

Attached:

Appendix 1 – Proposed Submission Site Allocations DPD

Appendix 2 – Neighbourhood Council draft minutes



Appendix 1

PETERBOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

Peterborough Site Allocations DPD
Proposed Submission

(Cabinet Version November 2010)

Preface

Peterborough City Council is preparing a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). This document will identify land and allocate sites for different types of development to deliver the planned growth of the area administered by the Council. This document also sets out a number of policies that relate to the allocation of land, such as safeguarding areas for future development.

Following previous consultation in 2008, 2009 and 2010, we have published this Proposed Submission Version. It is called a 'Proposed Submission Version' because it is your final chance to make formal representations (comments) before the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State. After it is submitted, he will appoint a planning Inspector to carry out an examination into the soundness of the document, taking all representations into account.

How to respond

We welcome formal representations on this Site Allocations DPD (Proposed Submission Version) on the soundness of the document. The document can be viewed at: <http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk>, where you can also submit representations on-line. This is our preferred method as it will save resources.

Alternatively, paper copies of the document, representation forms and guidance notes are available in all local libraries and the Council offices at Bayard Place. The representation form can also be downloaded at: www.peterborough.gov.uk

Representations can be submitted to us by e-mailing – planningpolicy@peterborough.gov.uk

The postal address for representations is:

Strategic Planning & Enabling
Peterborough City Council
Stuart House East Wing
St John's Street
Peterborough
PE1 5DD

The six week period during which representations can be made will start at **9.00am on [xxxx]**. The closing date is **5pm on [xxxx]**. **Please note that any representation received before the start date or after the closing date cannot be considered.**

At this stage in the process representations must relate to either legal compliance of the plan or whether the plan is sound (that it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy). Before submitting any representations, please read the How to Make Your Comments Effective section below and the guidance note (also available in local libraries).

Supporting Documents

There are a number of documents which support this plan, but perhaps the most important ones are as follows:

- **Proposals Map** - The Site Allocations Document includes a Proposals Map. This identifies the precise location and boundary of all allocations contained in this document.
- **Evidence Report**- Due to the amount of detailed assessment we have undertaken to select the allocated sites, we have produced a separate document called the Evidence

Report which provides further detail about our methodology and the scoring of each site.

- **Sustainability Appraisal Report** - This is a separate report which sets out how policies in the Document help to achieve sustainable development (see section 2.15).
- **Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Report** - This is a separate report which assesses the potential impact of the Document on designated nature conservation sites of European Importance.

The above documents can be viewed at <http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/sa/sapo/sapo?tab=files> and are also available in local libraries.

It should be noted that we are no longer seeking any additional sites for consideration. Should you wish to submit a new site, you will be responsible for the detailed assessment. We will not consider any new sites, but we will pass them to the Inspector who conducts the Examination.

How to make your comments effective

Tests of Soundness

If you intend to submit a representation (comment) on this document, it should relate to one or more of the 'tests of soundness'.

As required by national government legislation, the 'tests of soundness' are considered by the Council when preparing each DPD. The tests consider whether the submitted plan has been prepared in accordance with legal requirements and if the contents of the plan are sound. These are set out in the tables below.

Table 1 Tests of Soundness

Test of Soundness	Explanation
Are the policies justified?	To be justified, the policies must be based on a robust and credible evidence base and be the most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives.
Are the policies effective?	To be effective, the policies must be deliverable, flexible enough to deal with changing circumstances and able to be monitored.
Are the policies consistent with National Policy?	National Policy is set out in Planning Policy Statements, Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Circulars. The DPD should have regard to these policies. Where a departure is made, local evidence is needed to justify why.

Table 2 Legal Compliance

Test of Soundness	Explanation
Have the policies been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme and in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the	The Local Development Scheme sets out the documents the Council will prepare and over what timescales. The Statement of Community Involvement sets out how the Council will engage the community during the process of preparing the Local Development



Test of Soundness	Explanation
Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations, as amended in 2008 and 2009?	Framework documents. The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended 2008 and 2009, set out the legislation against which plans have to be prepared.
Have the policies been subject to Sustainability Appraisal?	Local Planning Authorities are required to prepare and submit a Sustainability Appraisal to accompany the document. The Sustainability Appraisal tests the potential social, environmental and economic impacts of the policies.
Do the policies have regard to National Policy?	National Policy is set out in Planning Policy Statements, Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Circulars. The DPD should have regard to these policies. Where a departure is made, local evidence is needed to justify why.
Do the policies have regard to any sustainable community strategy for the area?	The Peterborough Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) is prepared by the Local Strategic Partnership, with representatives from a range of interest areas. The SCS is subject to consultation but not independent examination.

For more information on the tests of soundness, please see the guidance note which supports this consultation document.

If you require further information on what issues we can, and cannot, consider through the planning system there are a number of sources of free guidance. The planning policy section of the council can be contacted direct on 01733 863872. Planning Aid, a government funded organisation, can also be contacted for free impartial advice on the planning system. There are also a number of websites that are designed to provide the general public with accessible guidance. Please see the links below, or contact us direct for further information.

<http://www.planningaid.rtpi.org.uk/>

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/>

How we have reached this stage

In 2007, as part of the evidence gathering stages, we asked developers, agents, landowners, parish councils and local residents to put forward sites that they wanted to be considered as potential allocations. From this, we received approximately 200 sites proposing a wide variety of development types. In October 2008, an Issues and Options consultation document was published which contained all sites submitted to the Council as potential housing and/or employment sites. In January 2009, an Additional Sites Document was also consulted on. This contained all sites submitted during the earlier consultation period.

The two Issues and Options Documents included a summary and map of each site. At the time of consultation no assessments had been carried out and no decision had been made as to the suitability of any site. The two full consultation documents, including all comments received during the consultation period, can be viewed at <http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal>.

All sites submitted to the Council were then assessed against a detailed set of criteria as set out in Chapter 2 - Approach to Site Selection (full details of the site assessment process are contained in the supporting Evidence Report). From this, we identified our “Preferred Sites” and these sites were consulted on in March - April 2010 as part of the Preferred Options consultation. The Preferred Options document and supporting evidence report can be viewed at: <http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/sa/sapo>, along with all comments received.

The Preferred Options consultation document did not include any sites or policies relating to cemetery provision. Therefore a separate options consultation was carried out in September 2010 to help identify the most suitable site. This can be viewed at: http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/site_allocations_options_for_cemetery_provision/saocp.

During the consultation on the Preferred Options version of this document in March - April 2010, we received over 4,000 comments. As well as objections to some sites, comments included additional supporting information for some sites and queries on the assessment process. As a result, we have reassessed or amended some of the sites that were in that version of the document.

Amended Sites

During the Preferred Options consultation a number of changes to the boundaries or uses of sites were suggested to the Council. Individual site plans for all amended sites are contained in the Evidence Report

In some cases, this has resulted in a smaller site area; in others this has resulted in a larger site area. Some sites have the same boundary, but the proposed new site use has changed. Sites are coded a, b, or c after the number to show which original site has been changed.

Table 3

Site Number	Site Address	Proposed Use	Amendment Justification	Total Housing
E021a	Red Brick Farm	Employment	Site area extended to allow for further flood attenuation works. Overall net area is now 30 hectares	0
E023 (E006 and E011)	Oxney North (Amended site boundary of E006 and E011)	Employment	Combines and amends sites E006 and E011, as part of these sites have been built	0
E025 (formerly part of H150)	Eye	Employment	Site H150 previously proposed 1 hectare of employment land as part of a mixed	0



Site Number	Site Address	Proposed Use	Amendment Justification	Total Housing
			use development. This new site is allocated as an employment site in its own right	
H027a	Land South of Oundle Road, Alwalton.	Housing	Site has been extended	210
H104a	St Martins Road, Newborough	Housing	Site extended to include vacant land adjoining site	60
H137b	Land West of Peterborough Road, Stanground	Housing	Site reduced to retain part of Green wedge between Peterborough and Farcet. Gypsy and Travellers requirements removed	110
H150c	Land North of Thorney Road, Eye	Housing	East of Eye development area reduced to now only include land north of Thorney Road. Gypsy and Travellers requirements removed	60
H151 (formerly E007a)	Perkins North, Newark Road	Housing	This site was originally proposed for employment/mixed use development. The site is now allocated for housing development only.	190

Previously Rejected Sites Now to be Included

The following site was rejected at the Preferred Options stage. However, during the consultation period, comments were received and additional information provided to help in the reassessment of the site. The table below summarises the site that was reassessed and is now included in this Proposed Submission document.

Table 4

Site Number	Site Address	Proposed Use	Justification	Total Housing
H078	Land off Sandpit Road, Thorney	Housing	Transport and access issues have been resolved. Allocation of the site ensures there will be sufficient land to deliver the quantity of residential development identified for Key Service Centres.	60

New Sites

A number of new sites were suggested for inclusion in the Proposed Submission document. We have accepted two of them as being suitable development opportunities, as follows:

Table 5

Site Number	Site Address	Proposed Use	Justification	Total Housing
H152	Former Freemans' Site, Ivatt Way	Housing	Brownfield re-development site, with good access	460
H154	Hempstead, London Road	Housing	Part of this site was originally identified for employment as part of a mixed use development. This site is now allocated for housing development only.	160

Note: Please note that this "Preface" is intended to be helpful to the reader as part of the consultation period. When the document is submitted to the Secretary of State (due April/May 2011), this preface will be removed and will not form part of the Submission document.

Main Report

1 Introduction	1
2 Approach to Site Selection	5
3 Residential Sites	9
4 Employment Sites	29
5 Other Site Allocation Policies	39
6 Implementation and Monitoring	45

Appendices

1 Deleted Policies	57
2 Glossary	59

Schedule of Policies

Policy SA 1 Urban Extensions	13
Policy SA 2 District Centres	14
Policy SA 3 Urban Area	17
Policy SA 4 Village Envelopes	20
Policy SA 5 Key Service Centres	22
Policy SA 6 Limited Growth Villages	24
Policy SA 7 Gypsy and Traveller Transit Pitches	26
Policy SA 8 Prestige Homes	27
Policy SA 9 Urban Extensions - Employment Land	31
Policy SA 10 Regional Freight Interchange	32
Policy SA 11 General Employment Areas and Business Parks	33
Policy SA 12 Red Brick Farm	35
Policy SA 13 Employment Sites Within and Adjoining the Urban Area	36
Policy SA 14 Rural Employment Sites	37
Policy SA 15 Safeguarded Land for Future Key Infrastructure	39
Policy SA 16 Hampton Country Park	40
Policy SA 17 Green Wedges	40
Policy SA 18 East of England Showground	41
Policy SA 19 Special Character Areas	43
Policy SA 20 Cemetery Provision	44

1 Introduction

- 1.1** The Peterborough Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) forms part of the Statutory Development Plan for Peterborough, known as the Local Development Framework (LDF). It identifies land required over the period to 2026 to deliver the scale of growth and development set out in the Peterborough Core Strategy.
- 1.2** The role of this document is to establish the principle that a suitable form of development can be located on a particular site. However, it does not to give permission to any particular proposal – this will still need to be secured through the planning application process. The intention is to provide developers, service providers, the local authority and residents with some certainty about what sites will be developed in the future and for what purpose. The allocation of a site does not necessarily mean that it will be developed straight away, although one of the intentions is to allocate sites which have the potential to enable development to take place without undue delay.
- 1.3** For more detailed information on the Peterborough LDF, and how documents in the LDF relate to one another, please see the Peterborough Local Development Scheme (LDS) and the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD, both of which are available on our website: http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/planning_and_building/planning_policy.aspx

Production Stages

- 1.4** There are a number of different stages involved in the production of this Site Allocations DPD, as summarised below:

MAIN STAGES		DATE
Evidence gathering	Identification of main issues	July 2007 - Oct 2008
	Submission of approximately 200 potential development sites	
Issues and Options	Public consultation on all potential sites	Oct 2008 - Jan 2009
Preferred Options	Public consultation on the Council's preferred sites	March 2010 - April 2010
Cemetery Provision	Public Consultation relating specifically to options for the allocation of a site for a cemetery	August - September 2010
Proposed Submission	Final opportunity for public consultation on the proposed sites	January/February 2011
Submission and examination	Site Allocations Document submitted to government along with all public comments received during the proposed submission consultation.	April 2011
	Independent Examination by a Planning Inspector.	Summer 2011
Adoption	Council adopts Final Plan	Winter 2011/12
Monitoring and Review	Each year, identified targets are monitored	

- 1.5** In 2007, as part of the evidence gathering stages, we asked developers, agents, landowners, parish councils and local residents to put forward sites that they wanted to be considered as potential allocations. From this, we received approximately 200

sites proposing a wide variety of development types. In October 2008, an Issues and Options consultation document was published which contained all sites submitted to the Council as potential housing and/or employment sites. In January 2009, an Additional Sites document was also consulted on. This contained all sites submitted during the earlier consultation period.

- 1.6** The two Issues and Options documents included a summary and map of each site. At the time of consultation no assessments had been carried out and no decision had been made as to the suitability of any site.
- 1.7** All sites submitted to the Council were then assessed against a detailed set of criteria as set out in Chapter 2 - Approach to Site Selection (full details of the site assessment process are contained in the supporting Evidence Report). From this, we identified our "Preferred Sites" and these sites were consulted on in March - April 2010 as part of the Preferred Options consultation.
- 1.8** The Preferred Options consultation document did not include any sites or policies relating to cemetery provision. Therefore a separate options consultation was carried out in September 2010 to help identify the most suitable site for a new cemetery.
- 1.9** We are now at the Proposed Submission stage; this version contains what the Council considers to be the final sites that it proposes to allocate. However, this is not the 'final' plan.
- 1.10** Before the Site Allocations DPD is adopted by the Council, and any site has the status of being formally allocated, the document has to go through a public examination conducted by an independent planning Inspector. The comments you make will be considered by that Inspector before the final plan is adopted.

Relationship with other Documents

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD

- 1.11** The Peterborough Core Strategy DPD is the overarching document for the Peterborough LDF. It is a strategic document which sets out the "core" principles for the future of Peterborough, establishing a strategic vision, objectives and policies that guides development and gives broad indications of where new development can go. However, it does not identify individual parcels of land for future development. This level of detail is provided through this Site Allocations DPD and a separate City Centre Area Action Plan DPD (see below).
- 1.12** The Core Strategy was adopted [TBC -due December 2010 or February 2011]. The Site Allocations Document is consistent with, and helps to deliver, the policies of the Core Strategy.
- 1.13** The most relevant sections of the Core Strategy for the Site Allocations Document are set out below.

Core Strategy Policy	Key policy contents to which this Site Allocations DPD conforms
CS1 (TBC)	Provision of a minimum of approximately 25,500 additional dwellings over the period from April 2009 to March 2026, excluding approximately 4,300 dwellings that will be identified through the City Centre Area Action Plan

Core Strategy Policy	Key policy contents to which this Site Allocations DPD conforms
CS2 (TBC)	Provision of approximately 213 to 243 hectares of employment land over the period from April 2009 to March 2026, excluding approximately 3.5 hectares that will be identified through the City Centre Area Action Plan
CS3 (TBC)	The identification of a location for a Regional Freight Interchange north-east of Stanground
CS4 (TBC)	The identification of locations for new Urban Extensions to the City of Peterborough
CS5 (TBC)	Focuses growth in and around the City of Peterborough, at Key Service Centres and, to a lesser extent, at Limited Growth Villages

1.14 The Core Strategy sets out the distribution of new dwellings (as at April 2009) and employment land (as at April 2007). This Site Allocations document updates these figures (where possible) in Chapters 3 and 4.

Peterborough City Centre Area Action Plan DPD

1.15 Recognising the important role of the City Centre, the City Council is to prepare a separate document which focuses directly on that area - the City Centre Area Action Plan DPD. In many ways that Area Action Plan will serve a similar function to the Site Allocations DPD, but it will focus its attention on the identification of development sites and the establishment of policies that will regenerate and enhance the centre of the city.

1.16 Accordingly, this Site Allocations DPD does not allocate any sites in the City Centre.

Peterborough Planning Policies DPD

1.17 The Planning Policies DPD will set out the detailed and technical policies against which planning applications are assessed. Until it is adopted, planning applications will be assessed against the policies of any adopted LDF documents, the remaining saved policies in the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) and relevant national policies.

2 Approach to Site Selection

Introduction

2.1 This section explains the approach undertaken in selecting sites for inclusion in the DPD. The site selection process was carried out in an open and transparent way, including consultation and the production of a full evidence base to support and justify the conclusions reached. The Evidence Report sets out the detailed methodology and site selection criteria, and includes a two page summary of each site that was considered, its score, and full reasoning and justification for allocation or not. The Evidence Report can be viewed at <http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/sa/sapo/sapo?tab=files>.

Summary of Methodology

- 2.2 All potential development sites were assessed against a detailed and wide ranging list of criteria, which were based on the principles of sustainable development and mirror the Sustainability Appraisal Framework. The assessment included site visits and desk based research.
- 2.3 The assessment criteria were developed through consultation with relevant stakeholders and internal Council departments to ensure that all relevant issues were addressed and the most appropriate and sustainable sites were selected. The criteria were made available for comments in October 2008 as part of the Issues and Options public consultation, and were amended and refined to take account of comments received. Full details were also published in the Preferred Options Evidence Report.
- 2.4 The assessment criteria were each scored using a 5 point colour matrix. This provided a clear, easy to understand system.

Considered outcome if development takes place on the site	
	<i>High risk of environmental or social harm</i>
	<i>Potential to deliver beneficial environmental or social effects</i>

- 2.5 There was a deliberate decision to use colour rather than numbers, as the use of numbers often implies a relative measure, which does not exist; for example, that a value of 4 is exactly twice the value of 2.
- 2.6 The use of colours provides a fair and consistent comparison for a single topic across all sites and also gives the reader an initial visual understanding of the way in which a site scores.

Major Criteria

- 2.7 To help eliminate clearly unsuitable sites, we identified 'major criteria or constraints' as being:
- **Compliance with the Core Strategy** – Sites had to conform to the Core Strategy; for residential sites, this meant the overall spatial distribution of growth set out in policy CS1. As a result, suggested sites located in Small Villages and in the countryside were rejected.
 - **Flood risk** – An approach based on the flood risk sequential test was carried out for all suggested sites. Housing sites located within flood zones 3a and 3b (based on Environment Agency maps at December 2009) were rejected. Details of the way in which this impacted on the selection of employment sites appears in the section below.
 - **Proximity to Hazardous Pipelines and Gas Compressor Stations** – Suggested sites located within the Inner Zones (450 metres) or Middle Zones (600 metres) were rejected, based on information from HSE and the PADHI process (last updated March 2008).
 - **Proximity to and impact on International and National Wildlife Sites** - Suggested sites located within areas protected for their international or national wildlife significance were rejected. In addition, any sites where it was likely that development would have a significant negative effect on protected wildlife sites were also rejected.
 - **Deliverability** – Sites were only included if they were likely to be available and deliverable within the plan period (15 years).

Other Criteria

- 2.8 Other issues which were taken into consideration in assessing sites, by way of examples only, include:
- **Contaminated land**
 - **Transport and highways access**
 - **Proximity to shops, schools, employment and public transport**
 - **Impact on landscape and the wider environment**
- 2.9 The full list of assessment criteria and scores can be viewed in the Evidence Report.

Employment Sites and Flood Risk Issues

- 2.10 A key part of the process of allocating development sites is the need to undertake a sequential approach to help steer development to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding, in accordance with PPS25 'Development and Flood Risk' (2010).
- 2.11 Through undertaking the sequential approach for housing allocations, we were able to allocate enough suitable sites on land with the lowest probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1). For employment sites, however, we were not able to identify enough suitable and available sites in this lowest risk category and it was necessary to consider the suitability of sites within Flood Zone 2 (medium probability) and Flood Zone 3 (high probability). To assist in this consideration, we used the information contained in the Peterborough Stage 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2009) (SFRA2). National policy in PPS25 does not preclude employment development occurring in Zone 2 and 3 areas, as employment uses are categorised as 'less vulnerable'. However, it will be

necessary for the developer of any employment site allocated in this DPD, and falling within Zone 2 or 3, to submit a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment at the application stage.

Cemetery

2.12 A basic assessment of land throughout Peterborough was carried out to identify suitable options for the provision of a new cemetery. This was based on the following criteria:

- Level ground
- Flood risk
- Natural features for landscaping
- Soil quality
- Proximity to aquifers
- Environment Agency guidance and Ground Water Regulations
- Access
- Availability and deliverability of the site

2.13 Once options had been identified and subject to consultation, they were further assessed against a detailed and wide ranging list of criteria which included:

- Archaeology
- Transport and access
- Public transport
- Agricultural land classification
- Public rights of way
- Landscape Charter Area

2.14 The results from this detailed assessment, including all criteria used and the scoring system, are presented in the Evidence Report.

Sustainability Appraisal

2.15 The Site Allocations DPD was subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA) under the requirements of section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The SA process also incorporates the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with European Union Directive 2001/42/EC.

2.16 SA is a systematic process undertaken throughout the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. Its aim is to assess the extent to which the allocations and policies help to achieve sustainable development and how relevant social, economic and environmental objectives are achieved.

2.17 A scoping report was produced by consultants for the Core Strategy in June 2006. This was the first stage of the SA process and highlighted the key issues in Peterborough, collecting and presenting relevant baseline data. The report also identified appropriate criteria for appraising the policies in the Core Strategy and all other documents within the Peterborough LDF, including this Site Allocations DPD.

2.18 Emerging options were appraised using these criteria, so that the process has informed the selection of sites.

- 2.19** The conclusions of the sustainability appraisal appear in a separate Site Allocations DPD Sustainability Appraisal Report, which is available at <http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/sa/sapo/sapo?tab=files>

Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 2.20** A 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' (HRA) is required for any land-use plan which is considered likely to have a significant effect on a European (Natura 2000) site of nature conservation importance. The purpose is to assess the impact of the plan against the conservation objectives of the protected site.
- 2.21** There are three designated sites of European importance in Peterborough and others nearby. The process of assessment of the Site Allocations DPD in relation to those sites has been carried out in parallel with the Sustainability Appraisal.
- 2.22** A separate HRA Screening Report has been produced and can be viewed at: <http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/sa/sapo/sapo?tab=files>

3 Residential Sites

Introduction

- 3.1** The Peterborough Core Strategy makes provision for new housing development at a wide variety of places across the local authority area, but with a distinct emphasis on locations within and adjoining the urban area of the city. These are generally the most sustainable locations and help to maximise the use of previously developed land. The table on the following page guides the selection of the site allocations, and demonstrates the relationship with the Core Strategy.
- 3.2** The second column of the table presents the approximate dwelling requirement figures from the Core Strategy, for which provision must be made over the period 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2026, broken down according to the locations in the first column. Since this DPD does not deal with the City Centre, there are no further details for the City Centre, and it is excluded from the total figures across the bottom row.
- 3.3** The third column provides details of the net dwellings actually gained during the year 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2010. Once these have been deducted from the original Core Strategy requirements from 1st April 2009, a revised Core Strategy approximate requirement for 1st April 2010 to 31st March 2026 appears in the fourth column.
- 3.4** The columns headed "Committed Sites at 1st April 2010" provide details of the number of dwellings committed on sites of 0.3 hectares and over; and on sites under 0.3 hectares; together with the totals. Commitments are defined as dwellings which remain to be completed on sites under construction, dwellings which have full planning permission and dwellings which have outline planning permission as at 31st March 2010. The 2010 Housing Monitoring Report provides information on all committed sites and can be viewed at : <http://consult.peterborough.gov.uk/portal/planning/peterborough/sa/sapo/sapo?tab=files>. This DPD does not allocate any sites that are under 0.3 hectares. All of the committed dwellings on sites of 0.3 hectares and over are included in policies SA1 to SA6 below.
- 3.5** The column headed "New Allocations" shows the number of dwellings that are assumed to be deliverable from new sites that are allocated in policies SA1 to SA6 below. These are sites without any planning permission at 1st April 2010.
- 3.6** The column headed "Total Dwellings 2010 to 2026" shows the sum of "Total Commitments" and "New Allocations". The difference between the figures in this column and those in the "Core Strategy, as adjusted 2010 to 2026" column are presented in the final column. This reveals the extent to which the allocations in this DPD deliver the approximate requirements from the Core Strategy. In overall terms, the allocations, along with existing commitments on sites under 0.3 hectares, are capable of delivering the dwelling requirement of the Core Strategy, with a modest surplus of almost 300 dwellings.
- 3.7** In the policies that follow, each site allocated for residential development has a figure in the column headed "Indicative Number of Dwellings". Where a site already has planning permission (at 1st April 2010), but no development has started, the figure is the number of dwellings for which permission was granted. Where development had already started (at 1st April 2010), the figure is the remaining number of dwellings still to be completed in accordance with the permission. Where the site is 'new' (i.e. without any existing permission), the figure is an estimate based on the size of the site, an assumption about the net developable area, and an assumption about the net residential

density which would be appropriate for the area in which the site is located. The densities used are based on the average densities referred to in the Core Strategy. There is a full explanation of the assumptions made in the Evidence Report. The indicative numbers of dwellings are used to demonstrate how the approximate Core Strategy dwelling requirements can be met. It is emphasised that they are only "indicative", and do not represent a fixed policy target for each individual site.

	Core Strategy 2009 to 2026	Completed 1st April 2009 to 31st March 2010 (Net)	Core Strategy, as adjusted 2010 to 2026	Committed Sites at 1st April 2010		New Allocations	Total Dwellings 2010 to 2026	Difference from Core Strategy, as adjusted 2010 to 2026
				Sites of 0.3ha and over	Sites Under 0.3ha			
City Centre	4,300							
Urban Extensions	14,400	505	13,895	6,391	0	7,650	14,041	+146
District Centres	1,300	122	1,178	116	108	931	1,155	-23
Urban Area	4,400	335	4,065	1,296	162	2,756	4,214	+149
Key Service Centres	600	47	553	229	27	275	531	-22
Limited Growth Villages	450	2	448	118	27	323	468	+ 20
Small Villages	50	13	37	0	45	0	45	+ 8
Countryside	0	1	0	0	19	0	19	+19
Total Excluding City Centre	21,200	1,025	20,176	8,150	388	11,935	20,473	+297
Completions since 2009, committed and new sites will be set out in the City Centre Area Action Plan								

- 3.8** The following section breaks down the approach to site selection for the different spatial areas: the City Centre, Urban Extensions, District Centres, the Urban Area of the City of Peterborough, Key Service Centres, Limited Growth Villages, and Small Villages and the Countryside; and also deals with the issues of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation and Prestige Homes.

City Centre

- 3.9** Approximately 4,300 dwellings are proposed in the Core Strategy for the city centre. The need to increase provision of housing in the city centre was a common theme emerging from all of the consultations on issues and options for the Core Strategy. As referred to in paragraphs 1.15 and 1.16, sites within the city centre will be allocated through a separate DPD, the City Centre Area Action Plan (CCAAP). The Proposal Map defines the geographical extent of the CCAAP, and there are no allocations or policies for that area within this Site Allocations DPD.

Urban Extensions

- 3.10** Three urban extensions allocated in the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005, at Hampton (SA1.1), Paston Reserve (SA1.2) and Stanground South (SA1.3), have planning permission and are partially developed, but remain to be completed. Their continued allocation is reconfirmed in the Core Strategy and in this document.
- 3.11** The Core Strategy proposes two further urban extensions at Great Haddon (SA1.4) and Norwood (SA1.5). Given the importance and strategic nature of these two extensions, they were consulted on as part of the preparation of the Core Strategy. This document does not therefore seek to revisit these sites as a matter of principle, other than to define their precise boundary on the Proposals Map. Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy, sets out the key policy criteria relating to these two urban extensions.

Policy SA 1

Urban Extensions

The following sites, as identified on the Proposals Map, are allocated for development in accordance with Core Strategy policy CS4 and, where applicable, in accordance with the principles of any planning permissions for each respective site which were in place at 31st March 2010.

Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Location	Status*	Site Area (ha)	Indicative number of dwellings
SA1.1		Hampton	UC	752.00	3,709
SA1.2		Paston Reserve	UC	45.45	1,154
SA1.3		Stanground South	UC	70.30	1,528
SA1.4	UE01	Great Haddon		345.38	5,350
SA1.5	UE02	Norwood		76.12	2,300
Total: Urban Extensions				1,289.25	14,041

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ PO Ref is the reference number of the site at the Preferred Options consultation stage. This is provided for information only, and will be removed when this DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State.

*O = Outline Permission. NS = Not Started, with full planning permission. UC = Under Construction

District Centres

- 3.12** The Core Strategy proposes intensification (such as retail, housing and leisure) in and adjoining the five existing district centres of Bretton, Hampton, Millfield, Orton and Werrington, the extent of such centres being defined on the Proposals Map via this Site Allocations Document. Provision of new housing at these centres would help to maintain the vitality of local communities, whilst supporting the improvement of local services and amenities.
- 3.13** The Site Allocations document confirms the boundaries of the District Centres, but mostly does not allocate specific development sites within each. This will be the task of individual regeneration master plans, which the Council will support coming forward.
- 3.14** The District Centre likely to be provided at Great Haddon (see Core Strategy) is not defined on the Proposals Map as its extent is not yet known. A future review of the Site Allocations Document will confirm its boundary on the Proposals Map.

Policy SA 2

District Centres

Through the allocation of sites and the preparation of masterplans or other studies, sites will be identified in and around those District Centres identified in Core Strategy policy CS14, and as shown on the Proposals Map, in order to deliver the following levels of new housing for each centre:

Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Status*	Site Area (ha)	Indicative number of dwellings
DC01 - Bretton					
SA2.1	H010	Site of Bretton Woods Community School		1.93	143
		Other sites through masterplanning			88
Total Bretton District Centre					231
DC02 - Hampton					
		Sites to come forward through masterplanning			250
Total Hampton District Centre					250
DC03 - Millfield					
SA2.2		163 Lincoln Road	NS	0.10	14
SA2.3		Rear of 42-48 St Pauls Road	NS	0.15	12
SA2.4		150-150A Cobden Avenue	NS	0.26	23
SA2.5		Welland Gospel Hall, 177 St Pauls Road	O	0.56	18
SA2.6		583 Lincoln Road	UC	0.06	12

Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Status*	Site Area (ha)	Indicative number of dwellings
SA2.7		Springfield House, 170A Lincoln Road, Peterborough	UC	0.25	23
SA2.8		Land rear of 108-110 Burghley Road	UC	0.12	14
SA2.9	H032	Bus Depot, Lincoln Road		0.5	50
		Other sites through masterplanning			0
Total Millfield District Centre					166
DC04 - Orton					
		Sites to come forward through masterplanning			300
Total Orton District Centre					300
DC05 - Werrington					
		Sites to come forward through masterplanning			100
Total Werrington District Centre					100
Total: All District Centres					1047

*O = Outline Permission. NS = Not Started, with full planning permission. UC = Under Construction.

3.15 The boundaries of Local Centres are also identified on the Proposals Map, in line with Core Strategy policy CS14.

The City of Peterborough

- 3.16** The Core Strategy proposes approximately 4,400 additional dwellings in the urban area of Peterborough. This figure has been amended to 4,065 to take account of the 335 net completions between 1st April 2009 and 31st March 2010. 162 dwellings are committed (with planning permission) on sites under 0.3 hectares, leaving a requirement to allocate sites for approximately 3,903 dwellings.
- 3.17** These dwellings will be provided from within the existing built-up area of Peterborough, excluding the city and district centres. The figure is based on evidence from capacity work, in particular the Peterborough Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2008). In order to make the most efficient use of land, net residential densities will be expected to average approximately 50 dwellings per hectare, but the Council will seek a range of densities and dwelling types and sizes, in accordance with policy CS6 of the Core Strategy.

Policy SA 3

Urban Area

The following sites, as identified on the Proposals Map, are allocated primarily for residential use:

Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Status*	Site Area (ha)	Indicative number of dwellings
SA3.1		106 Star Road	NS	0.18	16
SA3.2		Land formerly part of East of England Showground	UC	17.11	270
SA3.3		Rear of 219-237 Peterborough Road, Stanground	NS	0.54	14
SA3.4		St Nicholas Reception Home, South Parade	UC	0.26	24
SA3.5		48 Scotney Street and 61 Crown Street, New England	NS	0.20	14
SA3.6		Land rear of 1-43 South View Road	NS	0.62	40
SA3.7		Site of Towermead Business Centre, High Street, Fletton	NS	3.30	102
SA3.8		57-161 Fletton Avenue	UC	0.11	14
SA3.9		19 Shakespeare Avenue	UC	0.18	10
SA3.10		Land west of 15 Warwick Road	O	0.44	13
SA3.11		659 Lincoln Road	NS	0.19	24
SA3.12		12 North Street	UC	0.13	16
SA3.13		The Royal Oak, 1099 Lincoln Road	NS	0.31	14
SA3.14		Land to the north of 88 South Street, Stanground	NS	0.34	22
SA3.15		80 London Road	NS	0.20	22
SA3.16		Land off Willow Avenue	UC	0.31	9
SA3.17		Land formerly part of Peterborough Regional College	O	3.02	70
SA3.18		Land to rear of The Cherry Tree, Oundle Road	O	0.37	30
SA3.19		17 Oundle Road	NS	0.31	13

Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Status*	Site Area (ha)	Indicative number of dwellings
SA3.20		Breaks Snooker Club, adj 261 Eastfield Road	NS	0.35	33
SA3.21		Heltwate Court, Heltwate	NS	0.41	26
SA3.22		Rear of 12-16 Broadway Yaxley	O	0.96	27
SA3.23		Hempstead, east and west of London Road	UC	38.45	473
SA3.24	H016b	Former John Mansfield School Site, Western Avenue		4.06	140
SA3.25	H017b	Former Hereward Community College Site, Norman Road		1.15	40
SA3.26	H019	Site off New Road, Woodston (EH Lee Ltd)		0.98	40
SA3.27	H021	North of Fletton Avenue		0.69	30
SA3.28	H022	Galvanising Works, Oundle Road This site must be subject to a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment due to a small percentage of the site falling within Flood Zone 2		1.44	40
SA3.29	H025	Site of Former Lady Lodge Arts Centre, Goldhay Way		0.71	30
SA3.30	H027a	Land South of Oundle Road, Alwalton		5.66	210
SA3.31	H030	Woodston Point, Shrewsbury Avenue		1.40	60
SA3.32	H036b	Former Honey Hill Primary School Site, Paston Ridings		1.6	50
SA3.33	H040	PPDC, Cottesmore Close		0.85	35
SA3.34	H041a	Land South of Fletton High Street This site forms part of wider regeneration plans for the area. Any application must enable access to the whole site and make provision for allotment land.		4.12	155

Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Status*	Site Area (ha)	Indicative number of dwellings
SA3.35	H045	Land off Wessex Close, Tenter Hill, Stanground		0.75	30
SA3.36	H049	Stanground Stables, Whittlesey Road		0.82	35
SA3.37	H053	Windsor Avenue, Walton		1.97	85
SA3.38	H054a	Land off Itter Crescent, Walton		1.38	25
SA3.39	H058c	Land south of Westfield Road, The Grange		4.28	156
SA3.40	H137b	Land West of Peterborough Road, Stanground		4.85	110
		This site must come forward with the benefit of an agreed masterplan for the whole site			
SA3.41	H148	Former John Mansfield School playing field, Poplar Avenue		3.20	150
SA3.42	H151	Perkins North, Newark Road		5.08	190
SA3.43	H152	Former Freemans Site, Ivatt Way		15.42	460
		This site must come forward with the benefit of an agreed masterplan for the whole site			
SA3.44	H154	North Hempstead, London Road		4.25	160
SA3.45	M020	Hampton Court and Shops, Ravensthorpe		1.40	25
		This site forms part of a wider regeneration project for the Local Centre, and any development proposal or masterplan is expected to provide housing, retail and community facilities.			
SA3.46	H029	Site of Orton Brick Works, south of Hampton Vale		15.10	350
SA3.47	H031	Triangle Land West of Hampton Vale		6.47	150

Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Status*	Site Area (ha)	Indicative number of dwellings
Total: Urban Area					4,052

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ **PO Ref is the reference number of the site at the Preferred Options consultation stage. This is provided for information only, and will be removed when this DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State.**

*O = Outline Permission. NS = Not Started, with full planning permission. UC = Under Construction.

Rural Area

3.18 In the rural area of Peterborough, residential development is planned to be on a comparatively modest scale, whilst offering scope to maintain the sustainability and vibrancy of villages and a degree of choice in the location of new dwellings, including affordable rural housing. The Core Strategy indicates a total of approximately 1,100 dwellings in the wider rural area between 2009 - 2026.

Village Envelopes

3.19 For many years the City Council has defined, for each village within the District, a village envelope which sets the limit of the physical framework of the built-up area. The primary purposes of the envelopes, and the policies which apply within and outside them, are to prevent the spread of development into the countryside, to maintain the essential character of each settlement and control the growth within and outside each settlement in accordance with the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy (policy CS5).

3.20 Changes to some of the village envelopes have been made in conjunction with this Site Allocations Document, to incorporate sites which are allocated for development. Any further minor changes to village envelopes which are necessary for other reasons will be progressed through the forthcoming Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Policy SA 4**Village Envelopes**

The Village Envelope for each village is identified on the Proposal Map. Land outside the village envelopes and outside the Peterborough Urban Area boundary is defined as countryside.

Decisions on the type and scale of development within and outside Village Envelopes will be based on policy CS5 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and any relevant policies in the forthcoming Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Key Service Centres

3.21 The two Key Service Centres of Eye and Thorney are the highest placed villages within the settlement hierarchy, and they will see the majority of the growth in the rural area. It is important that development on allocated sites contributes towards the continued vitality of these villages. The Core Strategy requires the development of approximately 600 dwellings in the villages of Eye and Thorney over the period 2009 to 2026. Between 1st April 2009 and 31st March 2010, a total of 47 dwellings were completed. 27 dwellings are committed (with planning permission) on sites under 0.3 hectares, leaving a requirement to allocate sites for approximately 526 dwellings.

Policy SA 5

Key Service Centres

The following sites, as identified on the Proposals Map, are allocated primarily for residential use:

Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Status*	Area (ha)	Indicative number of dwellings
Eye					
SA5.1		Land off Thorney Road	NS	2.94	158
SA5.2		Land off High Street	UC	2.57	25
SA5.3		Warehouse Rear of 66 Crowland Road	UC	1.28	46
SA5.4	H075a	Land South of Nature Reserve		2.44	35
SA5.5	H150c	Land North of Thorney Road, adjacent to Dalmark Group		2.49	50
Total Eye					314
Thorney					
SA5.6	H131	Land off Whittlesey Road		6.25	130
SA5.7	H078	Land off Sandpit Road		2.79	60
Total Thorney					190
Total: Key Service Centres					504

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ PO Ref is the reference number of the site at the Preferred Options consultation stage. This is provided for information only, and will be removed when this DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State.

*O = Outline Permission. NS = Not Started, with full planning permission. UC = Under Construction

Limited Growth Villages

3.22 Limited Growth Villages have a number of facilities and services, but not to the extent of the Key Service Centres. In accordance with the Core Strategy, approximately 450 dwellings (over the period 2009 to 2026) should be divided between the villages of Ailsworth, Barnack, Castor, Glinton, Helpston, Newborough, Northborough and Wittering. Taking into account completions to 31st March 2010 (2 dwellings) and commitments (with planning permission) on sites under 0.3 hectares (27 dwellings), the remaining requirement is to allocate sites for approximately 421 dwellings.

Policy SA 6

Limited Growth Villages

The following sites, as identified on the Proposals Map, are allocated primarily for residential use:

Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Status*	Area (ha)	Indicative number of dwellings
SA6.1		Aborfield Mill, Glington Road, Helpston	NS	1.43	42
SA6.2		The Crown Inn, Lincoln Road, Glington	NS	0.32	12
SA6.3		54 Guntons Road, Newborough	O	0.32	10
SA6.4		Adj Village Hall, Newborough	UC	0.55	13
SA6.5		Land west of Uffington Road, Barnack	NS	1.76	41
SA6.6	H084	Land adjacent to 29 Maxey Road, Helpston		0.32	6
SA6.7	H086	Land between Helpston Road and Main Street, Ailsworth		0.42	8
SA6.8	H087	Clay Lane, Castor		1.67	25
SA6.9	H091	Land adjoining the Surgery, Glington		1.09	28
SA6.10	H098f	Land off Lawrence Road, Wittering (see also site SA14.1)		6.73	160
SA6.11	H104a	St Martins Road, Newborough		2.81	62
SA6.12	H141	Broadwheel Road, Helpston		1.98	34
Total: Limited Growth Villages					441

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ PO Ref is the reference number of the site at the Preferred Options consultation stage. This is provided for information only, and will be removed when this DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State.

*O = Outline Permission. NS = Not Started, with full planning permission. UC = Under Construction.

Small Villages

3.23 Within the villages identified in the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy as Small Villages, the scale of residential development will be very modest. At 31st March 2010 there were 45 dwellings already committed on sites under 0.3 hectares, and evidence shows that there is a long history of development of single dwellings or small groups of housing on infill land, which is likely to continue. These will be brought forward by the development industry in response to individual site availability over the course of future years. New sites within small villages are not allocated in this Site Allocations DPD.

The Countryside

3.24 At 31st March 2010, there were 19 dwellings committed in the countryside - i.e outside the urban area of Peterborough and the village envelopes. 8 had not yet started construction and 11 were under construction. Development in the open countryside contributes to the overall housing delivery and must be acknowledged in the spatial strategy, but the strategy does not make provision for any specific additional figure from this source. Any dwellings developed in the countryside are very much exceptional - for example, to meet a specific requirement related to local agriculture, or to enable the renovation and reuse of a listed building that has fallen into decay. If further dwellings arise from this source over the DPD period, these would be classed as "windfall", helping to deliver dwelling numbers in excess of the Core Strategy targets or to make up any shortfall from allocated sites not coming forward.

3.25 Core Strategy policy CS6 will allow, in exceptional circumstances, the release of land adjacent to a village envelope solely for the provision of affordable housing.

Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

3.26 Planning policy for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation is set out in the Core Strategy (policy CS7). No permanent Gypsy and Traveller sites are identified through this Site Allocations DPD. However, there is an identified need for a transit site and following an extensive search, the City Council will safeguard a parcel of land at Norwood Lane until provision is made there or elsewhere.

Policy SA 7

Gypsy and Traveller Transit Pitches

The following site is safeguarded on the Proposals Map as a potential Gypsy and Traveller transit site with the potential to make provision for approximately 10 pitches. If a transit site is provided elsewhere in Peterborough, and is of a sufficient size to negate the need for any further transit pitch provision (as evidenced by our up to date needs assessment), then the safeguarding applied to the following site is automatically revoked.

Site Reference	PO Site reference (1)	Site name	Area (ha)	Indicative number of pitches
SA7.1	H034a	Land adjacent to Norwood Lane	0.75	10

A transit site should consist of essential facilities, amenity blocks and a warden's office.

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ PO Ref is the reference number of the site at the Preferred Options consultation stage. This is provided for information only, and will be removed when this DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State.

Prestige Homes

- 3.27** The Core Strategy (policy CS6 Meeting Housing Needs) requires the provision of a wide choice of high quality new homes that meet the needs of all members of the community and provides housing that will help encourage employees to live locally rather than commute into Peterborough. The Council wants this provision to include "top of the market" or prestige homes.
- 3.28** A report assessing the need for prestige homes was produced in March 2009 (Need for 'top of the market' Prestige Homes in Peterborough) and concluded that a substantial proportion of higher paid people in managerial, professional and technical occupations are commuting into Peterborough for work, whilst living elsewhere in the housing market area (and possibly beyond). Nearly half of the managers and senior officials who work in Peterborough live outside the local authority area. Full details of this can be found in the supporting Evidence Report.
- 3.29** There is no specific definition of 'top of the market' prestige homes, but these can be generally regarded as being at the higher end of the market in terms of value (within the highest 10% price bracket of dwellings in the housing market area as a whole); large (perhaps with 5 bedrooms or more); and individually designed, with a high specification, detailing and facilities. Newly-built houses in this sector would be typically aimed at the senior professional and managerial market or would be of a bespoke design for an individual client.

3.30 The following policy identifies sites which the Council considers would be particularly suitable for prestige homes, although prestige homes on parts of other allocated sites may also be appropriate.

Policy SA 8

Prestige Homes

The following sites will be expected to include a reasonable proportion of prestige homes in line with the requirements of Core Strategy policy CS6:

- **SA1.4 - Great Haddon**
- **SA1.5 - Norwood**
- **SA3.38 - Land off Itter Crescent**
- **SA3.46 - Site of Orton Brick Works, south of Hampton Vale (Hampton)**
- **SA3.47 - Triangle Land West of Hampton Vale (Hampton)**
- **Allocated sites in the Rural Area**

4 Employment Sites

- 4.1** As part of creating a "bigger and better Peterborough" we need to ensure that the right amount of suitable land is available to attract businesses and enable existing businesses to grow. The purpose of this section is to allocate a range of different sized employment sites, in a number of locations that are suitable for businesses.
- 4.2** For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'employment land' means land for uses within Use Classes B1 (business), B2 (general industry) and B8 (storage and distribution). It does not include, for example, employment in shops, retail warehouses, school, hospitals or those offices found predominantly in shopping areas such as estate agents and solicitors.
- 4.3** The Core Strategy has established the strategic approach to employment land provision by identifying broad locations for employment land in the city centre, urban area, villages and urban extensions.
- 4.4** The following table sets out the relationship between the Core Strategy and this Site Allocations DPD. The second column of the table shows the employment land requirement figures from the Core Strategy, broken down according to the locations in the first column. Since this DPD does not deal with the City Centre, there are no further details for the City Centre, and it is excluded from the total figures across the bottom row.
- 4.5** The column headed "Existing Commitments (ha)" provides details of the amount of employment land with planning permission (including sites under construction) at 31st March 2007. This DPD does not allocate any sites that are under 0.3 hectares (and the commitment figure for the urban area includes a number of small sites which provide a total of 4.08 hectares of employment land). All of the committed sites of 0.3 hectares and over are included in policies SA9 and SA11 below.
- 4.6** The column headed "New Allocations (ha)" shows the amount of employment land from new sites that are allocated in policies SA9 to SA14 below. These are sites without any planning permission at 1st April 2007.
- 4.7** The final column reveals the extent to which the allocations in this DPD deliver the approximate requirements from the Core Strategy. In overall terms, the allocations, along with existing commitments on sites under 0.3 hectares, are capable of delivering the employment land requirement of the Core Strategy, providing a range of sites, in terms of size and location, for potential developers.

Table 6 Relationship with the Core Strategy Employment Land Requirement

Core Strategy Broad Locations	Core Strategy (to find) (ha)	Existing Commitments (ha)	New Allocations (ha)	Total (ha)
City Centre	3.5	(To be determined through the CCAAP)		
Urban Extensions	155.5	88.5	67.0	155.5
Within and adjoining the urban area	51 - 81	28.78 ⁽¹⁾	49.41	78.19

1 Includes 4.08 hectares on various small sites, which are not identified in this DPD

Core Strategy Broad Locations	Core Strategy (to find) (ha)	Existing Commitments (ha)	New Allocations (ha)	Total (ha)
Villages	3.0	0	3.0	3.0
Total (excluding the City Centre)	209.5 - 239.5	117.28	119.41	236.19

City Centre

- 4.8** The equivalent of approximately 3.5 hectares of employment space is proposed in the City Centre with an emphasis on B1 development (as referred to in Core Strategy policy CS15). The forthcoming City Centre Area Action Plan will detail the specific locations for employment development and the strategy to increase the attractiveness of the City Centre as a location for offices.

Urban Extensions

- 4.9** Approximately 65 hectares of employment land is proposed in the Core Strategy as part of the Great Haddon Urban Extension. This will ensure the principles of mixed-use development are adhered to and enable residents to have the opportunity to live and work in close proximity. It is envisaged that this employment area will contain a range of B1, B2 and B8 development, together with a waste management facility.
- 4.10** The Norwood Urban Extension has approximately 2 hectares of employment land proposed in the Core Strategy as part of the mixed-use development.
- 4.11** The Core Strategy re-affirms employment development on committed sites (i.e sites with planning permission) at Hampton Township (approximately 43 hectares), Alwalton Hill (approximately 40 hectares) and Stanground South (5.5 hectares).

Policy SA 9

Urban Extensions - Employment Land

The following sites, as identified on the Proposals Map, are allocated for development primarily for uses within Classes B1, B2 and B8, in accordance with Core Strategy policy CS2.

Site Reference	PO Reference (1)	Site Name	Area (ha)
SA9.1		Hampton	43.0
SA9.2		Stanground South	5.5
SA9.3	UE001	Great Haddon	65.0
SA9.4	UE002	Norwood	2.0
SA9.5		Alwalton Hill	40.0
		Total	155.5

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ *PO Reference is the reference number of the site at the Preferred Options consultation stage. This is provided for information only, and will be removed when this DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State.*

Regional Freight Interchange

- 4.12** Government policy is strongly in favour of increased use of rail for transporting freight within the UK, for reasons of minimising both road congestion and carbon emissions. An opportunity for such a strategic rail freight interchange has arisen in Peterborough on a site to the south-east of the city, immediately north-east of Stanground.
- 4.13** The principle and broad location for the Interchange have been set by the Core Strategy, together with policy requirements and arrangements for joint authority working to consider detailed proposals for the site (see Core Strategy policy CS3). The purpose of the Site Allocations Document is to define the precise boundaries of the site.

Policy SA 10

Regional Freight Interchange

The following site, as identified on the Proposals Map, is allocated for the provision of a Regional Freight Interchange. Detailed policy requirements for the site are set out in policy CS3 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Site Reference	PO Reference (1)	Site name	Site Area (ha)
SA10.1	E018	Regional Freight Interchange	102 ⁽²⁾ (approx)

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ PO Reference is the reference number of the site at the Preferred Options consultation stage. This is provided for information only, and will be removed when this DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State.

General Employment Areas and Business Parks

- 4.14** To reflect the differing locational and amenity requirements of various employment uses, two categories of employment areas are established, forming the basis for future land use decisions - General Employment Areas and Business Parks.
- 4.15** General Employment Areas (GEAs) are considered suitable for a full range of employment uses: offices, research and development facilities, light and general industrial, and storage and distribution (i.e Use Classes B1, B2 and B8).
- 4.16** Business Parks (BP) are expected to accommodate development within the B1 use class only. Generally these areas are developed at a lower density than other employment areas and provide a higher quality environment. General industrial and warehousing uses are not permitted within Business Parks in order to protect levels of amenity and maintain the attractiveness of these locations for inward investment. The design of all buildings within Business Parks should be of a high quality and respect the character of the area.

2 The total site area is approximately 135 hectares. The majority (102 hectares) lies within Peterborough administrative area, with about 33 hectares likely to be required in the Fenland administrative area

Policy SA 11

General Employment Areas and Business Parks

Within the General Employment Areas (GEA) listed below and identified on the Proposals Map, planning permission will be granted for development within Use Classes B1, B2 and B8.

Within Business Parks (BP) listed below and identified on the Proposals Map, planning permission will be granted for development within use Classes B1(a) and B1(b). Other development will not be permitted unless ancillary to a B1 use.

The individual sites listed below, as identified on the Proposals Map, are allocated for development for uses consistent with the Employment Area within which they are located.

Employment Area Name and Reference	Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Area (ha)	Status*
General Employment Areas (GEA)					
Bourges (GEA1)			None	0	
Bretton (GEA2)			None	0	
Eastern (GEA3)	SA11.1		Land off Third Drove and fronting Fengate	7.9	UC
	SA11.2		Land between Second & Third Drove	6.43	UC
	SA11.3	E008a	Perkins South	4.16	
	SA11.4	E021a	Red Brick Farm (see also policy SA12)	30.00 (approx)	
Hampton (GEA4)			(See policy SA9)		
Lakefield (GEA5)			None		

Employment Area Name and Reference	Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Area (ha)	Status*
Orton Southgate (GEA6)	SA11.5		Land Adjacent Pegasus, Bakewell Road, Orton Southgate	1.88	NS
	SA11.6		4B Culley Court	1.24	UC
Oxney (GEA7)	SA11.7		Oxney Road Site A	2.01	O
	SA11.8		Oxney Road Site B	0.51	O
	SA11.9	E023	Oxney Road Site C	9.55	
Paston (GEA8)			None	0	
Werrington (GEA9)	SA11.10		Plot 2, Papyrus Road	0.84	UC
Westwood (GEA10)			None	0	
Woodston (GEA11)	SA11.11	E014	Shrewsbury Avenue	0.96	
Alwalton Hill/Great Haddon (GEA12)	See policy SA9		None	0	
Business Parks					
Bretton (BP1)			None		
Peterborough BP (Lynch Wood) (BP2)	SA11.12		Site F, Peterborough Business Park	1.14	NS
	SA11.13	E012	Lynchwood (South), Orton	0.97	
	SA11.14	E013	Lynchwood (North), Orton	1.29	

Employment Area Name and Reference	Site Reference	PO Ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Area (ha)	Status*
Thorpe Wood (BP3)	SA11.15	M001	Land adjacent to Thorpe Wood House	2.48	
			Total	71.36	

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ *PO Ref is the reference number of the site at the Preferred Options consultation stage. This is provided for information only, and will be removed when this DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State.*

* O - Outline permission. NS - Not Started, with full planning permission. UC - Under Construction

4.17 The Red Brick Farm site (SA11.4) is a large allocation which has a number of detailed issues that warrant an additional policy to ensure appropriate delivery of the site. The policy is set out as follows:

Policy SA 12**Red Brick Farm**

Planning permission for the Red Brick Farm site will only be granted once appropriate solutions to the following issues are demonstrated and proved to be deliverable:

1. Transport issues, including the impact of proposed development on the local and wider road network. A full Transport Assessment will be required in this regard.
2. Flood risk and flood safety issues, as demonstrated by a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment and associated evidence.
3. Historic environment issues, in terms of managing and minimising the impact of the development on the archaeology of the Flag Fen basin, and conserving and enhancing the area's heritage assets.
4. Minerals issues, in terms of addressing requirements as set out in the Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents and associated Government guidance.

The Council will require the submission of sufficient information from the applicant to enable it to complete a project level Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulation Assessment process. Such an assessment will need to demonstrate that the development will have no harm to protected species and habitats, in particular the Nene Washes, in accordance with the relevant regulations.

- 4.18** For point 3 of the policy, assessment of the impact on Flag Fen and the surrounding waterlogged deposits should include a full archaeological and palaeoenvironmental evaluation, incorporating hydrological and geo-archaeological assessments. An analysis of the impacts on setting is also required.

Employment Sites Within and Adjoining the Urban Area

- 4.19** One site is identified for employment development as part of a mixed-use scheme outside any defined Employment Area, but within the Urban Area.

Policy SA 13

Employment Sites Within and Adjoining the Urban Area

The following site, as identified on the Proposals Map, is allocated for development primarily for uses within Classes B1, B2 and B8.

Site Reference	Site Name	Area (ha)	Status*
SA13.1	Hempstead	2.75	O
	Total	2.75	

- 4.20** A total of 4.08 hectares of employment land is committed on various small sites within and adjoining the Urban Area which are not identified on the Proposals Map.

Rural Employment Sites

- 4.21** There is scope for employment development in the villages in order to assist in diversifying the rural economy and enabling the reuse of redundant agricultural buildings for small-scale commercial use, but this will need to be on a modest scale, appropriate to the scale and character of any village, and not have an adverse effect on the highway network which serves it. The Core Strategy therefore proposes that employment development in the villages will be on a fairly small scale of approximately 3 hectares in total, with a focus on the Key Service Centres and Limited Growth Villages.
- 4.22** Policy SA14 allocates sites which will enable this figure to be achieved, but there may be scope for employment creation elsewhere in the rural area, subject to policies in the forthcoming Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Policy SA 14

Rural Employment Sites

The following rural employment sites, as identified on the Proposal Map, are allocated for development primarily for uses within Classes B1 and B2. Development should be appropriate to the scale of the village and protect or enhance the environment and local amenity.

Table 7

Site Reference	PO ref ⁽¹⁾	Site Name	Area (ha)
SA14.1	H098f	Land off Lawrence Road, Wittering (see also site SA6.10)	1.0
SA14.2	E025	North of Thorney Road, Eye	1.0
SA14.3	E017	Station Road, Thorney	1.0
		Total	3.0

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ PO Ref is the reference number of the site at the Preferred Options consultation stage. This is provided for information only, and will be removed when this DPD is submitted to the Secretary of State.

5 Other Site Allocation Policies

5.1 The following sections set out site related policies.

Safeguarded Land for Future Key Infrastructure

- 5.2 The City Council has developed the evidence to understand in more detail what infrastructure will be required, when this will be required and to provide certainty that it will be forthcoming. The mechanism for this work is the Integrated Development Programme (IDP). IDPs are costed, phased and prioritised programmes of infrastructure development to respond to anticipated economic and housing growth. The value of the IDP is to bring together key infrastructure requirements and identify any major constraints to wider development proposals. Policy CS11 'Infrastructure' of the Core Strategy could be used to prevent development from being commenced or, in certain cases, from being permitted, in the absence of essential infrastructure capacity.
- 5.3 Sometimes infrastructure which may not be viable or needed in the short-term is likely to be crucial to the future development of the City over the medium to long-term. This may lead to, on a fairly exceptional basis, the need to 'safeguard' land from certain forms of development in order to protect it for future infrastructure needs.

Policy SA 15

Safeguarded Land for Future Key Infrastructure

Planning permission on the following safeguarded land, as identified on the Proposals Map, will only be granted for development which does not threaten or otherwise hinder the ability to implement the identified infrastructure project.

Table 8

Site	Scheme	Location	Planned Infrastructure
SA15.1	Passenger Rail Station	Land at Hampton	Railway Infrastructure
SA15.2	Land Beside the A15	Glington/Northborough bypass	Highway Infrastructure
SA15.3	Former Wansford to Stamford and Peterborough to Wisbech Railway Lines	Wansford - Stamford; Peterborough - Wisbech.	Walking and Cycling Infrastructure
SA15.4	A1 Wittering Junction Improvements	A1 adjacent to Wittering	Highway Infrastructure
SA15.5	Thorpe Lea Road Playing Fields Flood Attenuation	Thorpe Lea Road	Water Management Zone

Hampton Country Park

- 5.4 Under the terms and conditions of the Hampton planning legal agreement (March 1993), the developer of the Hampton Township has agreed to a creation, management and maintenance scheme for a country park, covering some 162 hectares of land.

- 5.5** The City Council will encourage the use of the country park for recreational activities, such as walking, cycling and horse riding. The area around the former brick pit known as Beeby's Pit has potential for more water-based recreational pursuits such as sailing and canoeing.
- 5.6** The Urban Area Boundary in the vicinity of the former brickworks site has been drawn to include previously developed land, part of which may be redeveloped for some individually designed dwellings, in line with policy SA8 (Prestige Homes), provided these would be compatible with the Country Park allocation and would not prejudice its integrity and continuity.

Policy SA 16

Hampton Country Park

Within Hampton Township an area of land, as identified on the Proposals Map, is allocated for use as a country park. Planning permission will be granted for development which is considered appropriate to the proposed use of the area as a country park, especially if it would also contribute to or enhance its landscape character.

Green Wedges

- 5.7** In and around Peterborough there are four specific areas that are under considerable pressure for development and which, if built on, would result in the amalgamation of the Urban Area with nearby settlements. The City Council wishes to maintain the separate identity of settlements as far as possible. It is felt appropriate, therefore, to provide a long-term commitment to the maintenance of 'green wedges' in these particular cases.
- 5.8** One of these wedges separates Peterborough from Glinton; a second separates Peterborough from Eye; a third separates Stanground from Farcet; and a fourth separates the main part of Peterborough from its suburb of Stanground. Although Stanground forms part of the Urban Area, it is separated from the remainder of the City by an area of undeveloped land. Here, as in the other cases, it is the policy of the City Council to maintain the separate identity of communities by containing urban sprawl.

Policy SA 17

Green Wedges

Within the areas identified on the Proposals Map as 'Green Wedges', and in addition to the provisions of policy CS5 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD relating to development in the countryside, planning permission will not be granted for any development that would reduce the degree of physical separation between settlements.

East of England Showground

- 5.9** All of the land which comprises the East of England Showground lies outside the Urban Area boundary. Normally this would mean that policies relating to the countryside would be applicable. However, it is recognised by the City Council that the Showground is a unique facility and that its operations cover a variety of land uses. Further development relating to sporting, social and recreational events, in keeping with the open character of the area, will be acceptable. Any proposal will be subject to an assessment of the environmental and traffic impacts on the adjoining residential areas and on the nearby village of Alwalton, and suitable measures will be taken to alleviate any adverse impacts.

Policy SA 18

East of England Showground

Within the East of England Showground, as shown on the Proposals Map, planning permission will be granted for development for sport, leisure and social purposes which specifically relate to the existing use as a showground and would not impair its continued use for that purpose. Proposals for development should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the surrounding uses, and all development should ensure the open character of the area is maintained.

Special Character Areas

- 5.10** A number of areas in Peterborough are identified as Conservation Areas because of their special architectural or historic interest.
- 5.11** In addition, whilst not of Conservation Area quality, three locally specific Special Character Areas have been designated to acknowledge their strong landscape character, architectural quality and development patterns that together provide a high environmental quality. All three Special Character Areas are marked by their low-density and generally large dwellings set within spacious grounds. It is important that any development is carefully guided in order to protect each Area's character.
- 5.12** The development criteria identified below are intended to provide additional design guidance in respect of these Special Character Areas.
- 5.13** Further details on these Special Character Areas are available in the Evidence Report.
- 5.14 Wothorpe Village:** The settlement pattern is set around three bridleways established in the Enclosure Award (1797), now First Drift and Second Drift. Both are un-adopted roads. These bridleways provided access to allotments, which gradually became developed into residential properties. Since Enclosure the pasturelands, hedgerows and woodlands surrounding the village have remained largely unaltered. The area is characterised by low-density development, mainly individually designed family houses set in large landscaped gardens giving a semi-woodland setting. The built environment has a wide range of building styles.

5.15 Thorpe Road, Thorpe Avenue, Westwood Park Road: The character of the area is defined by low density, large detached family dwellings set back behind established building lines in large and typically spacious landscaped gardens. Many of the properties in the area have a sylvan setting. Trees of varied maturity add significantly to the special character of the area.

5.16 Ashton: The settlement is formed by a loose collection of three historic farmsteads, a small number of 19th Century cottages and some post-1950 infill dwellings. Ashton comprises two groups of dwellings interspersed with open space along Bainton Green Road and High Field Road. Most buildings are stone and slate construction. Development is very limited and the layout has changed little from the end of the 19th Century.

Policy SA 19

Special Character Areas

To preserve the special character of Wothorpe Village, Thorpe Rd, and Ashton, (as defined on the Proposals Map), the City Council will assess proposals for development against the following Special Character Area criteria:

- ***Garden Sub-Division:*** There should be no sub-division of gardens if this adversely affects the established pattern of development (such as creating plots significantly smaller than the average for the Area), amenity space and/or the loss of trees or boundary hedges.
- ***Extensions and Alterations:*** Incremental changes in the size and appearance of existing buildings will not be permitted if it harms their character and that of the Area. Alterations should be sympathetic to the original style and of an appropriate scale to maintain their character. Extensions that result in excessive site coverage, immediate or eventual loss of trees or hedges, or preclude the planting of suitable species of trees or hedges will not be supported.
- ***Design:*** Any new development must enhance the character and appearance of the Area. It must respect the scale, massing, depth, materials and spacing of established properties. Integral garages should be avoided. Garages should be sited behind the building line to the side of the dwelling.
- ***Analysis and Design Statement:*** All applications for development should be accompanied by a site analysis and design statement that demonstrates how the proposal takes into account the Area's special character.
- ***Trees:*** Where trees are present a detailed tree survey must be carried out that identifies the location, type, height, spread and condition.

The following additional criteria are applicable to the respective Special Character Area:

SA19.1- Wothorpe Area:

- All development proposals must ensure that the mature landscape character is maintained through the retention of existing trees, boundary hedges, walls and grass verges. Existing space around buildings should be maintained to preserve large trees.
- Proposals for whole or part demolition of any building or to intensify the use of plots in a way that adversely affects the current integrity of the area will not be supported.
- There will be a presumption against increased access and hard-standings, except where it can be shown to be necessary, and does not dominate the site or harm existing landscaping.
- Existing frontage hedging must be retained. Where this is absent, evergreen hedging species should be used. A combination of hedging and walls may be considered where the hedging predominates.

SA19.2 -Thorpe Road Area:

- **New building designs should incorporate boundary walls, railings or fences with evergreen hedging predominant and allow sufficient space for the planting of native woodland trees to reinforce the landscape around the site.**

SA19.3 - Ashton Area:

- **Any development should respect the linear form of Ashton. As such, there is a presumption against all backland development.**
- **The special relationship between the settlement and its agricultural setting must not be undermined by new development. As such, views of surrounding countryside must be maintained.**

Village Design SPD

5.17 In addition to Conservation Areas and Special Character Areas in the rural area, the Council has adopted (due Spring 2011) a Village Design SPD. This gives additional detailed design policy and will be taken into account when determining applicable development proposals.

Cemetery Provision

5.18 There is a requirement to safeguard an area of land to meet future need for cemetery provision. The size, design, layout and scale of buildings required to enable the functioning of the site as a cemetery will need very careful consideration. This will include testing proposal against the full range of LDF planning policies such as transport and access, design and landscaping impacts.

Policy SA 20

Cemetery Provision

The following site, as shown on the Proposals Map, is safeguarded for the provision of a new cemetery. Built development will only be permitted where it is required to enable the functioning of the site as a cemetery and where it would not harm the character of the surrounding area, including landscape character.

Site Number	Previous number	Address	Area
SA20.1	C003	Land North of A47 and west of Marholm Road	15ha

6 Implementation and Monitoring

- 6.1** This section outlines how the Site Allocations DPD will be implemented and monitored. It seeks to show how specific policies will be delivered and by whom, and when. The detailed implementation of policies will vary depending on their nature. In some cases, this will be via other DPDs such as the Planning Policies DPD as well as through Supplementary Planning Documents. The decision to undertake Supplementary Planning Documents will be based upon an identified need to enhance deliverability.
- 6.2** Monitoring, review and implementation are key aspects of the Government's 'plan, monitor and manage' approach to the planning system (PPS12). Preparation of a plan is not a 'one-off' activity; it is part of a process that involves keeping a check on how successful the plan is in delivering what it sets out to do, and making adjustments to that plan if the checking process reveals that changes are needed. An important aspect of the planning system is the ability to produce various local development documents at different times. This allows the Council to respond quickly to changing circumstances and priorities in Peterborough.
- 6.3** Monitoring is crucial to the successful delivery of this document because it takes a future oriented approach by identifying the key challenges and opportunities, and enabling adjustments and revisions to be made if necessary. One of the tests of soundness of a DPD is whether there are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring. The Council is therefore committed to the effective monitoring of the policies within this document, in particular to establish when interventions might be necessary to ensure timely delivery of what is proposed.
- 6.4** The purposes of monitoring are:
- to assess the extent to which policies and sites in the Site Allocations document are being implemented
 - to identify policies or sites that may need to be amended or replaced
 - to establish whether policies have had unintended consequences
 - to establish whether assumptions and objectives behind policies are still relevant
 - to establish whether targets are being achieved
- 6.5** Monitoring outcomes will normally be reported on an annual basis for a year which begins on 1 April and ends on 31 March, unless data is not available for such a time period. The key delivery vehicle for reporting the outcome of monitoring the Site Allocations Document will be the Peterborough Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).
- 6.6** The impact of the Site Allocation Document on sustainability will be monitored through the AMR process by looking at the indicators identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.
- 6.7** The tables on the following pages show our Implementation and Monitoring Strategy for this document.

Housing Section (Policies SA1 to SA8)	
Key responsible organisations	What is the delivery of the policies dependent upon?
Peterborough City Council Opportunity Peterborough Greater Cambridge-Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership Developers and Housebuilders Housing Associations Registered Social Landlords Private and public land owners Homes and Communities Agency	The IDP provides up to date details on the necessary infrastructure projects required to implement the policy. Delivery of development on each site will rely on private (predominantly) and public funding, and the willingness of landowners to make their land available to developers. Delivery will rely on the state of the national economy and the availability of funding from financial institutions.
How will the policies be implemented?	Indicators
Planning Policies DPD will provide detailed policies for the consideration of planning applications for housing. Masterplans or other studies for District Centres will identify scope for further residential intensification. Continuous partnership working with relevant organisations to ensure targets are met.	Net additional dwellings provided (by location)
	Net additional dwellings (cumulative) since April 2001
	Supply of ready to develop housing sites (assessed annually)
	Targets and dates 1420 per year (cumulative average) Monitored against the housing trajectory of the Core Strategy At least 5 years housing land supply at any point in time
	Risks
	Contingencies

Housing Section (Policies SA1 to SA8)		
<p>Funding from the National Affordable housing programme and PCC affordable housing grant.</p> <p>Use of planning obligations or conditions attached to planning permissions to secure affordable housing.</p> <p>The IDP will set out the detailed infrastructure requirements required to support the policy.</p> <p>Through the ongoing submission and determining of planning applications.</p>	<p>State of national economy, and impact on housebuilding sector</p> <p>Lending policies of financial institutions</p> <p>Lack of developer interest in housing sites</p> <p>Committed sites not being developed</p> <p>Shortage of funds from Homes and Communities Agency</p>	<p>Review planning policies.</p> <p>Seek further engagement with developers and OP to identify why development is not coming forward.</p> <p>Work with developers to overcome site-specific obstacles.</p>
<p>Phasing</p>		
<p>No specific restrictive phasing policy</p>		

Employment Section (Policies SA9 to SA14)	
Key responsible organisations	What is the delivery of the policies dependent upon?
<p>Peterborough City Council Opportunity Peterborough Developers Fenland District Council Cambridgeshire County Council Peterborough Regional Economic Partnership Greater Cambridge-Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership Inward-investors</p>	<p>The IDP provides up to date details on the necessary infrastructure projects required to implement the policy. Delivery of the regional freight interchange will be dependent on the granting of planning permission either by Ministers (following consideration by the Major Infrastructure Planning Unit) or by Peterborough City Council, Fenland District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council, working through a joint committee approach.</p>
How will the policies be implemented?	Indicators
<p>Planning Policies DPD will provide detailed policies for the consideration of planning applications for employment development. Active promotion of Peterborough as a business location.</p>	<p>Supply of land developed for employment use</p>
	<p>Number of years employment land supply available at current take-up rate</p>
	<p>Take up of employment land by location and type of use</p>
	<p>Targets and dates</p> <p>Deliver at least 209.5 hectares from 2007 to 2026 At least 5 years' worth. Increase</p>
	<p>Risks</p> <p>Contingencies</p>

Employment Section (Policies SA9 to SA14)		
<p>The Peterborough Delivery Partnership will work with partners to tap into funding sources.</p> <p>The IDP will set out the detailed infrastructure requirements required to support the policy.</p> <p>Through the ongoing submission and determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Implementation of the regional freight interchange will be by a private sector developer, following the determination of a planning application either by Ministers (following consideration by the Major Infrastructure Planning Unit) or by Peterborough City Council, Fenland District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council, working through a joint committee approach.</p>	<p>State of national economy, and impact on development sector.</p> <p>Lending policies of financial institutions.</p> <p>Lack of developer interest in employment sites.</p> <p>Committed sites not being developed.</p> <p>Lack of progress in education to develop knowledge based industry.</p> <p>Phasing</p> <p>No specific restrictive phasing policy.</p>	<p>Review planning policies and site allocations.</p> <p>Seek further engagement with developers and OP to identify why development is not coming forward.</p> <p>Work with developers to overcome site-specific obstacles.</p> <p>Seek further promotional measures to enhance the attractiveness of Peterborough.</p>

Safeguarded Land for Future Key Infrastructure (Policy SA15)	
Key responsible organisations	What is the delivery of the policies dependent upon?
Peterborough City Council	The IDP provides up to date details on the necessary infrastructure projects required to implement the policy. Diligent monitoring and review will be required to ensure the integrity of the policy is not being undermined by approvals for inappropriate development.
How will the policy be implemented?	Indicators
The IDP will set out the detailed infrastructure requirements required to support the policies.	Applications granted in areas allocated as safeguarded land that threaten or hinder the ability to implement the projects.
The policy will be implemented by the refusal of planning permissions that would threaten or otherwise hinder the ability to implement the identified infrastructure projects.	Risks
	Lack of interest/investment in infrastructure projects. Committed projects not being developed. Safeguarded sites succumbing to inappropriate development activity.
	Contingencies
	Review planning policies and site allocations. Seek further engagement with developers to identify why infrastructure is not being delivered. Work with developers to overcome site-specific obstacles.
	Targets and dates
	Minimise.

Hampton Country Park (Policy SA16)	
Key responsible organisations	What is the delivery of the policies dependent upon?
Peterborough City Council Developers and housebuilders Private and public landowners	Implementation of existing legal agreement.
How will the policy be implemented?	Indicators
Planning Policies DPD will provide detailed policies for planning applications. Through the ongoing determination of planning applications. Implementation of existing legal agreement.	Type and number of permissions granted within the area.
	Targets and dates
	Minimise those contrary to the purpose of the Country Park
Risks	Contingencies
State of national economy, and impact on housebuilding and employment sectors. Lending policies of financial institutions. Pressure for inappropriate development.	Review planning policies and site allocations. Seek further engagement with developers to identify why development is coming forward within the area and seek to ensure development is sympathetic to the Park and its setting. Maintain a watching brief over development activity which may threaten the integrity of the Park.

Green Wedges (Policy SA17)	
Key responsible organisations	What is the delivery of the policies dependent upon?
Peterborough City Council Developers and housebuilders Private and public land owners	The refusal of planning permission for inappropriate development.
How will the policy be implemented?	Indicators
Through the ongoing submission and determination of planning applications.	Type and number of permissions granted within the area.
	Targets and dates
	Minimise those contrary to the purpose of the Green Wedges
	Risks
Pressure for non-conforming development.	Contingencies
	Review planning policies and site allocations. Seek further engagement with developers and OP to identify why development is coming forward within the area. Seek to ensure development does not threaten the integrity of the Green Wedges and work with stakeholders to achieve appropriate solutions.

East of England Showground (Policy SA18)	
Key responsible organisations	What is the delivery of the policies dependent upon?
Peterborough City Council The East of England Agricultural Society	The granting and refusal of planning permission.
How will the policy be implemented?	Indicators
Through the ongoing submission and determination of planning applications.	Type and number of permissions granted within the area.
	Risks
	Pressure for non-conforming development.
	Contingencies
	Seek further engagement with the landowners. Seek to ensure development does not threaten the integrity of the Showground.
Targets and dates	Minimise those contrary to the purposes of the Showground.

Special Character Areas (Policy SA19)	
Key responsible organisations	What is the delivery of the policies dependent upon?
Peterborough City Council Parish Councils Developers and housebuilders Private and public land owners	The refusal of planning permission for inappropriate development.
How will the policy be implemented?	Indicators
Planning Policies DPD will provide detailed policies for planning applications. Through the ongoing determination of planning applications.	Type and number of permissions granted within the areas.
	Targets and dates
	Minimise those contrary to the objectives of the Special Character Areas
	Risks
	Pressure for non-conforming development.
	Contingencies
	Review planning policies and site allocations. Seek further engagement with developers and Parish Councils to achieve appropriate solutions.

Cemetery Provision (Policy SA20)	
Key responsible organisations	What is the delivery of the policies dependent upon?
Peterborough City Council Homes and Communities Agency	The refusal of planning permission for inappropriate development.
How will the policy be implemented?	Indicators
The policy will be implemented by the refusal of planning permissions that would threaten or otherwise hinder the ability to deliver a cemetery on the site.	Type and number of permissions granted within the area.
	Risks
	Contingencies
Pressure for non-conforming development. Landowner (Homes and Communities Agency) unwilling to sell land to the Council.	Work with the landowner to ensure delivery of the site. Investigate alternative sites.
	Targets and dates
	Minimise those contrary to the objective of developing a cemetery on the site.

Appendix 1 Deleted Policies

Part of the current Development Plan for the area covered by this document is the Peterborough Local Plan (first replacement), which was adopted by the Council on 20th July 2005. The majority, but not all, of the policies in that Plan were saved, by a Direction from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, beyond 20th July 2008 (For further information see: http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/planning_and_building/planning_policy/adopted_development_plan/peterborough_local_plan.aspx). Further Policies will be 'superseded' by the Core Strategy (once adopted). This appendix explains which of the saved Local Plan policies are to be replaced by policies in the Site Allocations document. Accordingly, the Local Plan policies below cease to have effect from the date of adoption of the Site Allocations DPD.

Policy to be deleted (Local Plan (2005))	New SA Policy Number
H3 Allocation of Housing Land: Urban Area	SA 3 Urban Area
H4 Hampton Township Development Area	SA 1 Urban Extensions
H5 London Road Opportunity Area	SA 3 Urban Area
H6 Stanground South	SA 1 Urban Extensions
H8 Village Envelopes	SA 4 Village Envelopes
H9 Rural Growth Settlements	SA 5 Key Service Centres
H10 Limited Rural Growth Settlements	SA 6 Limited Growth Villages
OIW1 General Employment Areas	SA 12 General Employment Area
OIW2 Allocated Sites in General Employment Areas	SA 12 General Employment Area
OIW3 Business Parks	SA 12 General Employment Area
OIW4 Allocated Sites in Business Parks	SA 12 General Employment Area
OIW9 Rural Employment Sites	SA 14 Rural Employment Sites
T13 Passenger Rail Station at Hampton	SA 15 Safeguarded Land for Future Key Infrastructure
T16 Land Beside the A15	SA 15 Safeguarded Land for Future Key Infrastructure
T18 Former Wansford to Stamford and Peterborough to Wisbech Railway Lines	SA 15 Safeguarded Land for Future Key Infrastructure
LT8 Hampton Country Park	SA 16 Hampton Country Park
LT13 East of England	SA 18 East of England Showground
CF11 Cemetery at Orton Waterville	SA 20 Cemetery Provision
LNE2 Green Wedges	SA 17 Green Wedges

Appendix 2 Glossary

Adoption - the formal decision by the Council to approve the final version of a document, at the end of all the preparation stages, bringing it into effect.

Affordable Housing - housing available at a significant discount below the market value, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. It includes social rented and intermediate housing (such as shared equity products, low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent).

Amenity - elements which contribute to the overall character of an area, for instance these can be trees, historic buildings, or even shops.

Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) - a document produced by the local planning authority and submitted to Government by 31 December each year to report on the progress in producing the local development framework and implementing its policies.

Appropriate Assessment (AA) - a requirement of the European Habitats Directive. Its purpose is to assess the impacts of the plans and projects on internationally designated nature conservation sites.

Area Action Plan (AAP) - a particular type of LDD which provides a planning framework for any area where significant change and/or conservation is needed.

Community facilities - facilities available for use by all the community, such as church or village halls, doctor's surgeries and hospitals, even public houses. Community facilities could also include children's playgrounds and sports facilities.

Conservation Area - an area of special historic or architectural interest whose character must be preserved or enhanced.

Core Strategy - a Development Plan Document (DPD) which contains the spatial vision, main objectives and policies for managing the future development of the area.

Development Plan - see Statutory Development Plan.

Development Plan Document (DPD) - one of the types of LDD; they set out the spatial planning strategy, policies and/or allocations of land for types of development across the whole, or specific parts, of the LPA's area.

Examination - a form of independent public inquiry into the soundness of a submitted DPD, which is chaired by an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. After the examination has ended the inspector produces a report with recommendations which are binding on the Council.

Green Infrastructure - a network of protected sites, nature reserves, green spaces, waterways and greenway linkages (including parks, sports grounds, cemeteries, school grounds, allotments, commons, historic parks and gardens and woodland). It offers opportunities to provide for a number of functions, including recreation and wildlife as well as landscape enhancement.

Gypsies and Travellers - persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling Showpeople or circus people travelling together as such. *Circular 01/2006*

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) - framework under which "Appropriate Assessment" is carried out.

Infill - the use of vacant land and property within a built-up area for further construction or development (see also "windfall sites")

Infrastructure - a collective term which relates to all forms of essential services like electricity, water, and road and rail provision.

Integrated Development Programme (IDP) - brings together key infrastructure requirements and any constraints to wider development proposals.

Large-scale major development - those where the number of residential units to be constructed is 200 or more. Where the number of residential units to be constructed is not given in the application, a site area of four hectares or more should be used. <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/hub/people-places/planning/planning-and-development-2009>

Local Development Document (LDD) - any document, prepared in accordance with the statutory requirements, which sets out the LPA's policies, including supplementary policies and guidance, relating to the development and use of land in their area. All LDDs are part of the LDF. There are different types of LDD.

Local Development Framework (LDF) - the collective term for the whole package of planning documents which are produced by a local planning authority to provide the planning framework for its area. The LDF includes LDDs, the LDS and the AMR.

Local Development Scheme (LDS) - a document which sets out the local planning authority's intentions and timetable for the preparation of new LDDs (including DPDs, SPDs and the SCI).

Local Planning Authority (LPA) - the local authority which has duties and powers under the planning legislation. For the Peterborough area, this is Peterborough City Council.

Major Development - development involving any one or more of the following: (a) the provision of dwelling houses where (i) the number of dwelling houses to be provided is 10 or more; or (ii) the development is to be carried out on a site having an area of 0.5 hectare or more and it is not known whether the development falls within paragraph (a)(i); (b) the provision of a building or buildings where the floor space to be created by the development is 1,000 square metres or more; (c) development carried out on a site having an area of 1 hectare or more; or (d) waste development.

Minor Development - any development which is not major development.

Mitigation measures - actions necessary to restrict or remedy the negative impacts of a particular development.

Mixed-use development - In accordance with national guidance we have identified sites in this document that are described as mixed-use development. 'Mixed-use' is a term used to describe a development where there is a combination of uses occurring on the same site. The focus on mixed-use will allow the market to bring forward proposals which better reflect the need for homes, jobs and services to be close to one another.

Open Space - areas of undeveloped or largely undeveloped land for leisure purposes - including village greens, allotments, children's playgrounds, sports pitches and municipal parks.

Pitch - a pitch is an area of land where a Gypsy or Traveller household can reside; typically this may contain a building, parking space and one or more caravans. The average number of caravans per pitch is currently estimated as 1.7. *Draft RSS Single Issue Review: Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation in the East of England. 2008*

Plot - the area of land set aside for accommodation by one Travelling Showpeople family unit and the area of land set aside for the storage and maintenance of their equipment collectively forms a plot. *Circular 04/2007*

Planning Inspectorate (PINS) - an agency of the DCLG which provides independent adjudication on planning issues, typically through an Inspector with responsibility for "examination".

Preferred Options - one of the stages in the preparation of a DPD that was required before the Regulations (and accompanying guidance) were amended in 2008 . At this stage the local planning authority published, for public consultation, a document which explained which option(s) the authority preferred, in relation to the subject matter of the DPD, and which other options had been considered and rejected.

Proposals Map - a map on an Ordnance Survey base map which shows where policies in DPDs apply. For an interim period it will also show where saved policies from Local Plans apply. It needs to be revised as each different DPD is adopted.

Rapid Inundation Zone - an area which is at risk of rapid flooding should a flood defence structure be breached or overtopped. The zones at highest risk of rapid inundation are typically located close behind the flood defences.

Registered Social Landlord (RSL) - a body which is registered with the Housing Corporation under the 1996 Housing Act. Examples include Cross Keys Homes, Nene Housing and North British Housing Association.

Sequential Approach - an approach to planning decisions which may require certain sites or locations to be fully considered for development before the consideration moves on to other sites or locations. The approach could apply to issues such as retail development, the use of previously developed land or the use of land at risk from flooding.

Settlement Hierarchy - settlements are categorised into a hierarchy based on the range of facilities, services and employment opportunities available, plus the ability to access other higher ranking settlements by public transport.

Spatial Planning - this concept brings together policies for the development and use of land with other policies and strategies which too have ramifications for the nature of places and how they operate.

Stakeholders - person, group, or organisation that has a direct or indirect stake in the local planning authority because they can affect or be affected by the its actions, objectives, and policies.

Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) - one of the types of LDD; it sets out the council's approach to how and when it will consult with the community in the preparation of planning documents, and making decisions on planning applications.

Statutory Development Plan - the overall term for a number of documents which, together, have a particular status under the planning legislation in decision-making. The Development Plan includes the Regional Spatial Strategy and all adopted DPDs for the area. For an interim period it may include all or part of certain structure plans and local plans.

Statutory Organisations - these are organisations which the LPA must consult at specific stages of the process, such as when a new draft document is produced. Organisations are typically neighbouring local authorities, such as South Kesteven District Council.

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLA) - identifies potential land and buildings that are/could be available for housing led regeneration.

Submission stage - the stage at which a DPD or SCI is sent to the Secretary of State as a prelude to its examination. At the same time, the document is published for public inspection and formal representations.

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - one of the types of LDD; they expand on policies or provide further detail to policies contained in a DPD.

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) - a formal, systematic process to assess the environmental, economic and social effects of strategies and policies from the start of preparation onwards. The process includes the production of reports to explain the outcomes of the appraisal.

Sustainable Development - usually referred to as “development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Brundtland, 1987).

The Act - the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which put in place the statutory framework for preparing the LDF.

The Regulations - the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended by the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009; and the Town and Country Planning (Transitional Arrangements) Regulations 2004.

Travelling Showpeople - members of a group organised for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family’s dependants’ more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers as defined in ODPM Circular 01/2006.

Use Classes Order - a piece of national secondary legislation which groups types of use of premises into classes, so that no development is involved if a building is changed from one use to another within the same class. Changing the use of a building from one class to another constitutes development, and needs planning permission, but in certain circumstances this may be automatically permitted without the need to submit a planning application. Use Classes referred to in this Site Allocations DPD are:

Class B1 - Business
Class B2 - General Industrial
Class B8 - Storage or Distribution

Village Envelope - a boundary on a map beyond which the local planning authority proposes that a village should not be able to extend.

Windfall Site - a previously developed site which has not been specifically identified as available through the development plan process, but which unexpectedly becomes available for development. A windfall dwelling is a dwelling which is delivered from such a site (see also "infill")

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2 – NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL RESPONSES TO SITE ALLOCATIONS PRESENTATION - EXTRACTS FROM DRAFT MINUTES

Dogsthorpe East and Park Neighbourhood Council held 1 September 2010:

The Policy and Strategy Manager gave a presentation on the Site Allocations Document and made the following points:

- No decision would be made on the Site Allocations Document at the meeting, as the document would be considered by Council later in the year.
- The Site Allocations Document was essentially a map which allocated new land for housing, retail or employment development. Once finalised, the document would encourage developers to come forward with proposals which accord with the detail on the map.
- There were a number of policies behind items for new development. The Site Allocations were not about planning permission as developers would need to seek permission for each proposal in its own right. The document was about setting principles about appropriate sites for different kinds of development.
- The preparation of the document was very regulated by the government, and had already been through two consultation stages. In 2009 all the possible sites known to the Council were put out for consultation. In March and April 2010, the Council put forward preferred sites.
- The next part of the consultation sought to finalise the map, which would then go to an independent inspector who gives final approval.

The Policy and Strategy Manager then talked through some of the site allocations particular to the Neighbourhood Council area:

- The John Mansfield School and a remote playing field to the north would be promoted for housing development, with an anticipated 250-300 houses across the two sites.
- The bus depot on Lincoln Road was proposed as a small housing site if the business relocated.
- Part of the Community College was also earmarked for housing development for approximately 40 houses.
- Former Perkins workers' sports field was proposed for housing.
- Two smaller sites marked for employment development were included in the current local plan, but had not yet come forward for development.
- A large area marked for employment development was known as Red Brick Farm and would provide a large extension of the east employment area. This large area would not be developed overnight, but formed part of a 20 year programme of development.

The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that the comments received at the meeting would be reported to formal Council for a final decision in November 2010. Following this, a further period of formal public consultation in January and February 2011 would take place, with responses being forwarded to the independent inspector.

During consideration the following points were noted:

- Wayne Stimpson sought clarification as to whether there were plans for green spaces or allotments amongst the site allocations identified. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that whilst there were no specific sites allocated for green spaces or allotments, Council policy would ensure that for larger housing sites, developers must provide a certain amount of open space. This would occur at the detailed planning development stage.
- The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that due to some flood risk and archaeological issues, the creation of one massive employment area was unlikely. It was possible that part of this area could be set aside as open space, which may include allotments.

- Dave Harman sought explanation on the economic justification for the plans as areas of the city currently stood vacant. The Policy and Strategy Manager explained that the process was about trying to balance new housing with job opportunities for the next 20 years. As Peterborough grew, it was anticipated that the vacant areas in the city would quickly be filled and new areas would need to be identified, hence the plan.
- John Shearman sought clarification as to whether there would be a judicious mix of housing in these developments, and confirmation that archaeological investigation would take place on the Red Brick Farm area prior to development. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that the rule of thumb with development was that 30% would be affordable housing with a mix of housing sizes on each site. With regard to archaeology, Council policy would require an assessment to be carried out before any works commenced on site.
- Cllr Peach sought clarification as to why the travellers provision was pulled from the strategy, but not the housing provision, and asked the Policy and Strategy Manager to confirm that the Council no longer had targets on affordable housing. The Policy and Strategy Manager confirmed that the Coalition government had abolished regional housing targets and whilst the matter still required clarity it was understood that regional groups could set their own targets, which would be tested independently. The Council no longer had housing, traveller or employment targets to meet, however the Leader on 7 June had issued a press statement stating that the Council would come up with its own target for travellers. The Leader also stated that the Council would carry on with the housing target that was developed through the RSS as it goes alongside what the community strategy says about growth.
- Cllr Peach asked if there would be any provision for executive homes on some of the sites, particularly sites near the city centre, as there was a need for this type of housing in Peterborough. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that the core strategy gives generic support for executive homes, and that the Site Allocations Document would allocate sites which would be suitable for a high proportion of executive homes. The Policy and Strategy Manager agreed to respond to Cllr Peach with further information on this matter.

Di Newman asked how issues of contamination would be managed on land that was once industrial use and now allocated for housing or employment, and what measures would be in place with developers to ensure the use of green fittings and materials in line with the environment capital aspirations. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that the council was currently reviewing its environment policy to fit in with the city's environment capital aspirations and once this was complete, officers would investigate how to support this through the planning process. With regard to contamination issues, this would be addressed through a contamination land report which would be required when a planning application was submitted, and possibly the involvement of the Environment Agency.

Fletton, Stanground and Woodston neighbourhood Council held 2 September 2010:

In the absence of the relevant officer, the Neighbourhood Manager gave a brief presentation on the Site Allocations Development Plan which detailed the sites in the Neighbourhood area that had been proposed to be developed over the coming years.

The details on the plan had not yet been approved and were still at the consultation phase. More decisions would be made by the Council in Jan/Feb 2011 and an independent inspector would review any plans/decisions taken by the Council shortly after.

The Neighbourhood Council was invited to comment on the site plan for the area. Questions asked included:

- The map is difficult to read as there are no road names, can road names be added?
- There was a presentation at a past meeting whereby Woodston was identified as a potential artisan area of the city; can this presentation be given again incorporating the proposed developments?

ACTION: Responses to the above questions to be provided at the next meeting, via the update boards.

Rural North Neighbourhood Council, held 16 September 2010

The Clerk advised that Members were not obliged to vote to show support or opposition tonight but officers were requesting opinions and comments on the proposed sites for development in the area. Comments from elected Members would not bind them to that point of view for future meetings discussing the Site Allocations Document.

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the Site Allocations plan and the approval process within the council that was needed before a final document was approved including:

- This is latest version on current recommendations from officers which will go to Cabinet (8 November), then full Council (8 December) to approve a draft version for 6 week consultation then on to the secretary of state and inspector and finally to full Council (possibly December 2011) for formal adoption;
- Some sites already have planning permission in this area;
- Gypsy and Traveller pitches now dropped from the document; none will be allocated. A transit site will not be in this area;

Comments and responses to questions included:

- Cllr Sanders – Eye and Thorney residents have already given responses at previous consultations; Parish councils' opinions should be foremost in planning considerations; officers must collate previous consultation responses before a final draft is presented;
- Thorney Parish Council – what happened to sites proposed in flood plain areas near Thorney? *These sites were removed as the Environment Agency opposed on the basis that they are in a higher risk flood zone. Flood zones are based on the assumption that there are no flood defences (as they could fail). It would therefore be difficult to put these sites back in;* Why additional site off Sandpit Road after the previous document? *There was an initial concern with the site which has now been reconsidered as acceptable;*
- Helpston Parish Council – 61 new dwellings proposed for Helpston when 45 were earmarked for the village envelope in total. Are figures from Core Strategy still valid? Requests city councillors object to the Site Allocations document;
- Glinton Parish Council – Concerned that city council will seek to build more houses to gain from government incentives;
- Eye Open Space Group – Previous opposition to growth in Eye was not listened to. Over 1000 people opposed to growth outside the current village envelope wrote to the council. Need employment in the village, not outside the village. Concerned about size of proposed housing developments for Eye as employment site not now included;
- Cllr Over – Developments are not sustainable as people have to work and shop outside villages because no employment development for rural areas. No evidence that more houses are needed or wanted. Little infrastructure at the moment so wouldn't cope with more people. This area will lose valuable agricultural land and countryside if housing developments take place;
- Eye Junior Youth Club - Concern that no consideration given for impact on local doctors, youth clubs, schools and amenities etc which are already oversubscribed;
- *Planning Policy Manager - Parish Councils can provide land for cemeteries; 3 sites for a city council cemetery proposed in the Castor and Ailsworth area currently open for consultation;*
- *Re Core Strategy – sites proposed in the document were due to full Council voting on that level of development in the rural area so officers are now obliged to find the sites to meet the agreed development level;*
- Helpston Parish Council – Must ensure that the government Inspector receives correct information from officers in the first instance when considering sites.

The clerk was requested to note that no favourable comments to support the Site Allocations Document were forthcoming.

Central and North Neighbourhood Council, held 21 September 2010:

The Policy and Strategy Manager gave a presentation on the Site Allocations Document and made the following points:

- The Site Allocations document affected other areas more than this neighbourhood area, given that no sites in this area had been put forward for development given the existing density of development.
- In the future, the Policy and Strategy Manager was interested in how Planning could work with the Neighbourhood Council and elected Members to help make the much needed regeneration and tidying up of the area happen.

During discussion, the following points were noted:

- Residents had been trying to find out from the Planning department what regeneration meant for the Council, as so far Millfield and New England had received no assistance. Residents do not feel that this attitude would change quickly, though there was a lot to be said for the area, if it was cleaned up.
- Residents queried the ongoing use of a car park in Bamber Street which was not heavily utilised, and sought clarification as to what stage the use as a car park could be abandoned and the site used for something else. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that it was not impossible to add new sites to the Site Allocations document at this time, though it was difficult.
- The brownland site near Matalan was not included in the Site Allocations document as it was already allocated as land suitable for development for general employment uses; the Site Allocations document was about allocating new sites with no current status whatsoever.
- Cllr Khan queried what would need to happen to have the relocation of the bus depot become a top priority. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that it was not a case of priority, but the need to offer the business a viable site to move them to.

When taking regeneration opportunities into consideration, it was agreed that young people would be involved in the process.

Peterborough North Area Committee, held 22 September 2010

The Principal Strategic Planning Officer introduced the item advising that the map showed the latest proposed sites allocated for development over the next 15 years. This area had mainly mixed use development with some residential. Gypsy and Traveller sites were removed apart from the transit site at Norwood lane.

Comments, questions and responses included:

- Cllr John Fox – concern over Werrington centre re housing – how many and where? *Don't know yet as just proposals, maybe 100 homes for that centre;*
- Cllr Lane – a development north of Werrington? *No longer required as Norwood and Greater Haddon used for the large residential development in the core strategy;*
- Cllr S Day – Traveller transit site no longer at Norwood? – *Possibly still the preferred site but can investigate;*
- Housing allocations on the sites, what numbers overall? – *one is Lincoln Road approx 60-70, Itter Crescent approx 25, Honey Hill School approx 50.*
- Not many houses for this area in the overall city development? - *Over 1000 houses in Norwood development for this area;*
- D Hedges – some areas will receive lots of S106 funding others very little. *S106 has to be linked to the development so if no development little justification for S106;*

- Cllr Thacker – why Norwood for the transit site as Travellers have stated they would not occupy it? – *was proposed as best site. If you feel is not right site, can raise this at Council, in the public consultation and to planning inspector. Not finalised yet.*

ACTION: provide information on whether Norwood is still the preferred location for Traveller Transit Site.

Ortons with Hampton Neighbourhood Council, held 23 September 2010:

Peter Heath-Brown, Planning Policy Manager PCC, explained that the Site Allocations Document was made up of a series of planning documents and detailed the developments over the next fifteen years. The purpose of the document was to identify land suitable for housing, employment or other forms of development. Planning permission would still need to be sought and areas identified for development would appear on local searches when purchasing a new house.

The document had not yet reached the formal public consultation stage, but was being exhibited at all Neighbourhood Councils during September in order to gather comments before going to Full Council Meeting in December, where the feedback from Neighbourhood Councils would be given. The document would then go to the Secretary of State for consideration and public consultation.

The following responses were provided to questions raised by attendees:

- The figure for the number of houses to be built was derived from the overall scale of growth for the area, natural domestic migration, large number of teenagers in area who will eventually need housing;
- Members of the Planning Team along with Councillors are spending a lot of time with developers so that the lessons learned from Hampton regarding community facilities would be taken forward for the Great Haddon project;
- The Site Allocations Document was not just about houses, it also included projects for employment for the new residents;

The following comments and feedback regarding the document were noted and would be considered in future stages of the consultation process:

- PCC must ensure that leisure and community facilities are built to compliment any new large and existing developments, such as Great Haddon;
- Road and transport networks must be in place to support new developments;
- Can any contracts with developers have a clause whereby the building of community facilities will be completed before residential/employment building;
- Any new developments must have sufficient space for car parking and storage for multiple waste and recycling bins;

Attendees were advised to write any further comments on the feedback form attached to the agenda, and pass to Council Officers at the end of the meeting.

Peterborough West Neighbourhood Council, held 29 September 2010:

Gemma Wildman introduced the proposed developments in the neighbourhood area giving timescales for the approval of the Site Allocation Document and further information including:

- Current draft document incorporates consultation and responses received earlier this year. Will be further opportunity for public consultation next year;
- Proposals included regeneration of the Bretton district centre and site of former Bretton Woods School and Ravensthorpe local centre redevelopment.
- Netherton Grange allotments already awarded planning permission.
- Possible housing development on the former Freeman's site.

Comments, questions and responses included:

- Cllr Fletcher – why build housing on Freeman’s site, it is an industrial centre;
- Glennis Bentley – losing allotments for housing again, Ravensthorpe is deficient in allotment sites but the document reduces allotments again;
- What about the existing hospital site? – *will be dealt with in city centre action plan, a separate document;*
- How were sites identified? – *landowners, developers, community were all invited to put forward development sites;*
- Bretton Centre – what is happening to it? – *there is a boundary for the centre and this is confirmed in the document (similar to other centres such as Werrington and Millfield), could include housing in redevelopments;*
- Cllr Dalton – old hospital site plan is coming to a future meeting hopefully to be held near the site;
- When plans go forward for housing, what about school, health and transport provision, Bretton Woods was closed down? – *will be dealt with when planning applications for sites come in and could include S106 funding;*
- Ray Cave – who will pay for cost of demolishing Freemans buildings, £4m?;
- Dearleap Residents Association – housing was planned for Bretton Woods site years ago but nothing happened following Bretton 2010, why would it happen now? – *This is a 15 year plan so would expect development in that time.*

CABINET	AGENDA ITEM No. 6
8 NOVEMBER 2010	PUBLIC REPORT

Cabinet Member(s) responsible:	Cllr Cereste, Leader of the Council	
Contact Officer(s):	John Harrison, Executive Director- Strategic Resources	Tel. 01733 452398

THE FUTURE OF WESTCOMBE ENGINEERING

R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S	
FROM : John Harrison, Executive Director of Strategic Resources	Deadline date : None
<p>1. Cabinet is requested to overturn its previous decision in 2007 to close Westcombe Engineering and to retain it as part of the Council.</p>	

1. ORIGIN OF REPORT

1.1 This report is submitted to Cabinet following a referral from Cllr Cereste, Leader of the Council, and John Harrison, Executive Director of Strategic Resources.

2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT

2.1 Cabinet considered this matter on 3 September 2007 and decided to accept a recommendation to close Westcombe Engineering. The reasons given were that the current employment model provided by Westcombe Engineering was inappropriate to best meet the needs of the workforce of the operation and restricted their life opportunities.

2.2 On 14 November 2007 a special meeting of Council was called to discuss the implications of the closure of Westcombe Engineering, and more broadly, what was the Council's policy for disabled employees. At the end of the debate a motion was put, that 'The Council asks that the decision relating to the proposed closure of Westcombe Engineering be referred back to Cabinet for re-consideration'. The motion was not carried.

2.3 Earlier on the same day of that Council meeting the then Leader of the Council, Cllr John Peach, signed a Cabinet Member Decision Notice (CMDN) stating that "in the light of Cabinet having been approached with an initial business proposal for Westcombe Engineering, the previous decision of Cabinet be put in abeyance, and that the Council enters into negotiations for the potential transfer of the business to a social enterprise delivery vehicle".

2.4 Protracted negotiations then took place, but eventually it was not possible to transfer the business to the social enterprise delivery vehicle, and Westcombe Engineering came back into the control of the Council in February 2009.

2.5 The Cabinet now needs to determine the future of Westcombe Engineering.

2.6 This report is for Cabinet to consider under its Terms of Reference No. 3.2.3, "To take a leading role in promoting the economic, environmental and social well-being of the area".

3. **TIMESCALE**

Is this a Major Policy Item/Statutory Plan?	NO
---	-----------

4. **THE FUTURE OF WESTCOMBE ENGINEERING**

- 4.1 The history of this matter is set out at paragraph 2 above.
- 4.2 Since Westcombe Engineering came back into Council control, a number of improvements have been made. An interim manager was appointed in July 2009 with the brief to turn the business around or, if that proved impossible, to prepare it for closure.
- 4.3 A great deal of work has been done into reshaping the business, including introducing efficiencies and price reviews that were long overdue. As a result trading figures have shown a marked improvement. Perkins were involved in the process, and this led to them having renewed confidence in the business, which they demonstrated by nominating Westcombe Engineering for a supplier award for achieving a 100% record in terms of quality and deliveries.
- 4.4 The business is to be congratulated for its fantastic achievement, in a relatively short period of time. In recognition of the positive changes and the award received from Perkins, Westcombe Engineering was recently given an Excellence Award by the Chief Executive.
- 4.5 The improvements in Westcombe Engineering have been so impressive that it now has the support of its major customer, Perkins, and a viable future.
- 4.6 As a result of the improvements that have been made, Westcombe Engineering is a viable business and as a result of improvements made it is a more suitable environment for its largely disabled workforce.
- 4.7 In all the circumstances it is intended that Westcombe Engineering will not be closed, and will remain part of the Council for the foreseeable future.

5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The workforce, and Westcombe Engineering's major supplier, Perkins, have been consulted about the intention to retain it as part of the Council.

6. **ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES**

- 6.1 It is intended that Westcombe Engineering will remain part of the Council for the foreseeable future. It is intended that a general manager will be recruited if Cabinet agrees this recommendation.

7. **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 The current position needs to be regularised, as there is still an existing executive decision to close Westcombe Engineering, which needs to be overturned if the business is to remain open.

8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 8.1 Close Westcombe Engineering: this is not now considered to be appropriate. It is a viable business, and an important link in the supply chain of Perkins, a significant local business.
- 8.2 Transfer Westcome Engineering to another owner: attempts to do this have failed.
- 8.3 Retain status quo: this decision is effectively retaining the status quo, but needs to be formalised as the current Cabinet Member Decision Notice of 14.11.07 only places in abeyance the earlier decision to close Westcombe Engineering.

9. IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 There are no specific legal implications except as dealt with in the body of the report. It is not necessary to take any action in respect of the employees, as they have remained employed by the Council throughout.

Financial implications:

- 9.2 The business plan for Westcombe Engineering shows a sustainable, viable trading position with no subsidy requirement from the Council from 2011/12, with potentially a marginal surplus. This improvement in the trading position is offset to some extent in 2010/11 by the additional costs of management intervention in achieving the turnaround, and the timescale necessary to achieve the benefits of the revenue developments. The forecast for 2010/11 based on the information currently available is a net cost of £120,000, (net cost to date is £137,000 and this is expected to improve in the final outturn). This is factored into the overall budgetary control position. Early indications are that the revised operating model is performing to expectations, and this will continue to be closely monitored

10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Cabinet decision 3 September 2007
Cabinet Member decision notice 14 November 2007
Council minutes 14 November 2007

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

This page is intentionally left blank