

NOTICE OF MEETING

MEETING	PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
DATE:	TUESDAY 24 MAY 2011
TIME:	1.30 pm
VENUE:	BOURGES/VIERSEN ROOMS - TOWN HALL
CONTACT:	Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer Telephone: 01733 452268 e-mail address: gemma.george@peterborough.gov.uk
<i>Despatch date:</i>	<i>16 May 2011</i>

AGENDA

	PAGE NO
1. Apologies for Absence	
2. Declarations of Interest	
3. Minutes of the Meetings held on:	
3.1 12 April 2011	1 - 14
3.2 26 April 2011	15 - 18
4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters	
4.1 09/01369/OUT - Great Haddon, Development of Employment Land, East of Alwalton Hill, Fletton Parkway, Peterborough	19 - 84



There is an induction hearing loop system available in all meeting rooms. Some of the systems are infra-red operated, if you wish to use this system then please contact Gemma George on 01733 452268.

MEMBERS OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

Councillor North (Chairman), Councillor Serluca (Vice Chair), Councillor Casey, Councillor Hiller, Councillor Simons, Councillor Stokes, Councillor Todd, Councillor Lane, Councillor Harrington and Councillor Martin

Subs: Councillors Winslade, Ash and Shabbir

CASE OFFICERS:

Planning and Development Team: Nicholas Harding, Lee Collins, Andrew Cundy, Paul Smith, Mike Roberts, Louise Lewis, Janet Maclennan, Astrid Hawley, David Jolley, Louise Lovegrove, Vicky Hurrell, Amanda McSherry, Sam Falco, Matt Thomson, Chris Edwards, Michael Freeman

Minerals and Waste: Theresa Nicholl, Alan Jones

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

NOTES:

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

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee
held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 12 April 2011

Members Present:

Councillors – North (Chairman), Lowndes (Vice Chair), Hiller, Serluca, Todd, Winslade, Ash, Lane and Harrington

Officers Present:

Theresa Nicholl, Development Management Support Manager
Amanda McSherry, Principal Development Management Officer
Louise Lewis, Senior Development Management Officer
Chris Edwards, Planning Information Officer
Julie Smith, Highway Control Team Manager
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)
Carrie Denness, Principal Solicitor
Gemma George, Senior Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Burton and Councillor Thacker.

Councillor Winslade attended as substitute.

Councillor Hiller had notified the clerk prior to the meeting that he would be in attendance at about 3.00pm.

2. Declarations of Interest

- 5.1 Councillor Todd declared that she had been approached by a Mr Ikram prior to the meeting, but that this would in no way prejudice her decision.
- 5.2 Councillor Lowndes declared that she had visited the application site but as she had not discussed the application, this would in no way prejudice her decision.
- 5.3 Councillor Serluca declared that she had a personal and prejudicial interest, therefore she would leave the meeting for the duration of that item.

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

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

4. Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 March 2011

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2011 were approved as a true and accurate record.

5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

5.1 10/00907/FUL – Construction of multi purpose hall, conference area(s), library, ICT rooms, store room, other associated facilities and additional car parking spaces to be used in association with the existing mosque at Burton Street Mosque, Burton Street, Eastgate, Peterborough, PE1 5HD

Planning permission was sought for a two storey extension to the existing mosque, to provide a multi purpose hall, conference areas, library, ICT rooms, store rooms and other associated facilities providing approximately 1150 square metres of additional floor space. The existing mosque had 995 square metres of floorspace provided over two floors.

There were currently 34 car parking spaces on site and a new car park area of 10 car parking spaces was proposed to the front of the existing mosque building, which was accessed from Burton Street, and 3 disabled car parking spaces in front of the new extension, which would be accessed from Star Mews.

The mosque site was located within a predominately residential area of two storey high residential housing. There was a tyre fitting business and indoor bowls centre in Burton Street. The two storey mosque building was currently accessed from Burton Street, with car parking available on site at the front of the mosque building. There were buildings accessed from Star Mews which were for commercial/industrial purposes at the time, these buildings would be demolished as part of the proposed development.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. Members were advised that the main issues for consideration were the proposed design and layout of the scheme, the impact on neighbouring sites, highways impacts and car parking. The recommendation was one of approval.

Members were advised that the scheme had been amended from the one that had originally been submitted. The massing of the building had been reduced and it was now felt that the relationship between the mosque and surrounding buildings was acceptable. All of the windows to the side elevations were to be obscured glazed in order to prevent overlooking. There had been an objection received from the police and local residents with regards to overspill parking onto the street and in response, the applicant had stated that the proposal would not increase parking on the site as the extensions were not to be implemented in order to try and increase the number of people attending the mosque, but simply to give the current attendees the best facilities possible.

Officers had concluded that any parking overspill would occur during large family gatherings, i.e. weddings and funerals and this could be managed by providing prior notification to the police and putting proper traffic management in place.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. An amended site plan had been submitted which outlined all of the land owned by the applicant outside of the application site. Members were further informed that, subject to conditions, highways had no objections to the proposals. Traffic flow and parking had been observed at the mosque during Friday prayers, this being the busiest time for the mosque, and there was a high volume of visiting traffic but with the proper marshalling there had been no particular problems observed.

If Members were minded to approve the application, an additional condition had been proposed which requested a Construction Management Plan to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Comments had been received from the Police Architectural Liaison Officer, stating that traffic congestion could be managed if the area was well staffed by members of the mosque and with prior notice provided to the public of larger events taking place at the mosque.

Three further letters of objection had been received against the application and the key points highlighted by these objections were the loss of peace and quiet in the area, the increased traffic flow in the area, the insufficient car parking provision, the size of the building being not in-keeping with the surrounding buildings and late night noise disturbance.

Mr Salim Ibrahim, the Project Chairman and Mr Raza Rahim, the president of the Muslim Community at Burton Street Mosque, addressed the Committee jointly and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The mosque had been built with the communities own funding, to enable people to attend and take their place as upright citizens of Peterborough
- Activities had always taken place at the centre, including women's group and interfaith activities, senior citizen groups and playgroups
- The drive for the project was to provide better facilities for the younger people in order to realise the vision of a community that was an integral part of the society as a whole
- The proposal would be funded by donations and members of the community
- The whole idea had been to enhance the centres provision to the community
- The growth of the community had been natural with some younger people moving away
- There would not be a large sudden increase in numbers attending the centre
- The facilities for the younger generations was vital and education facilities were key
- Senior members were also not forgotten and the enhanced facilities would provide comfort for them
- During the planning process, consultation had been undertaken with all relevant parties and adjoining neighbours
- Events had been held where concerns could be raised and discussed. As a result, the size of the development had been reduced and a strategy had been imposed to monitor the traffic issues
- The traffic flow strategy would be constantly under review and constant consultation would be undertaken with the relevant people
- There was a dedicated team who monitored the situation with the car parking
- Number 128 was not owned by the centre, however the owners had stated that the land could be used for the charities purposes
- More than 60-70 families lived within walking distance of the centre and the access from Star Mews would encourage people to walk
- There were contingency plans in place when there were larger functions, such as utilising the parking spaces at the bowling club
- Support for the project was across the whole community

The Highways Officer addressed the Committee in response to queries around parking and stated that site visits had been undertaken at the mosque. There were a number of parked cars situated along Burton Street during these visits, but these could not be directly attributed to the mosque. Minor congestion along the road had

also been observed, however this tended to be when the patrons of the bowling club were leaving the site at the same time as the members of the mosque. Going forward, possible restrictions along Burton Street were to be looked into.

Members requested confirmation that Highways were happy that the additional condition number three, as contained in the update report, could easily be complied with. The Highways Officer responded and confirmed that the condition would be able to be complied with. It was a standard condition on a lot of sites and these sites were monitored regularly. The Highways Officer further confirmed that work would be undertaken with people in the community around the parking situation.

Members questioned where the accesses onto the site would be situated. The Planning Officer addressed the Committee in response and stated that there were to be two accesses onto the site, one from Star Mews accessing the three proposed disabled spaces and one from Burton Street. The access from Star Mews would be a pedestrian access also.

Following debate and further questions to the Planning Officer relating to the provision of access for both vehicles and pedestrians, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve application, subject to the imposition of the additional condition as highlighted in the update report and an informative with regards to the mosque working with the Highways Authority to ensure that parking was managed at the site. The motion was carried by 4 votes, with 3 voting against and 1 abstaining.

RESOLVED: (4 for, 3 against, 1 abstention) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C8 as detailed in the committee report
2. An additional condition requiring a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority
3. An additional informative with regards to the mosque working with the Highways Authority to ensure that parking was managed at the site

Reasons for decision:

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

- It was considered that the height, scale and mass of the extension would form an acceptable relationship with the existing mosque building and would not appear unacceptably dominate or visually harm the character of the area.
- It was considered that the siting, height, scale and mass of the proposed extension would not have an unacceptable overbearing impact on adjacent residential sites and first floor windows not fixed and obscure glazed unacceptably reduce their privacy.

It was therefore considered that the proposed development was in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS13 of the Core Strategy.

5.2 10/01705/FUL – Proposed two storey side extension and ground floor rear extension at 90 Vere Road, Peterborough (Part retrospective)

This application had arisen as a result of unauthorised works being reported to the Planning Compliance (enforcement) Team. Work had already started to construct the rear extension without obtaining either Planning Permission or Building Regulations approval.

Permission was therefore sought to construct two extensions to the property at 90 Vere Road, Peterborough.

The first part of the application sought permission to erect a two storey extension to the side of the dwelling. This would result in the width of the dwelling being extended by approximately 2 metres and would bring the end wall up to the boundary with the adjacent property. The purpose of this was to extend the third bedroom and create an additional room for use as a study on the first floor. The ground floor was to be left open to create a covered passageway to the rear.

The application also sought permission to erect a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling. This proposed extension measured approximately 9 metres from the rear wall of the original dwelling and was to cover the entirety of its width. The purpose of this extension was to create an enlarged kitchen measuring 23.5 square metres and a new lounge with ensuite WC measuring a total of 31.9 square metres. The proposal would also create an additional WC in place of the area currently occupied by the kitchen.

Subsequent communication with the applicant had revealed that the purpose of the rear extension was to be an annex for the applicant's disabled mother.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and stated that an amended plan had been submitted for the application. Members were advised that the overall depth of the extension was now to be 7 metres and set in by ½ metre from the neighbouring property on the right hand boundary. The proposals for the two storey side extension remained the same. The extension was still substantial but due to its reduction in length and its offsetting from the boundary to the right of the proposal, Officers felt that the proposal was now acceptable and the recommendation was one of approval, having previously been one of refusal.

Following debate Members commented that as there were two speakers who were due to be present who were not in attendance and as there had not been an amended report provided outlining the subsequent changes proposed, a motion was put forward and seconded to defer the application to a later date. The motion was carried by 8 votes, with 1 abstaining.

RESOLVED: (8 for, 1 abstaining) to defer the application to a later date.

Reasons for decision:

The Committee agreed that in order for it to be able to make an informed decision on the application, the item was to be deferred to allow for an updated report to be circulated and for the speakers to be in attendance in order to answer any questions Members may have on the application.

Councillor Serluca left the meeting.

5.3 11/00073/FUL – Construction of 4 x 1 bed flats and 6 x 2 bed flats in a 3 storey block at 38 Elm Street, Woodston, Peterborough

It was proposed to construct a single block containing ten flats over three floors. The block, although on the site of 38 Elm Street (now demolished), would face onto and read as part of Silver Street. The block was designed to pick up on some of the features of neighbouring buildings, and followed the existing building line along Silver Street.

The block would have a ground floor elevation incorporating some bay windows, a plain first floor with windows and the second floor would be mostly within the roof space, lit by dormer windows.

The vehicular and personal access would be from Elm Street. This would be functionally the “front” of the building, although the more detailed elevation would be on the Silver Street side, where there would be a row of small private gardens, the same depth as neighbouring front gardens, separating the building from the street. The car parking area would be on Elm Street, and the amenity space directly behind (or in front of) the block, next to the parking area.

This area was characterised on the Silver Street side by Victorian terraced housing with a strong, regular 2-storey ridgeline. On Elm Street there was some terraced housing, leading to later semi-detached housing. There were larger houses facing onto London Road to the east of the site. There was notable on-street parking congestion, as few of the dwellings on Silver Street had off-street parking, but those immediately adjacent to the application site had access to parking at the ends of their gardens, accessed from Elm Street. On Elm Street and the adjacent residential streets there was more available off street parking, but not every house was so provided for.

The site itself had been cleared of the house and garage block that previously occupied it, and was currently reverted to low-level scrub.

There was a large tree adjacent to the south east corner of the site, the crown of which overhung the site.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the proposal. Members were advised that the main issues for consideration were the principles of development, residential amenity, neighbour amenity, highway safety and parking and the design and character of the area. The recommendation was one of approval.

Members’ attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. There had been a previous appeal decision associated with the site and this decision was appended to the main report for Members’ information. Members were further advised that the proposal was considered to be acceptable by Officers and the issue highlighted in the appeal had been overcome.

On the site visit undertaken on the Friday prior to the Committee meeting, Members had raised questions with regards to the nature of the bin storage. In response to these concerns Members were advised that if the bin collections were undertaken by the Council then the bin provision necessary to serve ten flats would be two, 1100 litre bins for ordinary rubbish and two each for recyclable refuse, therefore four in total. The dimensions of the bins would be 1210mm wide by 1100mm deep. Members were advised that there was sufficient space on the site to accommodate these bins within an enclosure for which the refuse crew would be provided with a key for as standard practice. A condition had been proposed requesting a design for the bin store to be submitted for approval. The agent for the application had previously indicated that the refuse collection would be undertaken by a private company, however designing the bin store to accommodate Peterborough City Council requirements was acceptable (as a secondary option).

The proposal was a resubmission following the previous appeal decision in February 2010. The previous appeal had been dismissed due to overlooking 40 Elm Street by windows above ground floor level to the side of the proposal.

Councillor Matthew Lee, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and stated that he had originally come before the Committee to talk about policy CS10, which was the requirement that the development made a contribution towards the city being an environment capital. Councillor Lee felt that the original refuse collection in the plans had not initially lived up to that requirement and as the application had been extremely controversial amongst the local community Councillor Lee felt that providing revised plans for the bins storage prior to a decision being taken on the application would be preferable. Councillor Lee also requested clarification as to the amount of S106 money which had been agreed for the development.

In response to the queries raised by Councillor Lee, the Planning Officer addressed the Committee and stated that the S106 contribution was in accordance with the Planning Obligation and Implementation Scheme (POIS) document, £36,000 being the pooled contribution for strategic and neighbourhood infrastructure. Travel packs would also be requested for new occupants containing bus timetables etc. This would contribute towards residents utilising sustainable transport in the area. There would also be a monitoring fee enabling the S106 to be monitored. With regards to the bin issue, there was a visitor cycle parking area which was not particularly necessary, this could be utilised for the bin storage if required.

Members sought confirmation from the Highways Officer that they were happy with the proposals. The Highways Officer addressed the Committee and stated that she was happy and did not see any part of the proposal as being unachievable. The plans for the bins stores would be looked at and commented upon.

Members questioned whether the words "in perpetuity" could be added into condition C8 relating to the windows. The Planning Officer advised that this change would be implemented to the condition.

The Planning Officer further addressed the Committee and stated that once the plans had been submitted for the bin storage, condition C10 relating to bin storage would be amended prior to the decision notice being issued, and would state that the applicant would need to construct the bin store in accordance with the approved plan.

Following further brief debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application subject to the proposed amendments to conditions. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The prior satisfactory completion of an obligation under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
2. The conditions numbered C1 to C19 as detailed in the committee report, including the proposed amendments to conditions C8 and C10
3. If the S106 had not been completed within 2 months of the date of the resolution without good cause the Head of Planning Services will be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason R1 as detailed in the committee report

Reasons for decision:

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

- The proposal would contribute towards meeting a local and national housing need
- The proposal was for residential development in a residential area
- Adequate parking and access could be provided
- The proposal would not have any unacceptable impact on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties
- Satisfactory levels of amenity would be provided for future residents
- The design of the proposed building was appropriate to the area
- The applicant had agreed to make a contribution to the infrastructure needs arising from the development

The proposal was therefore in accordance with Saved Policies H7, H16, T9, T10, and IMP1 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2005 (First Replacement); Planning Policy Guidance 13; and Policies CS10, CS14 and CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy.

The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.

Councillor Serluca and Councillor Hiller joined the meeting.

5.4 11/00232/FUL – Revised proposals to include moving boundary to Plot A, loft play room and option for photoelectric panels to the roof slope, of planning permission 10/01503/FUL – Construction of 4 bed, 2 storey house with detached double garage – Plot B – The Haven, Second Drift, Wothorpe, Stamford

The proposed development was a four-bedroom house with a detached double garage. The house proposed was of two storeys, of a main block with projecting gable-end features to front and rear. The proposed dwelling would be about 11.5 metres wide, set 7 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring plot (Cromwell House) and about 2 metres from the boundary with Plot A (on the approved scheme this latter measurement was 3 m, this boundary had moved, but this had no material impact). The height to eaves would be about 5.2 metres and height to ridge of about 9 metres. Access was proposed via a new entrance from Second Drift, which would be shared with the dwelling on Plot A. The proposal differs from the approved scheme in that:

- a. The boundary fence with Plot A was different (1 metre different);
- b. There was a loft room with 2 rooflights however the height of the house was unchanged; and
- c. Solar panels were proposed.

The application site was part of a plot known as The Haven. The site had already been divided, with the rear part of the garden developed as a single dwelling. The front part of the site was shown as two plots known as plot A and plot B (subject of this application). The application site was comprised of an area of about 40 metres deep and 18 metres wide. The front section of the plot was comprised of an existing verge and hedge line, behind this would be the garage and shared access/turning area, then the house and garden. The site sloped in two directions.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the differences in the proposal to that which had previously been approved. Members were advised that the main issues for consideration were the principle of development, the impact on the character of the area and the impact on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. The recommendation was one of approval.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. Councillor David Over had submitted comments on the application stating that the proposal was a repeat of the original refused application and there was a lot of local opposition to the application.

A neighbour had also commented that the proposed solar panels would not be in keeping with the area however, the need to generate energy from renewable sources should be given significant weight. Members were also informed that the conditions attached to the previous proposal would also be attached to the current proposal, if Members were minded to grant the application the conditions would be updated to reflect the newly adopted Core Strategy. A previous condition had also been discharged for a landscaping scheme earlier on in the year therefore approval would encompass this discharged condition.

Councillor David Over, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- Councillor Over had recently been to a Parish Council meeting attended by a number of residents concerned about the proposals being undertaken in Second Drift
- Residents had found it difficult to put across any objections to the proposals as there was confusion about which policies were relevant at any one time
- The planning history started back in 2001, it was about time that it was sorted out
- The Village Design Statement implications held very limited weight
- There appeared to be a lack of knowledge about the village by both developers and Planning Officers
- Wothorpe was not close to a wide range of facilities, as stated in the committee report
- The road was a bridleway and Burghley estates had no legal obligation to look after a bridleway
- There would be an issue with flooding in the future if building commenced
- Good quality houses, which fitted in with Wothorpe, were required
- The idea of solar panels was excellent

Mr John Gibbison, on behalf of the applicant Hereward Homes, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- Flooding had occurred on Second Drift at the bottom of the road through lack of maintenance of a ditch and drain across the road. This had been addressed by simple maintenance
- The photo panels had been included in the design in order to achieve the latest Standard Assessment Procedure ratings, however as locals had objected other measures had been taken to achieve the building regulations
- Apologies were given with regards to the number of planning applications put in for the site
- It was hoped that the latest changes would be acceptable to the Committee

Following debate and questions to the Planning Officer regarding the additional windows in the roof, positive comments were made with regards to solar panels and a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application. The motion was carried by 8 votes, with 1 voting against.

RESOLVED: (8 for, 1 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The prior satisfactory completion of an obligation under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for a financial contribution to meet the infrastructure needs of the area
2. The conditions numbered C1 to C9 as detailed in the committee report
3. If the S106 had not been completed within 2 months of the date of this resolution without good cause, the Head of Planning Services be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason R1 as stated in the committee report

Reasons for decision:

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

- The site was within the settlement boundary
- A dwelling could be accommodated without unacceptable detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings
- A suitable level of amenity could be provided for residents, including access and parking
- The proposed dwelling would not affect the character of the area to an unacceptable degree

The proposal was therefore in accordance with Policies H16 and T10 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2005 (First Replacement) and Policies CS16 and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

5.5 11/00233/FUL – Revised proposals to include loft play room, of planning application 10/00975/FUL – Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of three-bed dwelling with detached garage, Plot A, The Haven, Wothorpe, Stamford

The proposed development was a three-bedroom house with a detached double garage. The house proposed was of two storeys, of a main block with projecting gable-end features to front and rear. The proposed dwelling would be about 10.5 metres wide, set 6 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring plot (Thomas House) and 2 metres from the indicative boundary with the plot on the other side (this boundary had moved slightly, but this had no material effect). The height to eaves would be about 5.2 metres and the height to the ridge about 8.8 metres (this was a slight reduction from the previous proposal). Access was proposed via a new entrance from Second Drift.

The application site was part of a plot known as The Haven. The site had already been divided, with the rear part of the garden to be developed as a single dwelling. The front part of the site was shown as two plots known as plot A (subject of the current application) and plot B (to the north-west). The application site was comprised of an area of about 40 metres deep and 18 metres wide at the front, narrowing to about 14.5 metres wide at the rear. The front section of the plot was comprised of an existing verge and hedge line, behind this would be the garage, then the house and garden. The site sloped in two directions.

The application initially included a garden room, and a side utility extension. These aspects were withdrawn on Officer advice.

The application also proposed photo-electric panels, these had been withdrawn from the proposal by the applicant.

The internal layout was changed from that originally approved in order to accommodate the staircase to the loft.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and gave an overview of the differences in the proposal to that which had previously been approved. Members were advised that the main issues for consideration were the principle of development, the impact on the character of the area and the impact on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. The recommendation was one of approval.

Members' attention was drawn to additional information contained within the update report. Further comments had been received from neighbours raising a number of additional issues in relation to the future use of the loft space, concerns about future applications for dormer windows, changes to the windows and a new door on the side facing Thomas House and proposed additions encroaching further on neighbouring properties.

Objections had also been made to some extensions to the property which had been part of the original application but withdrawn from the current proposal.

Members were advised that in the opinion of Planning Officers the impact of the internal layout change on neighbours would be minimal. There would be door on the side facing Thomas House instead of a kitchen window, however the site levels showed that the door would be set below the level of Thomas House, and given the existing boundary treatment there was unlikely to be any overlooking.

Councillor David Over, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee. In summary the concerns highlighted to the Committee included:

- The character of the area was important and the in keeping of the area was important
- It was about time the site was sorted
- Could Highways look at right turning traffic onto Kettering Highway? The traffic along the road during rush hour was substantial and dangerous
- Solar panels were welcomed once again
- There were no objections to a playroom in the loft, but what could happen to the room in the future?
- The residents of Second Drift's views should be taken into consideration

As a point of clarification, the Planning Officer highlighted that the application did not propose solar panels however the future occupier may add them under permitted development rights if they wished.

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

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. The conditions numbered C1 to C8 as detailed in the committee report

Reasons for decision:

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

- The site was within the settlement boundary
- A dwelling could be accommodated without unacceptable detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings
- A suitable level of amenity could be provided for residents, including access and parking
- The proposed dwelling would not affect the character of the area to an unacceptable degree

The proposal was therefore in accordance with Policies H16 and T10 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2005 (First Replacement) and Policies CS16 and CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

5.6 Provisional Tree Preservation Order Ref: 1_11 – Trees at Firdale Close, Peakirk

The trees (2 Maple, 3 Cherries, 3 Birch a Deodar and a Monkey Puzzle) were located on a small piece of open space adjacent to the B1443 Peakirk-Newborough Rd and the entrance to Firdale Close, Peakirk. The trees were all to the front of 1 Firdale Close. The front half of the site was unregistered land and the rear half under the ownership of 1 Firdale Close.

The trees were easily seen from the B1443 and it has been assessed that the trees were worthy of protection.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and outlined the proposal. Members were advised that two letters of objection had been raised to the preservation order detailing that the branches were too close to the telephone wires and affected sound quality, the branches overhung the pavement, the order would prohibit future tree works and the owners of some of the trees was unknown so maintenance may be an ongoing issue.

Members were advised that the trees offered the village significant amenity value and that as a group they were worthy of protection. The order would not prohibit future tree works, an application would need to be made to the planning department for works to be undertaken.

Following debate and questions to the Planning Officer regarding the number of trees in a relatively confined area, the type of trees which could have TPOs placed upon them, the growth of the trees, Members commented that the trees deserved protection and as environment capital tree preservation should be encouraged.

A motion was put forward and seconded prior to the completion of discussion, therefore the proposal was withdrawn to allow discussion to proceed.

Members further discussed attaching tree preservation orders to appropriate specimens for particular areas. The Legal Officer addressed the Committee and stated that the Tree Preservation Order did not necessarily need to stay in perpetuity and could be revisited in the future if necessary.

Following further brief debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to confirm the Tree Preservation Order. The motion was carried by 8 votes for and 1 voting against.

RESOLVED: (8 for, 1 against) to confirm the Tree Preservation Order, as per officer recommendation.

Reasons for decision:

It was the opinion of the Case Officer that the TPO be Confirmed for the following reasons:-

- There was the potential for the loss of the trees or inappropriate pruning that could shorten the life of the trees.
- The trees offered public visual amenity value and it was considered that the loss of the trees and or inappropriate pruning would be of detriment to the greater public and the landscape in this location.
- It was the opinion of the Case Officer that trees could provide 20 years + visual amenity value based on their current condition.

5.7 Provisional Tree Preservation Order Ref: 2_11 – Trees at Bergen House, Wothorpe

The trees were located in the gardens of Bergen House, 2nd Drift, Wothorpe. G1 (3 Oak), T1 (Oak) and T2 (Horse Chestnut) were located in the front garden whilst G2 (4 Willow) was located on the western boundary toward the middle of the garden.

All the trees provided landscape value as a group when viewed from the A43 – Kettering Road and the Public Footpath both on 1st Drift and to the east of 2nd Drift.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee and outlined the proposal. Members were advised that there had recently been a change in ownership of the land and whilst the previous owners had been happy to maintain the trees this could not be a certainty for the new owner. Members were also advised that there may be the possibility of development proposals coming forward on the site, therefore it was important to protect the trees prior to any development coming forward.

There had been an objection submitted to the proposal which highlighted specific objections against the oak and horse chestnut trees being contained within the TPO.

Members were further advised that one of the oak trees had a fork in it and was extremely bent over. The Tree Officer had therefore approved the removal of this tree from the proposed order but in his opinion the other trees still had significant life left in them and were not diseased to an unacceptable degree and they did have significant amenity value.

Following debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to confirm the Tree Preservation Order as modified to reduce the number of oaks included in the order from 3 to 2. The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to confirm the Tree Preservation Order application, as per officer recommendation.

Reasons for decision:

It was the opinion of the Case Officer that the TPO should be confirmed in a modified form (G1 being reduced from 3 Oaks to 2) for the following reasons –

- The trees offered public visual amenity value and it was considered that the loss would be of detriment to the greater public and the landscape in this location.
- It was the opinion of the Case Officer that the trees could provide 20 yrs + visual amenity value based on their current condition.
- One of the Oaks in G1 was unsuitable for protection due to its condition.

13.30 – 16.10
Chairman

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee
held at the Town Hall, Peterborough on 26 April 2011

Members Present:

Councillors – North (Chairman), Lowndes (Vice Chair) Harrington, Hiller, Lane, Todd and Winslade.

Officers Present:

Nick Harding, Group Manager, Development Management
Theresa Nicholl, Development Management Support Manager
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)
Carrie Denness, Principal Solicitor
Alex Daynes, Senior Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ash, Burton, Serluca and Thacker.

Councillor Winslade attended as a substitute.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Lowndes declared an interest in item 4.1 as she had called at the property before.

Councillor Todd declared an interest in item 4.1 as she was acquainted with the agent, Mr Branston.

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

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

4. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

The Chairman addressed the Committee and stated that a member of the public had requested permission to record the meeting on a digital recorder. Approval from the Committee was required as per the Council's Constitution and Members agreed to allow the recording.

4.1 10/01705/FUL - 90 Vere Road, Peterborough, PE1 3EA

Permission was sought to construct two extensions to the property at 90 Vere Road, Peterborough.

This application had arisen as a result of unauthorised works being reported to the Planning Compliance (enforcement) team. Work had already started to construct the rear extension without obtaining either Planning Permission or Building Regulations approval.

The purpose of this extension as stated on the plans was to create an enlarged kitchen and lounge extension measuring 7.3 metres deep x 6.0 metres wide. Taking account of an existing kitchen extension which would be incorporated into the new rear extension, the proposed floor space measured approximately 35.4 sq metres. The proposal would create an additional WC in place of the area currently occupied by the kitchen.

Subsequent communication with the applicant had revealed that the purpose of the rear extension was to be an annex for the applicant's disabled mother.

Members were advised that the revised application was acceptable to them except for the choice of material selected for the construction.

In response to questions from Councillor Hiller, the Planning Officer confirmed that some of the existing construction would need to be removed and that a render could cover the brickwork, but a matching brick to surrounding properties would be preferred. The use of render could be conditioned, as could the type of tiling used in order to match to those already used.

Following debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, subject to an amendment to conditions to state that brick be used rather than render and the tiles to be used are to be in keeping with those already used.

RESOLVED: (7 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendation subject to:

1. Conditions 1 and 2 as detailed in the Committee report
2. The amendment to Condition 2, stating that render be used and specifying the type of tiling

Reasons for decision:

Side Extension – The proposed side extension was considered acceptable as it would not have any adverse impact on the neighbouring properties or the character of the area and indeed was similar to many other properties in the area. The design had incorporated a number of finishing details from the original dwelling house which helped to integrate it. The front wall of the extension was also stepped back and the roof ridge lower, making the extension appear subservient to the original dwelling house.

Rear Extension – The proposed rear extension, whilst considered large, was acceptable. The design of the extension now incorporated a stepped side wall which took it away from the boundary line thereby reducing its impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

4.2 03/01171/RMP, 10/01440/MMFUL, 10/01441/MMFUL, 10/01442/MMFUL - Cooks Hole Quarry, Leicester Road, Thornhaugh, Peterborough

Councillor North addressed the committee and asked if permission would be given for the local Parish Council representative, Mr Witherington, to speak on this application. The committee agreed to this request.

Permission was sought for the updating of planning conditions (03/01171RMP), installation of weighbridge, weighbridge and site offices, mess room, fuel store, equipment store, processing plant, substation and other ancillary facilities (10/01440/MMFUL), the extension of quarry area for the winning and working of minerals (limestone, sand and ironstone) (10/01441/MMFUL) and the construction of alternative means of access and wheel wash facility (10/01442/MMFUL).

The planning officer addressed the meeting and gave an overview of the applications. Compensation claims could ensue if the application was amended to remove less material from the quarry. Visual, highways and biodiversity impacts were all contained and found acceptable in the application. It was proposed to use the existing entrance to Thornhaugh 1 to access the site. The applications were considered acceptable.

Mr Martin Witherington, a representative of Thornhaugh Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. The main concern was Condition 16 regarding the rights of way and access to the site. The Thornhaugh 1 quarry was due to end in approximately 3 years but the new Cooks Hole Quarry was to continue for 15 years. Therefore, should separate access not be arranged for Cook's Hole instead of using the access for the soon to end Thornhaugh 1? The restriction on agricultural only use for the Cook's Hole access could be removed to enable this to become the access point to the re-opened quarry which could enable the installation of a bus stop on the road for nearby residents.

The applicant and agent, Drs Campbell and Wilson respectively, spoke on the application highlighting the aspects of the proposals to return the land to agriculture and natural landscape and the proposed process of quarrying the site i.e. quarry one zone before beginning another and landscape each zone as quarrying finishes. A second access point had been considered but the current Thornhaugh 1 access point was found to be the most suitable due to its distance from bends in the road and visibility accessing and leaving the site and its current ability to cope with access for large vehicles.

In response to questions Members were advised that the proposed weighbridge and wheel wash facilities would be in use and separate from the Thornhaugh 1 site equipment as that equipment was not on the access route to the Cooks Hole quarry site and only a quarter to a third of the site would look to be operational at any one time.

The Transport Officer, Jez Tuttle, advised Members that improvements were needed if the Cook's Hole access was to be used instead of the existing and proposed Thornhaugh 1 access and that an increase in traffic was not envisaged.

A motion was put forward and seconded that officer recommendations be approved for the application 03/01171/RMP.

RESOLVED: (7 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendations.

A motion was put forward and seconded that officer recommendations be approved for the application 10/01440/MMFUL.

RESOLVED: (7 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendations.

A motion was put forward and seconded that officer recommendations be approved for the application 10/01441/MMFUL.


RESOLVED: (7 for, 0 against) to approve the application, as per officer recommendations.

A motion was put forward and seconded that officer recommendations be approved for the application 10/01442/MMFUL.

RESOLVED: (6 for, 0 against, 1 abstention) to approve the application, as per officer recommendations.

13.30 – 15.00
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



LOCATION PLAN 09/01369/OUT

Land to the East of Alkallon Hill Flitton Parkway

Scale NTS

Date 12/5/2011

Name MKB


Department

Planning Services



PCC GIS

PETERBOROUGH
CITY COUNCIL



Dry Leas (Nene Pkwy)
Hoylake Drive (Fletton Pkwy)

HAMPTON

Beeby's Lakes

YAXLEY

ORTON GOLDHAY

Orton Pit SAC/SSSI

Two Pond Coppice / Chambers
Dole Woodland

Old Great North Road

ORTON SOUTHGATE

A1(M)

HADDON

20

09/01369/OUT: DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 65 HECTARES OF EMPLOYMENT LAND (B1, B2 AND B8 INCLUDING SAFEGUARDING OF A SITE FOR A HOUSEHOLD RECYCLING CENTRE/ PARK AND RIDE). ASSOCIATED HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE (INCLUDING PEDESTRIAN, BRIDLEWAY AND CYCLE ROUTES), AND CAR PARKING FOR ALL USES. FOUL AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE NETWORKS (INCLUDING SUDS AND LAKES) AT LAND TO THE EAST OF ALWALTON HILL, FLETON PARKWAY, PETERBOROUGH

VALID: 2 DECEMBER 2009
APPLICANT: ROXHILL (PETERBOROUGH) LIMITED
AGENT: DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES and DAVID SHAW PLANNING
REFERRED BY: HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES
REASON: MAJOR STRATEGIC APPLICATION
DEPARTURE: NO

CASE OFFICERS: VICKY HURRELL AND LEE COLLINS
TELEPHONE: 453480 AND 454421
E-MAIL: victoria.hurrell@peterborough.gov.uk and lee.Collins@peterborough.gov.uk

1 SUMMARY/OUTLINE OF THE MAIN ISSUES

The main considerations are:

- Principle of Development
- Highway Impacts
- Impact on Visual Amenity
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Ecological Impacts
- Landscape Impacts
- Drainage and Flood Risk
- Energy Efficiency

The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services recommends that the application is APPROVED subject to conditions, the completion of a S106 Agreement and the passing of an Appropriate Assessment.

2 PLANNING POLICY

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

Development Plan Policies

Adopted Core Strategy

The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council on 23 February 2011. The following key policies are relevant to this application:-

CS3: Spatial Strategy for Employment Location
CS5: Urban Extensions
CS10: Environment Capital
CS11: Renewable Energy
CS12: Infrastructure
CS13: Development Contributions to Infrastructure Provision
CS14: Transport
CS16: Urban Design and the Public Realm

- CS17: The Historic Environment
- CS19: Open space and Green infrastructure
- CS20: Landscape Character
- CS21: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
- CS22: Flood Risk

The Adopted Core Strategy replaces a number of the 'saved' policies in the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement). A list of the replaced policies is set out in Appendix A of the Core Strategy. The following policies remain relevant:

The Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement)

- T2: Development Affecting Footpaths and Public Rights of Way
- T4: Development Affecting the Cycleway Network
- T8: Connections to Existing Highway Network
- DA12: Light Pollution
- LNE9: Landscaping Implications of Development Proposals
- LNE10: Detailed Elements of Landscaping Schemes
- LNE12: Hedgerows
- LNE18: Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphologic Sites
- U2: Sustainable Surface Water Drainage

The Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)

The Site Allocations DPD identifies land for different types of development to deliver the overall level of planned growth as identified in the Core Strategy. The document also sets out a number of policies that relate to safeguarding areas. It has recently been subject to public consultation (between 11 February and 24 March 2011). Following a review of the representations received a submission version of the document has been prepared and submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for public examination later this year.

Policy SA9 sets out that 65 hectares of land at Great Haddon is allocated for employment uses in accordance with the Core Strategy policy CS3. The boundaries of the allocation are marked on the proposals map.

Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste DPDs

The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy has been examined by the Planning Inspectorate and found to be sound. It was approved for adoption by Full Council on 13 April 2011. It will not, however, be adopted until the 19 July 2011 after it has been put to members of Cambridgeshire County Council. The following policies are relevant considerations:

- CS14: The Scale of Waste Management Provision
- CS16: House Holder Recycling Centres - Peterborough is identified as a location
- CS26: Mineral Safeguarding Areas
- CS28: Waste Minimisation, Re-Use and Resource Recovery

The Site Allocations DPD has been the subject of public consultation and is due to be examined by the Inspector between 28 June and 22 July 2011. The Great Haddon area is identified under policies W1AF and W8BF as a potential location for waste management facilities.

Regional Guidance

Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East of England (May 2008)

In June 2009 the Coalition Government announced its intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies as part of its localism agenda. This abolition was subsequently successfully challenged through the Courts. The RSS therefore current remains part of the Development Plan.

The RSS for the East of England sets the overall housing and growth targets for the region. Policy CS3 identifies Peterborough as a key centre for development and change. These targets are reflected in the Adopted Core Strategy.

National Guidance

The following national planning guidance issued by the Government is relevant to the determination of this application:-

Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: 'Delivering Sustainable Development' January 2005

PPS 4: 'Economic Growth' December 2009

PPS 5: 'Planning for the Historic Environment' March 2010

PPS 9: 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation' August 2009

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13: 'Transport' Updated January 2011

PPS 22: 'Renewable Energy' August 2004

PPS 23: 'Planning and Pollution Control' November 2004

PPG 24: 'Planning and Noise' October 2004

PPS 25: 'Development and Flood Risk' March 2010

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations – April 2010

From 6 April 2010 it will be unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account when determining a planning application for a development, or any part of a development, that is capable of being charged CIL, whether there is a local CIL in operation or not, if the obligation does not meet all of the following tests:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

ODPM Circular 05/2005 "Planning Obligations". Amongst other factors, the Secretary of State's policy requires planning obligations to be sought only where they meet the following tests:

- i) relevant to planning;
- ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;
- iii) directly related to the proposed development; (in the Tesco/Witney case the House of Lords held that the planning obligation must at least have minimal connection with the development);
- iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and
- v) reasonable in all other respects.

In addition Circular 05/2005 states the following principles:

The use of planning obligations must be governed by the fundamental principle that **planning permission may not be bought or sold**. It is therefore not legitimate for unacceptable development to be permitted because of benefits or inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Similarly, planning obligations should never be used purely as a means of securing for the local community a share in the profits of development.

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 - Appropriate Assessment

This requires a "Competent Authority", in this case the Local Planning Authority (LPA), to make an Appropriate Assessment of the implications of the development on Orton Pit Nature Reserve, against the nature reserve's conservation objectives. The LPA can only issue planning permission after having ascertained that the development would not adversely affect the integrity of the nature reserve (see section 7e below).

3 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site, which is 87.42 hectares in size, is currently in agricultural use. It is bounded to the north by Fletton Parkway (A1139) beyond which is the township of Orton. To the west is land at Alwalton Hill beyond which lies the A1(M). Located on the west side of the A1(M) is the village of Haddon.

To the east is Orton Pit Special Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI)/ Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a site of international ecological importance and beyond this the existing development of Hampton.

Immediately south of the application site is a wooded area known as "Two Pond Coppice" and "Chambers Dole", and beyond it the site of the Great Haddon Core Area where it is proposed to locate a housing development with associated infrastructure (see section 4 and planning application 09/01368/OUT). The woodland is within private ownership and does not form part of the proposed Great Haddon development. To the south west of the site is the old Great North Road along which there are a number of individual houses. To the south of the core area is the A15 and the villages of Yaxley and Norman Cross.

Bridleway Number 1 which is part of the Green Wheel runs through the length of the application site from the Old Great North Road to junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway. Connected to the bridleway at the north of the site is a footpath/cycleway which leads to a bridge over the Fletton Parkway and the township of Orton.

The site is relatively flat although there is some change in levels across it from the Fletton Parkway. There are a number of existing trees, hedges and drainage channels associated with the agricultural use of the land and 3 small ponds are also located within the site.

4 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

Two outline planning applications, with all matters reversed for detailed consideration at a later stage, were submitted in December 2009 for a new urban extension known as Great Haddon.

This application is for the employment site. The main elements of the proposal can be summarised as follows:-

- The provision of 65 hectares for employment land;
- A total floor area of 324 500 square metres (Gross External Area), comprising a mix of B1 (business, including offices - 15% or 48 675 square metres (sq.m)), B2 (general industry - 40% or 129 800 sq.m.) and B8 (warehouse and distribution - 45% or 146 025 sq.m);
- Maximum building heights of 15 metres, except tranche E7 with a maximum height of 17 metres along with associated ground works;
- A new site access road from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway. Also proposed is a new vehicular connection with the Old Great North Road to the south west;
- Diversion of the northern section of Bridleway Number 1 (to facilitate the new access road connection with junction 1 of Fletton Parkway);
- Safeguarding of 1.5 hectares (for a 6 years period of time) for a Householder Recycling Centre or Park and Ride;
- A buffer zone of 30 metres with Orton Pit SSSI/SAC with the buildings within the adjacent plots to be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the boundary of the site;
- Measures to control unauthorised access into Orton Pit SSSI/SAC;
- Areas of ecological mitigation (areas OS5 and OS2) and habitat enhancement;
- Associated attenuations ponds and surface water drainage;
- Associated foul drainage infrastructure; and
- Provision of a private bus service for employees.

Based on a generic 'industry standard', the applicant has predicted the amount and type of development proposed could create in the order of 8,500 jobs.

The application is supported by the following documentation:

- Design and Access Statement;
- Planning Statement;
- Environmental Statement;
- Access Management Strategy for Orton Pit SSSI/SAC; and
- Transport Assessment and Travel Plan

Under separate consideration is an application for the Great Haddon core area. Outline planning permission is sought for a maximum of 5350 dwellings, with three new primary schools and one secondary school, a district centre and two local centres, open space and drainage.

With the exception of the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan the supporting information submitted relates to both applications. They were originally to be progressed in tandem but in December 2010 the employment site was sold to Roxhill (Peterborough) Limited.

The core area application is the subject on going negotiations and will be reported separately to members at a later date.

The adjacent site of Alwalton Hill is also under the control of the applicant, Roxhill (Peterborough) Limited. The site has detailed planning consent (reference 09/00725/REM) for some 172 000 square metres of B8 floorspace (warehousing and distribution) with ancillary offices, in five 15 metre high buildings, a new access road from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway including an associated diversion of the bridleway, internal access roads, drainage and associated landscaping. This existing permission is a material consideration in the determination of the current application although the scheme has not yet been implemented.

The agent acting on behalf of the applicant has confirmed that the phasing of the development, including the Alwalton Hill site, will be market led. Parcels of land will be developed as and when the demand arises. Roxhill will, however, manage the site, retaining control over the strategic areas of open space, landscaping, drainage and highways infrastructure. It will also co-ordinate the building materials so that the development clearly shows the Roxhill 'brand'.

A full application has also been made for the new access road through the employment land from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway to a point some three quarters of the way through the site (reference 10/00320/FUL). The proposal includes a connection to adjoining land at Alwalton Hill. This application has been progressed in parallel with the outline planning application subject to this report. As the principle of a new access road in the location proposed would be established under this outline planning application, should planning permission be granted, the application for the road would thereafter be determined under delegated powers.

5 PLANNING HISTORY

Application Number	Description	Date	Decision
09/01368/OUT	Development of an urban extension comprising up to 5350 residential dwellings; a district centre (with up to 9200 square metres (99031 sq.ft) retail floor space) and two neighbourhood centres (with up to 2300 square metres (24758 sq.ft) retail floor space) comprising district/neighbourhood retail (A1-A5); community and health (C2, D1); leisure(D2); residential (C3) and commercial (B1) uses. Provision for education facilities (sites for three primary and one secondary school); sports and recreational facilities; site for 5 gypsy and traveller pitches; a range of strategic open spaces including new landscaping , woodland and allotments; and cemetery provision. Associated highway infrastructure (including pedestrian, bridleway and cycle routes), public transport infrastructure and car parking for all uses. Utilities and renewable energy infrastructure; foul and surface water drainage networks (including SuDS and lakes) at Land To The North Of Norman Cross, East Of The A1(M) And West Of London Road (A15), Peterborough		Still under consideration
10/00320/FUL	Construction of a new access from Junction 1 of Fletton Parkway, part dual part single carriageway to serve the Great Haddon Employment Area and the consented Alwalton Hill development including: the provision of a		Still under consideration

	new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian link between the New Road and Junction 1; the partial diversion of bridleway No 1 to allow the retention of the route running parallel to the new road along its length; surface water drainage; and details of structural landscaping		
09/00725/REM	Details of siting, design and external appearance of the warehouse buildings (5 individual units with maximum of 172,000 sq metres floor space) with ancillary offices, car parking and service yards and the landscaping of the site including strategic landscaping, new woodland lakes and ponds the provision of public art (Reserved Matters to application 06/00346/OUT) at Land At Alwalton Hill East Of The A1 And South Of Fletton Parkway Peterborough	16.10.2009	Approved
06/00346/OUT	Development of warehouse and distribution units (max of 5 individual units with a max of 172,000 square metres floorspace) with ancillary office space, together with access road, car parking, service yards, new woodland, landscaping, lake, ponds and screen bunding Land At Alwalton Hill East Of The A1 And South Of Fletton Parkway, Peterborough	08.09.2006	Approved

6 CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Work on the application has been on-going, and City Council officers have been working closely with a number of statutory/technical consultees to resolve the technical issues. Notwithstanding this on going work, two separate rounds of more formal consultation have been undertaken. The first consultation period commenced on the 8 December 2010 and lasted for 6 weeks to the 19 January 2011. The statutory requirement is 3 weeks. Representations received after the deadline continued to be accepted and taken into consideration. The second round of consultation ran from the 23 February to the 25 March 2011. As before, representations received after the deadline have continued to be accepted. Any representations received after the despatch of this report will be tabled to Members in the Update Report.

The comments set out below are the final responses received from both public and technical/statutory consultees, and reflect the negotiation which has take place with the applicant and consultees. Both the core area and employment area applications were consulted on at the same time. As a result, a number of the responses received cover both applications. Only the comments which relate to the employment application are reported below. Comments which relate to the core area will be dealt with when that application comes to the Committee for a decision.

The representations are discussed under the relevant topic headings in Section 7 of this report.

INTERNAL

Local Highway Authority – No objections to the development subject to the imposition of conditions. The Travel Plan is considered to be acceptable and should be secured as part of the S106 Agreement (see section 7b).

Rights of Way Officer- No objections to the proposed diversion of the bridleway in principle subject to the agreement of a suitable alternative route. A separate diversion order outside of the planning system will need to be made. The diverted route will need to be in place before the existing bridleway is closed. (see section 7b).

Environmental Engineering Team (Drainage) – No comments/observations.

Landscape Officer – No objections in principle. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment will need to be submitted to allow an assessment of the impact of the development on retained trees within the site and those adjoining it, as each tranche comes forward. Tree protection measures will also be required during the construction period. Conditions recommended (see section 7f).

Landscape Architect- No comments received in relation to the second period of consultation. Originally commented as follows:-

The proposal is generally well thought out and considered.

Wildlife Officer- Considers the revised proposals to be acceptable subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions. Defers final comment on the Access Management Strategy to Natural England (see section 7e).

Archaeological Officer – No objections in principle. Further assessment including trial trenching and a watching brief should be secured via a planning condition (see section 7i).

Minerals and Waste Officer- No objections in principle. Notes the details in the Environmental Statement in terms of minerals and waste extraction. As an approved minerals safeguarding area the proposal should be reviewed in the context of policy CS26 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD. Adequate land should be set aside for the Householder Recycling Centre at a nominal fee (see section 7i).

Environmental Health Pollution Control Section- Recommends conditions be imposed in respect of contaminated land, noise and odour. Has advised that a further assessment of air quality in relation to Hoylake Drive is required (see section 7d).

Opportunity Peterborough- No comments received.

Waste Management- A site should be retained for a Householder Recycling Centre at a nominal fee (see section 7i).

EXTERNAL

Anglian Water- Has not responded in detail to the second consultation but has confirmed the connection point for foul drainage remains acceptable. It responded in more detail to the original consultation. This confirmed Anglian Water's duty to provide water and wastewater infrastructure for new employment developments under the Water Industry Act 1991. It did not raise any objection to the development but requested the imposition of a condition requiring the approval of a detailed drainage strategy along with informatives in relation to foul drainage, surface water drainage, wastewater treatment and trade effluent. No objections to the wording of the proposed foul drainage condition (see section 7g).

Local Access Forum- Concerned about the dominance of vehicle movements rather than sustainable travel which will damage Peterborough's Environment Capital aspirations (see section 7b).

Police Architectural Liaison Officer- No objections to this outline proposal.

Highways Agency- No objections but directs that the conditions which it has specified be attached to any planning permission which may be granted (see section 7b).

Natural England- Following negotiation it has no objection to the development subject to conditions as specified (see Section 7e).

Natural Networks Partnership- The Natural Networks Partnership (NNP) no longer responds to planning applications and therefore an updated consultation response has not been submitted. Individual responses have instead been submitted by its members. The NNP objected to the development after the initial consultation raising concerns about the potential adverse effects on Orton Pit SSSI/SAC and the exclusion of Chambers Dole woodland from the development area (see section 7e and f).

Environment Agency- Has removed its objection on the grounds of flood risk subject to the imposition of a condition and satisfactory completion of the S106 in respect of long term management/maintenance of the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs). No objections on the grounds of foul drainage

subject to a financial contribution towards the Counter Drain improvements being secured through the S106 Agreement (see section 7g).

Middle Level Commissioners- Response received in respect of the initial consultation only. This raised no objections. It noted that the proposal would provide sustainable water level/flood risk management systems. It should not, therefore, detrimentally affect the Commissioners system (see section 7g).

Cambridgeshire County Council- Response received in March 2010 set out a holding objection to the application primarily on the basis of transport issues. It also commented, in light of the piecemeal nature of the information, that a revised application should be submitted.

Following the submission of additional information Highways officers have concluded that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the County's road network. Officers therefore recommend that the County's previous holding objection be removed subject to the provision of a number of mitigation measures to be secured via conditions/ S106 measures (see section 7b).

Officers have also advised that there should be sufficient measures to demonstrate the mitigation of the risk of flooding to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency and the City Council (see section 7g).

Note- The above response removing the holding objection has not yet been to the County's Cabinet and is not, therefore, endorsed by members at this stage.

Huntingdonshire District Council- Raised concerns in respect of the following issues:-

- The impact of the development in surrounding villages within Huntingdonshire especially Haddon;
- Impact on the highway network;
- HGVs from the proposed employment area should only access and egress the site from Fletton Parkway;
- Further consideration should be given to the phasing of the development in the current economic climate to allow for the retention of prime agricultural land and development of existing brownfield sites before building on greenfield sites ;
- Careful consideration should be given to water attenuation measures. This should be based on a Sustainable Urban Drainage System across the area;
- Need to negotiate an appropriate S106 agreement to manage the impact on the highway network and to ensure timely delivery of major infrastructure (see sections 7a, b, and g).

An updated highways consultation response has subsequently been received from officers. It has not been endorsed by members at this stage. Officers do not object to the employment development in terms of traffic impacts upon the district but remain concerned that the proposal does not provide for more sustainable means of travel. The development being brought forward before the core area would be wholly car dependent and would not provide opportunities for access by other means of transport until a later stage. The Travel Plan will have difficulty in reducing car dependence. Neither is it clear how HDC residents would access the site.

Government Office for the East of England- No comments.

Orton Waterville Parish Council- No response received

Hampton Parish Council- Concerned about the potential impact of additional traffic on the local roads which are already congested with local Hampton traffic if the new Great Haddon/Fletton Parkway link road is not completed prior to the construction of the planned residential and industrial units (see Section 7b).

Yaxley Parish Council- Objects to the application. Concerned about the height of the buildings within the employment area. They will interrupt the visual approach to Peterborough. Object to the traffic and transport routes to the employment area from the Great North Road (see sections 7 b and c).

Support the comments made by the Norman Cross Action Group.

Farcet Parish Council – Response does not make any specific comments on the employment application. The Council is a member of the Norman Cross Action Group.

Norman Cross Action Group (NXAG), Folksworth and Washingley Parish Council, Stilton Parish Council and the Haddon and Local Residents Action Group- Object to the application. Separate letters of objection have been submitted but contain much of the same text. They have, therefore, been summarised together rather than being repeated. Both the Parish Councils and the Residents Action Group are members of the Norman Cross Action Group and fully support the representations that the group has made. The NXAG formed following the first round of public consultation.

Note: the Group is made up of representatives from Yaxley Parish Council; Stilton Parish Council; Haddon Parish Meeting; Farcet Parish Meeting; Folksworth & Washingley Parish Council; Alwalton Parish Council; Chesterton Parish Council; District Councillors; and Cambridgeshire County Councillors (Councillor Matt McQuire and Nick Guyatt (also a District Councillor))-

- The application as currently presented does not fulfil Peterborough City Council's key ambitions. The City Council has a strategic ambition to build high class mixed use development that will encourage industry to relocate to Peterborough. The Council has publically expressed its intention to provide high skilled and professional employment opportunities to match that of Cambridge. This site will reinforce the view that Peterborough provides low skilled jobs for its residents.
- Highly skilled people will continue to choose to live in the surrounding market towns.
- The plans for the employment development are unsound given the rural location of the site, its dislocation from the centre of Peterborough and any major transport interchange. It therefore represents a significant overdevelopment of the site.
- Lack of a master plan and an ill conceived set of plans that do not produce a coherent picture.
- The development is on prime agricultural land when there are many acres of brownfield land left in the city to be used which already has planning consent but has remained dormant.
- The employment land is surplus to long term requirements in light of the hundreds of square metres of vacant employment space throughout the city and surrounding areas.
- The treatment of the boundary of tranche E7 appears to leave no tree belt or separation between the A1M other than the embankment. In general, the A1M may be characterised as a motorway running through open countryside. Therefore object to the lack of trees and hedges along the boundary with the A1(M). This scale of development redefines Peterborough as a primarily warehouse and industrial centre sprawling into the countryside.
- Specifically object to the height of the buildings. The site is on a hill that rolls up and away from the A1M and the buildings will dominate the 'skyline'. The effect of this visual approach to Peterborough needs to be softened as does the view in from the Millennium Green Wheel. On these plans the Green Wheel will simply be a trip from town to an industrial site.
- Objects to the traffic and transport arrangements. Specifically object to the employment site access onto the Old Great North Road. All HGV's, vans etc should only enter and leave the site via the Parkway system. Cars should use a link via the suggested outer ring road, or the Parkway system.
- No signage (e.g. company names, logos or 'To Let' boards) should be erected along the A1M or the Old Great North Road.
- There should be no access/egress during the construction phase of construction vehicles of any type (including cars) via the A15 or Old Great North Road. The hours of working on and deliveries to the site should be restricted to 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 9am to 1pm Saturday. There shall be no Sunday or Bank Holiday working. This is to reduce noise impact on residents.
- Concerned at the confusing range of plans and maps presented at recent public consultation.
- The timescale for consideration of the proposals was completely inadequate given the extent of the documentation.
- Folksworth and Washingley Parish Council/NXAG do not wish the village of Folksworth to be part of any further urbanisation.
- Believe that not enough work has been done on the visual aspect of the colour of the proposed buildings and the difficulty of colour choice given the requirement to cater for two distinct views into the development.

- Any conditions approved should also be approved by Huntingdonshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and Yaxley PC as a minimum.
 - Object to the use of the name Great Haddon.
- (see sections 7a, b, c, d, i and j)

Note: A copy of the full representation from the NXAG is appended for information in Appendix 1.

Alwalton Parish Council- Objects to the application. The Parish Council has many concerns about the development all of which are embodied in the letter from the Norman Cross Action Group (see above and Appendix 1). The Council endorses the letter and also places strong emphasis on the matter of projected traffic flow, especially from the A1 southbound through Alwalton (see section 7a, b, c, d, i and j).

Haddon Parish Council- No separate letter of objection received but is part of the Norman Cross Action Group (see section 7a, b, c, d, i and j).

Chesterton Parish Council- No separate letter of objection received but is part of the Norman Cross Action Group (see section 7a, b, c, d, i and j).

The Ramblers Association- No response received.

The British Horse Society- No objections in principle. Green grid routes should be formalised on the definitive map at bridleway or restrictive byway status. The Society requests that any cycleway routes be upgraded by bridleway status (see section 7b).

Cambridgeshire Bat Group- No response received.

Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)- Objects to the proposal. Concerned about the changing nature of the Old Great North Road, especially the creation of a vehicular link from the employment land as a result of the development. It has become a valuable leisure route for families, dog walkers, cyclists etc giving access to the Green Wheel. Any downgrading of this route would be contrary to the Local Transport Plan. Concerned about the height of the proposed warehouses particularly especially those adjacent to the A1M. Provides a dominating view to users to the A1(M). Would not advertise Peterborough's aspirations as environment capital. The buildings should be designed to include easily seen green measures i.e. green roofs and passive solar heating (see section 7b).

East of England Development Agency- This body no longer exists.

East of England Regional Assembly- This body no longer exists and could not, therefore, be reconsulted. It was consulted following the original submission of the application at which point it noted the link to the emerging Core Strategy but expressed some concerns regarding the transport implications of the development and potential impacts upon Orton Pit SAC. Subject to these matters being addressed it considered that the proposal would accord with the growth identified in the RSS.

Plantlife- No response received.

Buglife- No response received.

Froglife- No comments received.

The British Herpetological Society- No comments received.

Note: Herpetology is concerned with the study of reptiles and amphibians.

Herpetological Conservation Trust- No comments received.

Wildlife Trust- The Access Management Strategy presents a comprehensive approach to addressing the potential adverse impacts on Orton Pit SSSI/SAC. Particularly welcome the additional resources for wardening and education. It is essential that all the elements in the Access Management Strategy, Biodiversity Strategy and Surface Water Management Strategy are implemented in full and the

developer enters into a legally binding agreement. Concerns regarding pollution of Beeby's lake west have been addressed via the details of the long term management and maintenance arrangements. Aquatic plant monitoring will need to be conditioned.

However, concerned about the potential culminative effects arising from increased nitrogen deposition caused by increased traffic levels on Fletton Parkway. The Peterborough Local Transport Plan predicts higher levels of nitrogen which Stoneworts (aquatic invertebrates found in Orton Pit SSSI/SAC) are sensitive to. Have not seen anything in the application to demonstrate that there will not be an adverse impact from the development, therefore object to the proposal (see section 7e).

RSPB- No response received.

British Telecom- No comments received.

EDF Energy- No comments received.

E.ON UK PLC- No comments received.

National Grid- No comments received.

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue- Adequate provision should be made via a S106 agreement or condition for the provision of fire hydrants (see section 7i).

Peterborough Environment City Trust- No response received in relation to the second consultation. Commented as follows originally:-

Of the view that the proposal includes positives aspects but concerned that a number of these are stated as being 'subject to S106 negotiations'. (see section 7h)

Greater Peterborough Partnership- No response received in relation to the second consultation. Commented as follows originally:-

Concerned that there is an over reliance on the S106 to deliver the aims of the Sustainability Statement (see section 7h).

Peterborough Civic Society- No response received in relation to in relation to the second consultation. Comments as follows originally:-

The master plan is well considered but further thought needs to be given to the 'place' which would be created to give it a distinct identity. Disappointed that the scheme does not include a Park and Ride. Links to other settlements are poor. Disappointed that the energy proposals are not firmer/clearer (see sections 7h and i).

Sustrans- Object to the development. Do not believe that the proposal is compatible with the Core Strategy and should, therefore be rejected. Consider the proposal to be contrary to policy CS14. The application fails to address sustainable transport seriously, in particular there needs to be clear high quality routes leading to crossing points. A cycle route is needed through the employment area. A new route should also be created along the SAC buffer. Cycle parking needs to match City Council standards, car parking should be kept to a minimum, the whole area should be 20mph. Concerned about the impact on the national cycleway network, particularly through Haddon village. Support the objections made by Peterborough Cycling Forum. New development in this area needs to seek to minimise use of the car via a range of measures (see section 7b).

Peterborough Cycle Forum- Object to the application as it fails to address cycling seriously in light of the Council's Environment Capital policy. The Transport Assessment gives very low projections for cycle use which are not accepted. Expect higher levels of cycling to be achieved.

There is a need for the creation of high quality cycle links. The associated documentation shows poor connectivity. There is no direct link to the cycle link to the bridge over Fletton Parkway. A cycle route

should be created along the buffer strip between Orton Pit and the employment area. There should be 20 mph speed limits on the roads. Cycle parking guidance should be used as a minimum requirement (see section 7b).

Norman Cross Area Road Safety Committee- Detailed comments relate to the A15 and are not considered relevant to this application.

NEIGHBOURS

With regard to the first round of public consultation, 1541 individual letters were sent out to properties surrounding the Great Haddon site. In addition, 24 site notices were displayed. Two public events were also held, one at Yaxley (on 7 January 2010 from 2pm to 8pm) which some 60 people attended and the other at Serpentine Green (on 12 January 2010 from 2pm to 8pm) attended by some 150 people.

A summary of all the representations submitted relating to this application following the first round of public consultation is set out in Appendix 2 attached to this report.

With regard to the second round of public consultation 7423 letters were sent out. This included letters to all residents of Yaxley. 46 site notices were displayed. A press release was provided to the ET. In addition, two public consultation events were held again, one at Serpentine Green on 28 February and one in Yaxley on 1 March 2011. To advertise these events a note was added to all of the public consultation letters, 5000 flyers were sent out with the Yaxley Gazette and an article was placed in the Silton news letter. The events were also advertised on the "Your Hampton" website.

In total, approximately, 180 people attended the Serpentine Green event and 250 the Yaxley event.

934 letters have been received in respect of the second round of consultation. Of these 792 are a copy of a standard letter albeit additional text has been added in a number of instances. 132 letters relate to both the core and employment applications. 10 letters relate solely to this application.

The following is a summary of all the comments received in respect of this application only. For ease of reference these have been divided into topic areas.

Principle of development (see section 7a)

- Welcome the principle of development
- Brownfield land should be developed before greenfield land in line with Central Government policies
- Development should not be allowed on greenbelt
- Overdevelopment
- Size and scale of the development is too large
- Employment uses proposed will generate low skilled jobs not high skilled as needed
- Will there be accountability measures or fines imposed on the developer if jobs are not created?
- No need for new industrial/employment units while so many are vacant throughout the City
- No demand for business premises in the City due to current economic climate
- Loss of arable land for food production
- Why can the development not go to the North East or West of the City?

Highways implications (see section 7b)

- Insufficient capacity on the existing road network to accommodate the development, particularly on Old Great North Road which is substandard for the proposed usage
- Serious highways issues on the Old Great North Road as a result of the proposed link through the Employment Area from Fletton Parkway – junctions and blind bends will become more dangerous as a result of increased traffic
- Proposed road link through the Employment Area from Fletton Parkway to Old Great North Road will create a 'rat run'
- Significant increase in traffic through smaller villages as a result of 'rat-running'
- No need has been established for a road link between the Employment Area and Old Great North Road

- Under application reference 09/00725/REM (the Alwalton Hill development) and in 1990 residents were assured by Planning Services that no link would be allowed onto Old Great North Road
- Industrial access from Old Great North Road will require improvement to J16 of A1(M)
- Inadequate provision for commercial traffic on Fletton Parkway
- Inadequate entry/exits points for commercial traffic to the employment area
- Increased congestion on the A1 as a result of the proposed signals
- The application does not provide any calculations of existing and proposed traffic volumes
- Construction traffic routes will harm the safety of users of the Green Wheel
- Will result in damage to the surrounding roads i.e. pot holes from increased lorry usage
- No integrated Transport Plan for the development as a whole (employment and residential)
- Lack of sustainable travel solutions
- Buses should not be the only method of public transport – rail and tram systems are absent from the proposal
- Disruption to public footpaths, rights of way, bridleways and cycle routes
- Traffic calming on Old Great North Road is unwanted by local residents
- Combined impact of Great Haddon and Alwalton Hill permission has not been taken into consideration
- No signage should be allowed fronting the A1(M)

Visual Amenity (see section 7c)

- Height of the employment buildings will dominate the landscape
- 17m high buildings should not be located in Area E7 and would be more appropriate in Areas E4 or E6
- Development will result in employment sprawl into the countryside
- Harmful visual impact on the 'gateway' to Peterborough – will give the wrong impression of the City as an industrial area
- Combined impact of Great Haddon and Alwalton Hill permission has not been taken into consideration
- There should be a landscape buffer of at least 75m around the entire development (including the Employment Area)

Residential Amenity (see section 7d)

- Impact of the proposal upon existing residents has been overlooked – increased levels of noise, dirt, petrol fumes and other pollution
- The Old Great North Road currently acts as a noise buffer for existing residents – this will be lost as a result of noise generated by increased traffic
- Impact on TV reception
- Loss of quality of life for neighbouring residents
- Construction hours of delivery and working within development sites should be restricted to 8am to 6pm Mon-Fri and 9am to 1pm on Saturdays to prevent disturbance to local residents
- Harmful impact upon safety of children playing as a result of more traffic using village roads

Ecology (see section 7e)

- Displacement and loss of habitat for wildlife

Drainage and Flood Risk (see section 7g)

- Limited Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) proposed for the Employment Area

Energy and sustainability (see sections 7b and h)

- Development as a whole (employment and residential) is unsustainable

Other considerations (see section 7j)

- Documents and drawings are unclear as to the true intentions of the scheme, therefore the application is unsound
- Insufficient consultation

- Concern that Peterborough Councillors will be making a decision affecting Huntingdonshire District Council residents
- A referendum should be held with a binding result
- Design of the whole scheme does not accord with Central and Local Government Policy (including Core Strategy)
- The Human Rights of existing local residents will be impinged

In addition, during the course of the Great Haddon applications two smaller separate consultations were carried out in respect of the detailed proposal for the new access road (planning application 10/00320/FUL). The comments received which are relevant to the determination of this application are set out in Appendix 3 at the end of this report.

ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE'S

Comments received from Shalish Vara MP in connection with the first round of public consultation are set out in Appendix 2 at the end of report.

A letter was received under the road application (10/00320/FUL) raising a concern from one of his constituents that there maybe underground military communication cables within the vicinity of one of the proposed balancing ponds. This matter is dealt with in this report as the balancing pond referred to is within this application (see section 7j).

No formal representations have been received from Peterborough City Council Councillors.

Councillor John Watt, a Huntingdonshire District Councillor, has sent in an individual letter of objection stating that there should be no vehicular link with the Old Great North Road in order to protect Haddon village residents, and that the application be deferred until approximately 75% of the Hampton Leys brownfield land is developed.

Councillor Watt fully endorses the Yaxley and Stilton Parish Council and NXAG representations and a number of other representations made by surrounding Parish Councils and that originally received from Cambridgeshire County Council and Huntingdonshire District Council (see sections 7a and b).

Councillor Maddie Banerjee, a Huntingdonshire District Councillor, submitted an individual representation. Considers that people living on the Old Great North Road and in Haddon should have a buffer between their houses and the new development.

7 REASONING

a) The Principle of Development

Policy Context

As set out under Section 2 above, the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) currently remains part of the Development Plan. It sets out a target for job creation for the region during the plan period 2001-2021. Peterborough has been set a minimum target of 20 000 new jobs.

The Adopted Core Strategy reflects the overall targets set in the RSS and sets out a strategic vision for the city until 2026. It outlines the overall spatial strategy for employment growth recognising that urban extensions will be required to achieve the RSS target. It allocates 65 hectares of employment land at Great Haddon (policies CS3 and CS5 refer).

The Site Allocations DPD also includes the urban extension of Great Haddon. Although the DPD is not yet approved (the examination is likely to be later this year), given the RSS targets and the allocation of the Great Haddon employment land within the Core Strategy, it is considered that there is sufficient policy basis to support the principle of development.

Development of brownfield sites and the loss of agricultural/greenfield land

A number of objectors to the development have raised concerns about the loss of agricultural land, including impact on food production, and the development of greenfield land stating that this site should not come forward until other brownfield sites within the city have been built out. The issues around the loss of agricultural land and the development of greenfield sites were considered as part of the evidence

base for the Core Strategy and found to be acceptable. The issue of a phased approach to development (i.e. brownfield land to be built out first) was also considered during the Core Strategy process and rejected.

In addition, it is not within the remit of officers to decline to deal with or to recommend the refusal of a planning application on the basis that land elsewhere in the city remains vacant. Each planning application has to be considered on its own merits and it would not be lawful to impose a condition or a S106 clause seeking to prevent a development from being built out until such time as other sites have been completed. The current application cannot, therefore, be resisted on these grounds.

It has been questioned why the development is located here and not elsewhere in the city. The Core Strategy sets out the overall growth strategy and the evidence base for it assessed the options as to where this should be located. It concluded that the allocation of 65 hectares of employment land in this location was appropriate.

Some objectors have referred to development on greenbelt land. It should be noted that Peterborough does not have a greenbelt. Under the Local Plan a number of green wedges were designated, the purposes of which is to separate areas of development. The application site is not a designated green wedge, nor will it encroach upon any.

Job creation

A number of objectors including the Norman Cross Action Group have raised concerns that this development would not deliver the quality of jobs that Peterborough is seeking to encourage; rather it will result in the delivery of low skilled 'blue collar' jobs.

The planning system cannot in its own right deliver jobs whether these be high quality or 'blue collar'. Rather, as the Core Strategy acknowledges, the most important contribution which it can make towards any job creation is to ensure that sufficient land is available to employers in the right locations and at the right sizes. The Core Strategy establishes the strategic approach to employment land provision within the city and this includes the allocation of land at Great Haddon.

Approval of this application would, therefore, give the city a more robust land basis upon which to attract potential employers and to respond to changing economic conditions/market needs. The range of uses proposed (i.e. B1, B2 and B8) would also keep future job options for the site open. It will then be for the market to determine which end users/companies choose to occupy the development and therefore the nature of the jobs created.

It has been suggested that fines should be paid by the applicant if the number of job referred to in the supporting Environmental Statement are not created. This cannot be done under the planning system.

Concern has been raised that the development would not help the city to grow in the right way. This has been partly covered above. Furthermore, the overall strategy for the growth the city was determined through the Core Strategy process.

Over development

Concerns have been raised by objectors that the proposal would result in over development of the site. However, the amount of development proposed is in accordance with the Adopted Core Strategy and as such is acceptable in principle. A condition is recommended which imposes a cap on the overall amount of development to 324 500 sq.m (gross external floor area). Each individual parcel will need to be the subject to a separate reserved matters submission which will consider the details of the layout.

b) Highways Impacts

Background

The application is supported by a substantial amount of technical modelling information. This is summarised in the Transport Assessment and associated appendices. A separate Framework Travel Plan has also been produced.

The modelling has been undertaken using the City Council's own transport model (the Peterborough Transport Model or PTM) and assesses the predicted traffic impacts of the development on the

surrounding highway network in 2026, when the development is built out in its entirety. Included within the base model is development already committed, such as Alwalton Hill and Hampton, in order that the cumulative impacts of committed development and the proposed development are assessed in an integrated way. Certain aspects of the scheme have also been assessed using other more detailed modelling tools and through the safety audit process.

The application site is solely within the Peterborough unitary area as is Fletton Parkway to the north. The Highways Agency has control over the A1(M) including junction 17 (the strategic network) which links to Fletton Parkway. Cambridgeshire County Council has control over the A605 which connects on the west side of Junction 17, the Old Great North Road and the A15 which lies to the south of the site. The A15 is within the boundary of the administrative area covered by Huntingdonshire District Council.

Highways officers from Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC), Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) and the Highways Agency have been involved throughout the application process since submission in December 2009 and have worked closely with Peterborough City Council officers.

The predicted impacts of the development on each part of the highway network are set out below.

Key Impacts

1. Impact on Peterborough's Highway Network

(a) New Access Road to the Development

The employment area would be served by a new access from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway. The detailed design of this road is the subject of a separate application (reference 10/00320/FUL) which has been progressed in parallel with this outline scheme. The new road will serve both the Great Haddon employment area and the consented scheme at Alwalton Hill.

The new access road will result in a requirement to divert a section of the existing bridleway (part of the Green Wheel route) which runs through the site. The Council's Rights of Way Officer has not raised any objections to this in principle and has been involved in detailed discussions under the road application regarding the form and alignment of the diverted route. Notwithstanding any planning permission which may be granted, the applicant will need to go through a formal diversion process under separate legislation. This will include a requirement to maintain a right of way available for use during the construction of the road and until the realigned route is available to ensure connectivity is maintained.

The individual employment tranches will be served by additional access roads off the main spine road. The location of these roads will be determined by the requirements of the future site occupiers as these become known, and will be the subject to detailed reserved matters applications in their own right.

A concern has been raised that there are insufficient entry/exit points to/from the development onto the surrounding highway network. Highway officers have advised that the access/egress arrangements are suitable and acceptable.

(b) Impact on Junction 1 of Fletton Parkway

In order to accommodate the predicted traffic flows the applicant is proposing the signalisation of three arms of the junction 1 roundabout. Signals would be located on the new access road into the development, and the on/off slips of the Parkway. This approach has been agreed in principle with highways officers.

The timing of the new signals would need to be set so that the flow of traffic exiting the development during the evening peak period (5-6pm) is managed in order to prevent an unacceptable level of congestion on junction 1 or on the surrounding network including the Parkway slip roads and the Parkway itself. It is predicted that this approach would result in queuing back within the development area as traffic would effectively be held there. This would not normally be advocated but as the access road serves the development alone it is considered by Highway officers to be an acceptable approach. This issue has been discussed with the applicant who accepts queuing within their site at peak times, as a potential implication of the junction design.

A condition requiring the approval of a detailed scheme of works to junction 1, based upon the principles which have been assessed at this outline stage, is recommended. The condition requires that these works be carried out prior to the first occupation of any development within the site unless an alternative trigger point, based on modelling analysis, is subsequently agreed with the Local Planning Authority. If a later trigger point is agreed, some works (slipway widening) would still be required prior to commencement to be consistent with the approach taken in respect of the consented Alwalton Hill scheme.

(c) Impact on Fletton Parkway

The section of Fletton Parkway between junction 2 and junction 17 of the A1(M), particularly that between junctions 1 and 2 currently operates close to its capacity during the morning peak period (8-9am). In order to accommodate the level of housing and employment growth set out in the Adopted Core Strategy improvement/widening works between these junctions will be necessary. The need for these works was identified in the Council's Infrastructure Development Programme (IDP) which forms part of the Core Strategy evidence base. The IDP lists these works as medium term projects with funding from developers. The applicant has agreed to pay a contribution towards the works, proportional to their share of the overall level of growth. This contribution will be secured via the S106 Agreement.

The modelling information shows that drivers travelling westbound (i.e. towards the A1(M)) between junction 3 and 1 of the Parkway currently experience delays to their journey in the region of 1 and a half minutes during the morning peak hour. With all the development in place, the transport modelling predicts that until the widening/improvement works are implemented, drivers would experience an additional delay in the region of 2 and a half minutes, thereby resulting in a total delay of some 4 minutes on this section of the Parkway.

Officers considered that the length of this delay and its impact upon the city's transport network to be unacceptable. The Highways Agency raised additional concerns about the potential knock on impacts onto its strategic network at junction 17.

In order to address these concerns the applicant's transport engineers have proposed a cap on development limiting the amount of floor space which can be built out to no more than 24 338 sq.m. of the B1 floor space (which equates to 50% of the total B1 floor space proposed), 86 534 sq.m. of the B2 (which equates to 66% of the total B2 floorspace) and 146 025 sq.m. of the B8 (which equates to 100% the total B8 floor space) before the improvement works between junction 17 and junction 2 of the Fletton Parkway have to be carried out.

As a result of this cap on development the modelling information predicts that drivers travelling westbound during the morning peak would experience an additional delay to their journey in the region of a minute (so two and a half minutes in total).

In light of the wider objectives for the city in terms of growth and job creation opportunities which the development of the site would create, this delay is considered by officers' to be within acceptable limits and an acceptable impact of the development. A condition limiting the development to the above thresholds is therefore recommended.

In the interim period the Council will need to look at funding sources and use pooled money from the S106 Planning Obligation Implementation Scheme (POIS) 'pot' in order to generate the capital needed to deliver the schemes. If the works are completed before the caps are reached there would be no requirement for the development to cease. Should any funding become available, the Council would look to bring forward the works at an earlier date.

2. *Impact on the Strategic Network (A1(M) and Junction 17)*

Following detailed technical discussion and assessment of the information the Highways Agency has removed its Holding Direction which prevented the City Council from determining the application. In order to protect the function and movement of traffic on its strategic network the Agency has directed that two conditions be imposed upon any planning permission which may be granted.

The first of these conditions requires the approval and implementation of a detailed scheme of works to junction 17 comprising signalisation of the junction (including the introduction of signals on the A605 approach road), based upon the draft scheme which has been assessed at this outline stage. The detailed scheme will need to be agreed with the Highways Agency and implemented prior to the first occupation of any unit within the Great Haddon employment area, unless an alternative trigger point is subsequently agreed with the Highway Agency. This is consistent with the condition imposed upon the consented Alwalton Hill scheme.

The second condition which was referred to in section 1(c) above places a cap on development limiting the amount of floor space which can be built out until such time as the improvement/widening works between junction 17 of the A1(M) and junction 2 of the Fletton Parkway have been implemented.

The Highways Agency has not raised any objections regarding the impact of the development on Junction 16 of the A1 (M).

Subject to the imposition of the above conditions, the impact of the development on the strategic road network is considered to be acceptable.

3. Impact of Cambridgeshire County Council's Network

(a) Impact on the A605

Highways officers from Cambridgeshire County Council have advised that in their view the proposed signalisation of junction 17 and the A605 approach road would be sufficient to mitigate the impact of development related traffic on their network both before and after the improvement/widening works to the Fletton Parkway have been implemented. The County has requested that the works to the junction be secured via a planning condition. This is the same condition as requested by the Highways Agency and is set out in section 9 below.

The A605 runs east west and crosses the border into Northamptonshire a short distance beyond the turn off for Elton village. Given this, Highways officers at Northamptonshire County Council have been consulted twice by Council Highway officers and have raised no objections.

(b) Impact of the A15 (London Road).

The traffic modelling predicts that the proposed development would not result in any significant increase in traffic along the A15 or the B1091 (also known as 'Broadway', the main road through Yaxley). The impact of the development upon this part of their network is therefore considered by Highway officers to be acceptable.

(c) The Old Great North Road/ A15 Junction

This application also seeks to establish the principle of a new vehicular link from the employment site to the Old Great North Road. This would effectively create a through route from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway to the A15 to the south. This link would not be for use by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) which would be physically prevented from accessing the Old Great North Road by a 'pinch point' or narrowing. HGVs would enter and exit the employment site via Fletton Parkway both during the construction and operational phases.

Highway officers from Cambridgeshire County Council have not raised any objection to the principle of this link, subject to the inclusion of physical measures to prohibit HGVs access onto the Old Great North Road.

The link would need to be the subject of a future detailed application but it is recommended that a condition be imposed upon any outline planning permission setting out, in principle, the requirement for access control measures and the trigger point for its provision. Following discussion with the Highways Agency the same trigger point as that being used for the widening works to Fletton Parkway is recommended. The Highways Agency has advised that without the provision of this link during the build out of the employment development it would have concerns about potential impacts on its strategy network especially junction 17 of the A1(M). The condition relates to the latest point when the link could be provided. Should the applicant choose to do so the link could be implemented at an earlier date.

Notwithstanding any agreement which is reached in respect of this application, the issue will need to be reviewed and reassessed as part of the core area application. This is likely to result in the need for an alternative trigger point.

The modelling originally undertaken for the development was based on the provision of a new signal controlled junction on the Great North Road/A15 and associated widening works between this section of the A15 and junction 16 of the A1(M). Additional technical analysis has subsequently been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that works to this junction including the associated widening are not required to support this application. This analysis has been reviewed and accepted by Cambridgeshire County Council Highway officers. No conditions in respect of this junction are therefore recommended.

4. Floor Space Limits

The transport implications of the development have been assessed on the basis of a total floor area of some 324 500 sq.m allowing for 15% B1, 40% B2 and 45% B8. It is, therefore, recommended that a condition be imposed on any planning permission which maybe granted limiting the total amount and mix of floorspace to the above. It is, however, suggested that flexibility be built into the condition to allow for more B8 floor space (ie more than 45% of the total floor area) subject to it satisfactorily being demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact upon the surrounding highway network. It is also recommended that a condition be imposed removing permitted development rights for future extensions. This is to ensure that the impacts of any additional floor space within the development can be properly assessed to ensure that there would be no unacceptably adverse impact on the surrounding highway network.

Sustainable Travel

(i) Public Transport Provision.

It was originally proposed to serve the site via a fixed bus service linking it with the Ortons and the core area. This proposal was discussed with the Council's Passenger Transport Team and Stagecoach but was not considered to be a viable option. Neither was it considered to be the most effective solution for achieving modal shifts given the final site occupiers are likely include companies which work shifts.

Following discussions with Roxhill a private bus service is now proposed. This approach is supported by the Council's Passenger Transport Team.

The provision of a private bus service will be a requirement of the S106 Agreement. This will require the provision of services at key times including shift change over times (provisionally 6am, 2pm and 10pm). The exact routes will be agreed with the Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services as developments come forward, once staff have been recruited. This is to ensure that the services are targeted to the most appropriate locations within the city in order that they can achieve the highest level of modal shift.

It has been agreed that a charge can be made for the services but that this should be no more than 50% of the commercial rate for the first six months when travel patterns are established and 80% of the commercial rate thereafter.

It will be the responsibility of each occupier to set up a bus service although as the site develops there will be the opportunity to take a more strategic approach within the site as a whole and for joint services between a number of occupiers to be run. The S106 will require that the services run for a period of at least 5 years after completion of the development.

This approach reflects that agreed as part of the Alwalton Hill development and is now common practice.

It has been suggested that buses should not be the only method of public transport and that rail and trams systems should be considered. Given the location of the site this would not be realistic or viable (physically or financially) and has not, therefore, been pursued with the applicant.

(ii) Walking and Cycling

The proposed development would be linked to the Ortons via the existing footway/cycleway over the Fletton Parkway. The applicant has agreed to pay a contribution towards improvement works to this link as part of the S106 Agreement.

It is not possible to link the development directly to Hampton to the east due to the presence of Orton Pit which is a site of international ecological importance and, therefore, a development constraint. Should planning permission subsequently be granted for the core area, a new cycle link with Hampton would be created.

The bridleway through the site will retain the existing connection to the Old Great North Road. If planning permission is subsequently granted for the core area a new footpath/cycle link between the two sites would also come forward.

As the internal access arrangements for each parcel of land come forward, further consideration will be given to connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists. Each development will also be expected to include provision for cycle parking.

(iii) Travel Plan

In order to support the development the applicant has prepared a Travel Plan. This sets out the overall strategy for reducing the number of single occupancy car trips to the site and includes the appointment of an overall Travel Plan Coordinator. Roxhill will lead the delivery and implementation of the Framework Travel Plan, and they will have overall responsibility for the relevant obligations. Each future occupier will either need to sign up to the Travel Plan (where the size of their development is below certain thresholds) or produce their own detailed Travel Plans.

The Travel Plan sets out a strategy for review and monitoring so that the targets can be reassessed and evaluated during the build out the development. It also includes a section on remedial measures, including a financial payment, which would be used to instigate new measures and to enhance existing measures should the Travel Plan not achieve its targets.

The content of the Framework Travel Plan has been agreed by Peterborough Highway officers. The Highways Agency is of the view that the Travel Plan is acceptable, given the nature of the development, subject to regular review and strengthening of the targets therein. It has advised that it would wish to have a seat on the Travel Plan Steering Group (which would be made up of key stakeholders) referred to therein.

Some concerns have been raised by Cambridgeshire County Council officers that the Travel Plan is not ambitious enough. These concerns are noted but it is considered that a pragmatic approach is required given the location of the site. It is also considered that the plan has sufficiently robust monitoring and review mechanisms to allow targets to be tightened as the development progresses along with scope for the introduction of remedial measures. Neither will it be the only Travel Plan produced for the site. As Peterborough officers consider the Travel Plan to be acceptable and there are no objections from the Highways Agency it is recommended that it be approved as part of the S106 Agreement.

Construction Traffic

It is recommended that a condition be imposed upon any planning permission which may be granted requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan for the development of each parcel as it comes forward. This will ensure that other users of the site, including people using the bridleway are protected. All construction access to the site is to be via the new road off junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway and not via the Old Great North Road. It is recommended that this is specifically referred to in the planning condition for the avoidance of doubt.

Other Transport Matters

(i) Objections to the Proposed Old Great North Road Link

A number of objections have been received in relation to the principle of this proposed link.

It is considered that the measures set out above would be sufficient to prevent HGVs from accessing the Great North Road from the employment site. Some concerns have been raised that lorries will be directed to the employment site via the Great North Road by their sat navs. These concerns are noted and there is the possibility that this will happen from time to time. However, this would occur whether there is a physical link or not. It is also likely the occupiers will have regular contractors who will know the route to the site. The potential for this to happen does not make the proposal unacceptable.

Some objectors have stated that there should be no signage etc. on the Old Great North Road or A15 which might encourage access via this route. These comments are noted and it is agreed that consideration will need to be given to this in the future to ensure that it is appropriate. Signage is, however, a separate matter which cannot be controlled under any permission which may be granted here.

Some objectors have stated that they have previously been told by Council officers that no link through to the Great North Road would ever be created. Officers currently involved with the scheme have never given that commitment. Any comments which may have been made in the past cannot be verified. Notwithstanding this, each application also has to be considered on its own merits and the principle of creating a link is considered to be acceptable.

Some objectors have suggested that there is no need for this link or have put forward alternative road alignments to link the employment area with the core, which avoid a connection with the Great North Road. However, the Local Planning Authority must consider the proposal that is put before it. This has been assessed and is considered to be acceptable.

A number of objectors have raised concerns that the proposal would adversely impact upon the character of the Old Great North Road. It is accepted that as a result of the Great Haddon development as a whole the nature of this road would change. However, it is a significant piece of existing infrastructure which is under utilised. Only some 2% of the total capacity of the road is currently taken up. With the Great Haddon development (i.e. both the employment development and the core area) as a whole the traffic modelling predicts that its use will increase to some 70% of its capacity. With the employment development alone usage would increase to some 10% during the morning peak, and less (under 5%) in the evening peak. It is appropriate to make use of existing infrastructure which is suitable for the purpose proposed and the traffic volumes would remain well within its total capacity. The fact that the Old Great North Road will remain within its capacity has also been acknowledged by Highway officers from Cambridgeshire County Council.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the potential impact for 'rat running' through Haddon village to the west of the site on the other side of the A1M. Once the Old Great North Road curves underneath the A1M it becomes a low key single track road which ultimately connects to the A605 at Elton. These concerns are noted and have been reviewed by Highway officers. They are of the view, however, that in reality it would not be an attractive route for rat running given the nature of the road and route to the A605. Secondly, many people working within the employment area are most likely going to live in Peterborough. As such this route would represent a substantial diversion which would add a number of miles to their journey.

Concerns have also been raised that junctions and blind bends would become more dangerous as a result of increased traffic. No highway safety concerns have been raised by either Peterborough or Cambridgeshire Highways officers or by the Highways Agency.

(ii) Comments from Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC)

HDC officers do not object to the development in terms of traffic impacts upon roads within the district but have raised concerns that the proposal does not provide for more sustainable means of travel, particularly for HDC residents. The issues around sustainable travel have been set out above and the proposal is considered to be acceptable. It is not considered appropriate at this stage to make further provision for HDC residents to access the site via more sustainable means of travel. Should it become clear in due course that a number of residents are working at the site then consideration could be given to a private bus service provision as allowed for through the S106 Agreement.

(iii) Dry Leas

A petition with 44 signatures was received following the first round of public consultation raising concerns that development at Great Haddon would increase traffic on the A1260 Nene Parkway to the detriment of residents who consider that their amenity is already affected by traffic noise and pollution. In addition, it asks that the City Council look at ways of reducing traffic noise nuisance from the Parkway between junction 31 and 32.

The traffic flows associated with this application have been analysed by Highway officers who have advised that the traffic modelling predicts an increase in traffic volumes of between 4-5%. In traffic terms such an increase is considered by Highway officers to be minimal. The Council's Environmental Health Pollution Control Section has advised that this increase in traffic flows would not alter noise levels to any measurable degree.

The request that the Council actively look for ways to mitigate road noise is noted, but this needs to be reviewed separately outside the scope of this application given it is perceived by the public as an existing issue. In view of officer's conclusions about traffic levels from the development it is not considered reasonable to ask the applicant to contribute to any mitigation measures in this location.

(iv) Response from the Cycle Forum

The Cycle Forum has indicated that the role of cycling is under assessed in the Transport Assessment. This approach is considered appropriate for assessment purposes, in order that a 'worst case scenario' in terms of the traffic impacts is assumed.

With regards to connectivity it has to be recognised that there are a number of constraints in this instance, particularly the presence of Orton Pit nature reserve, the integrity of which has to be protected. This site does link to the footpath over Fletton Parkway but a cycle route cannot be created along the buffer zone to Orton Pit due to the need to restrict access in this area (see section e below). In this instance these ecological considerations must be the overriding factor.

Road speeds within the employment area will be considered further and set appropriately as detailed applications come forward.

(v) Representation from Sustrans

Sustrans is objecting to the application on the grounds that it does not consider the proposal to be compatible with policy CS14 of the Core Strategy in that it fails to address sustainable transport seriously.

Policy CS14 is an overarching transport policy the key elements of which are around reducing the need to travel especially by private car; delivering a sustainable transport package capable of supporting a bigger and better Peterborough; supporting the city's environmental capital objectives; improved accessibility to facilities for residents and accident reduction.

It is considered that the measures which have been set out above in terms of the provision of a private bus service, the role of the Travel Plan and its associated measures meet the requirements of policy CS14. The ecological constraints to the site in terms of the provision of additional cycle routes have also been acknowledged and in this instance outweigh the benefits which would be achieved via additional cycle routes.

(vi) British Horse Society Comments

The comment from the British Horse Society that the green grid routes should be formalised on the definitive map as bridleways or restrictive byways is noted but this is a matter for consideration outside of the planning system. The Society's comment that cycleway routes be upgraded to bridleway status is noted. In this instance the existing bridleway will be retained so it is considered that adequate provision is made. Given the nature of the development it would not be appropriate to have additional bridleways through the site.

(vii) Comments from CPRE and the Local Access Forum

Both organisations have raised concerns about the impact of the development on the Old Great North Road, particularly for cyclists and walkers, many of whom use it as a leisure route. For the reasons set out it is considered appropriate to utilise this existing piece of infrastructure as part of the development. Walkers/cyclists using this route are unlikely to be significantly affected by the employment development and should the core area come forward in the future alternatives routes for walking and cycling would be created.

(viii) Comments from Hampton Parish Council

Concerns have been raised by Hampton Parish Council about traffic impacts on Hampton before the new road to link the Fletton Parkway and the A15 is in place. The trigger point for this piece of infrastructure will be controlled via any planning permission for the core area or through the trigger point in the original S106 Agreement for Hampton (it is referred to as the Western Peripheral Road) should the core area not come forward. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that the employment development itself is likely to have any significant traffic impacts on Hampton given the relative location of the two areas.

(ix) Other Representations

- Concerns have been raised that the development would result in more damage to the surrounding road network i.e. potholes. This is not a planning consideration.
- A concern has been raised that the development would be harmful to children playing on village roads. No highway safety concerns have been raised in this regard.

c) Impact on Visual Amenity

Changing the Character of the Area

The application site is not classed as being of 'best landscape' (namely an area of particular amenity value to be given special protection from the adverse impacts of development) under the Adopted Local Plan. It is accepted if planning permission is granted for this development, that the character of the area which is currently rural would be permanently changed. The quantum of development allocated in the Adopted Core Strategy and applied for under this application, namely 65 hectares of employment land, could not realistically be delivered without such an impact. This change to the existing rural character of the area has also been previously accepted with the granting of planning permission for the Alwalton Hill scheme.

Some concerns have been raised regarding the kind of entrance which would be created into the city as a result of the development and that its scale would redefine Peterborough primarily as a warehouse and industrial centre sprawling into the countryside. Whilst the character of the area would be changed, a strategic decision has been taken to develop this area (including Alwalton Hill) through the Core Strategy process in order to improve the variety and type of employment land available within the city and therefore its ability to compete for jobs and attract businesses. The final end users are not yet known and will be determined on the basis of market needs, so the development has the potential to deliver a range of jobs. It is not accepted that the development would result in sprawl in the open countryside as the site is located adjacent to the built up area of the Ortons. The consented scheme at Alwalton Hill and the A1M beyond form a distinct boundary to the site and therefore a clear division with the open countryside beyond. Land to the south is also allocated in the Core Strategy as part of the urban extension of Great Haddon.

Impact upon the Visual Amenity of the Surrounding Area

The proposal is in outline only so the precise size, number and design of the individual buildings is not yet known. This will be determined by the requirements of the future occupiers and each building will be the subject of a detailed application. Any permission which is granted here will, however, establish the building heights.

Permission is sought for a maximum building height of 15 metres except on tranche E7 to the south west where the building height is 17 metres. The applicant has stated that a higher building is required here to accommodate the requirements of a potential occupier but that the whole building is unlikely to be this high.

Associated with the development would be earth works to individual tranches to level these out. These works are likely to result in levels being increased to highest existing point within a tranche. In the case of tranche E7, this is likely to result in levels being increased in the region of 2 metres across the southern part of the development area.

A condition limiting the building heights is recommended on any permission, with the heights to be measured from the highest existing ground levels within any tranche.

The consented scheme at Alwalton Hill is for 5 buildings with a maximum height of 15 metres. As part of the Environmental Statement supporting the application a visual assessment of the impact of these buildings heights has been carried out.

(i) From the A1(M) and Haddon

It is acknowledged that there would be views of the buildings from the A1(M) given their height and the topography of the area. As Alwalton Hill is a consented scheme it is appropriate to consider the visual impact of the Great Haddon development in the context of this development. The Great Haddon site for the most part lies further east than Alwalton Hill so it is these buildings that would be most prominent from the A1(M). The Alwalton Hill scheme includes a landscape buffer running along the length of the development which will soften views to the site as it matures. As such, the visual impact of the application has been minimised.

If Great Haddon is built out first then the buildings there would be more prominent in the short term but they would be located further away from the motorway. Given the wider context it is not considered appropriate for all the development tranches to the west of the site (i.e. those closest to the A1(M)) to provide substantial landscape buffers as this would result in unnecessary duplication of this feature and impact upon the developable area. Notwithstanding this, the existing woodland at Alwalton Hill would have some mitigating impact.

The landscape master plan for the scheme shows that tranche E7, the only part of the Great Haddon development to directly adjoin the A1M, would have a buffer zone approximately 15 metres in width. This approach is consistent with the consented scheme at Alwalton Hill and therefore considered to be acceptable. A condition requiring the inclusion of the buffer is recommended on any permission for the avoidance of doubt.

It has been suggested that the employment area should have a buffer zone of 75 metres all around it. This is not considered to be necessary or practical given the impact which this would have on the allocation.

Permission is sought for a higher building on this tranche (17 metres as opposed to 15 metres) but it is not considered that it would be unduly noticeable to users of the A1(M).

There would also be some views of the Great Haddon buildings from Haddon village, further to the west. The nearest house is approximately 200 west of the A1(M) (some 340 metres from the site itself), and the village itself some 400 metres. As indicated above, the Great Haddon buildings would largely be screened by the Alwalton site and tranche E7 would have a landscape buffer. At these distances it is not considered that a higher building on tranche E7 would appear unduly prominent or dominant. In any case, it is considered that the consented Alwalton Hill scheme would have a greater impact on existing views from Haddon village. It should be noted that under the planning system there is no right to a view.

(ii) From the South

The nearest neighbouring residential property to the south of the development is located approximately 120 metres away. O & H Properties Ltd, part of the Consortium which has applied for the development of the core area, is the owner of this property and has confirmed that it has no objections to this application. It is acknowledged that the development would have an impact upon the outlook of this property but in view of the fact that it is within the core application area this impact is considered to be acceptable.

There would be some views of the site from along the Great North Road including the residential properties at the northern end which are located approximately 340 metres from the southern end of tranche E7. As acknowledged above, the development would change the character of the area. The

visual impact of the development from the south is, therefore, considered to be acceptable. Although a higher building is proposed on the southern most tranche it is not considered that this building would appear overly prominent or dominant compared to the buildings which would surround it. A 17 metre height is, therefore, acceptable.

Existing landscaping within the area would also help mitigate views of the site, particularly from the existing residential properties. In the longer term, should planning permission be granted for the core area a new area of open space would be developed between the nearest properties on the Great North Road and tranche E7 which would include new woodland planting. There is also an expectation that the individual development tranches will include opportunities for landscaping proposals in their own right, so depending upon the final design for tranche E7 the visual impact maybe further mitigated.

There maybe some views of the employment development from the A15 but given the topography, existing vegetation and distance, it is considered that these would be very limited.

(iii) Other Views

Given the topography of the area, some views of the development are likely from Hampton to the east. However, in light of the separation distance of some 700 metres, and the presence of Orton Pit between them, the visual impacts are considered to be acceptable.

Some views are also likely of the northern part of the site from the adjacent township of Orton. However, given that Orton is separated from the site by the Fletton Parkway which forms a distinctive physical barrier and contains mature landscaping, the visual impacts are considered to be acceptable.

Building Colour

A concern has been raised that not enough work has been done in respect of the colour of the buildings. Roxhill has confirmed that it intends to retain overall control of the development site, and wants the scheme to have a recognised 'brand', part of which will be a consistent colour scheme. This intention is noted and further consideration will need to be given to materials at the reserved matters stage to ensure that they are appropriate and that whole site is co-ordinated. Further analysis is not, however, considered necessary at this stage to determine the outline application.

d) Residential Amenity

Concerns have been raised that the proposed development would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residents. The issues raised in relation to transport have been covered under section (b) and visual amenity under section (c). This section therefore focuses on other potential impacts upon residential amenity.

Noise

An initial Noise Assessment has been submitted with the application. However, at this stage without knowledge of the final end users the potential noise impacts cannot be assessed completely.

Therefore, in order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents officers in the Council's Pollution Control Section have recommended that a condition be imposed specifying a noise level for each development parcel for night time and daytime which should not be exceeded at the nearest noise sensitive properties unless it can be demonstrated that a higher noise level would not have an adverse impact. This flexibility is in recognition of the fact that certain parts of the development would be less noise sensitive and also because some buildings may act as buffers for others.

A concern has been raised that additional traffic on the Old Great North Road would adversely affect the amenity of residents as this road currently functions as a buffer to the A1(M). No concerns have been raised by the Council's Pollution Control Section. It has also been asked whether the applicant is going to provide a new acoustic fence along the A1(M). The applicant has not been asked to do so. If there are issues with the adequacy of the existing fencing this is a matter for the Highway Agency. It has not raised any concerns in relation to this application.

Representations have been received which state that existing noise levels for surrounding properties should not alter as a result of the development. This issue has been assessed by the Council's

Environmental Health Section which has put forward the condition to protect amenity. Levels may change from the existing but would continue to be within acceptable limits.

Odour

Until the final occupiers are known the potential odour impacts cannot be properly assessed. In order to protect residential amenity it is recommended that a condition be imposed upon any permission requiring the submission of an odour assessment as part of the detailed reserved matters applications unless officers agree that such an assessment is not necessary because of the nature of the use.

Construction Impacts

It is also recommended that a condition be imposed requiring the submission and approval of a 'Construction Management Plan' for each development tranche. This would cover matters such as the hours of working, hours of delivery, measures to minimise noise from construction activity and to control dust. As set out under section (b) above, all construction traffic would be routed via junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway.

Operational Hours

It has been suggested that the operational hours of the development should be limited to 8am-6pm Monday to Friday and 9am to 1pm on Saturdays. This is not considered to be appropriate given the location of the site and the nature of the use for which it has been allocated. Subject to the imposition of a condition in respect of noise levels it is considered that the development could operate for longer hours without adverse impact upon residential amenity.

Air Quality

The supporting Environmental Statement covers the issue of air quality and concludes that there would be no adverse impact upon air quality within the vicinity of the site. Notwithstanding this, a concern has been raised by the Council's Pollution Control Section that the development could have an adverse impact upon the air quality at Hoylake Drive, a small residential development located adjacent to junction 3 of the Fletton Parkway and the B1091 in Stanground.

Pollution Control Officers are concerned that air quality in this location has been adversely affected on a piecemeal basis through a number of consented developments as a result of which the Council may have to declare an Air Quality Management Area (under European legislation). This would be the first Management Area in the city declared because of nitrogen dioxide. (Note- the only other Air Quality Management Area is to the east of the city caused by sulphur dioxide from brick works located outside of the Peterborough administrative area). Should one be declared this would mean that the Council would need to prepare an 'Air Quality Action Plan' setting out the measures which would be put in place to improve air quality and would have to monitor this closely. The plan would need to be approved by the Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra).

Although not within the scope of the Environmental Statement, in light of the concerns which have been raised, the applicant has agreed to carry out a further assessment to identify what impact, if any, this development may have upon air quality at Hoylake Drive. The results of this assessment and any associated planning conditions will be tabled to members in the Update Report. It should be noted, however, that if an impact is identified the development could not be held solely accountable as the impact would be culminative and associated with the overall growth of the city. It would not, therefore, be reasonable to resist this application on these grounds nor to require the applicant to do more than mitigate the impact of their development.

Householder Recycling Centre

Some concerns have been raised about potential odour and traffic from the proposed Householder Recycling Centre (HRC) indicated on the plan. Should a proposal for the HRC come forward this would need to be the subject of its own detailed application and would need to be supported by its own technical assessments in terms of factors like noise and odour. This would allow the impacts to be properly assessed and considered. It should be noted, however, that modern HRCs are not big open areas (like Dogsthorpe) but tend to be enclosed buildings thereby helping to mitigate the potential impacts arising from noise and smells.

Other Matters

- Some concerns have been raised about loss of property value but this is not a material planning consideration and cannot, therefore, be taken into consideration in determining this application;
- Concerns have been raised that the development would have an adverse impact on TV reception. This matter has been raised with the applicant. TV reception is affected by a number of factors including the height of the buildings and the location of the building in relation to the transmitter. In this instance the applicant has advised that the signal comes from the south of the site so properties to south of the development area should not be affected. Given the relative height of the buildings and the separation distance with the residential properties to the north of the site adverse impact on their TV reception is considered unlikely. Furthermore the potential for interference to reception from buildings has been reduced with the introduction of digital transmission. In view of the above factors it is not considered that there is likely to be any adverse impact upon TV reception as a result of the development.

e) Ecology

Impact on Orton Pit SSSI/SAC

The application site lies directly to the west of Orton Pit SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest)/ SAC (Special Area of Conservation), an area of international ecological importance for its population of great crested newts and assemblage of stoneworts (aquatic invertebrates). The SSSI/SAC are separate designations but generally overlap. The SSSI does however extend further west and abuts the application site. Orton Pit is owned by O & H Hampton. Public access is limited and by authorised appointment only.

The development could potentially impact upon the designated species of Orton Pit in the following ways:-

- (i) from its physical presence;
- (ii) from changes to drainage system;
- (iii) from an increased human population in close proximity to it.

These impacts are assessed below.

(i) Physical Impacts of the Development

In order to protect Orton Pit from the physical presence of the development the application proposes a 30 metre buffer zone from the edge of the SSSI boundary. In addition, buildings within the adjacent tranches would be set back a further 5 metres, thereby creating a total separation distance of 35 metres.

Concerns were initially raised by Natural England that, in view of the building heights proposed (15 metres), this buffer would be insufficient to prevent overshadowing to the detriment of its population of Stoneworts which are light sensitive. In response the applicant submitted a detailed shadow analysis. Having reviewed this Natural England has confirmed it considers the buffer width to be sufficient. It has recommended that a condition be attached to any permission requiring the provision and retention of this buffer zone.

The change to the height of buildings on E7 is not considered to be of issue given the separation distance with Orton Pit.

Stoneworts are also sensitive to changes in water quality. Pollutants or nutrients that could alter the water chemistry could therefore have a detrimental impact on the Stonewort populations present. The area of greatest concern is the impact of increased nitrogen deposition arising from the increased traffic associated with the development. As a result, the applicant has submitted a detailed assessment, based upon the predicted traffic flows associated with the development, which concludes that, overall, average background concentrations of nitrogen are predicted to fall and there would be no adverse impact. This conclusion is accepted by Natural England, but it has recommended for the avoidance of any doubt, given the predictive nature of the assessment, that a precautionary approach be adopted and a condition imposed upon any planning permission requiring the monitoring of nitrogen levels as the development is built out, along with a mechanism for securing a scheme of mitigation should the monitoring results indicate unacceptable adverse impact on the Stonewort populations as a result of nitrogen deposition.

As referred to in section (b) above, widening works between junctions 1 and 2 of the Fletton Parkway will be required in the future. The applicant has submitted a basic plan to show that widening work can be undertaken within the existing highway boundary without direct impact on Orton Pit. Before the widening

works are carried out further more detailed assessment of the potential impacts on Orton Pit would need to be carried out. This reflects the approach taken when the improvement works between junctions 2 and 3 were implemented.

(ii) Drainage

The designated species within Orton Pit are also susceptible to any changes in the drainage regime. The proposed surface water drainage system includes new ditches within the buffer zone and attenuation ponds. The scheme does not result in any surface water from the development entering Orton Pit or any of the drainage channels that flow into it. The proposed drainage scheme also has the added benefit of reducing the potential for floodwater entering the reserve. Natural England is, therefore, satisfied that this aspect of the proposal would not have any adverse impact upon Orton Pit. The drainage regime would be monitored and maintained to ensure that it continues to work successfully.

A foul drain was originally proposed within the buffer zone but in response to concerns raised by Natural England this has been removed.

(iii) Population Impacts.

The development of Great Haddon as a whole would result in more people living and working closer to Orton Pit resulting in the potential for increased disturbance by people and their dogs; eutrophication arising from increased levels of dog faeces; potential for fly-tipping, pollution and vandalism; and potential impacts from an increased cat population.

At an early stage it was agreed with Natural England that public access into Orton Pit should be restricted. The physical measures proposed to achieve this, including those that would be necessary as part of any future residential development, have been set out in an 'Access Management Strategy'.

For the employment area security fencing is proposed along the length of the buffer (this will also act as the boundary to adjacent employment tranches) and around open space OS5 to the south which is proposed as a new area of habitat creation. Within the buffer a new drainage ditch is also proposed (experience to date has shown that water features are effective at keeping people out of Orton Pit. They are also a natural element with associated biodiversity opportunities) along with new hedging. Tree planting has been ruled out as an option following discussion with Natural England given the potential for wind blown seed to enter Orton Pit thereby altering the environment within it. These measures will be implemented prior to the first occupation of any of the industrial units or first public use of the road and thereafter regularly monitored and maintained to ensure that they continue to be effective.

Natural England has confirmed that these measures are acceptable subject to conditions requiring their implementation and maintenance.

Appropriate Assessment

In view of the proximity to Orton Pit an 'Appropriate Assessment' (AA) under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 must be undertaken to demonstrate that the development would not have an adverse impact upon the integrity of the site. The AA must consider both the direct impacts of the development and any 'in combination' effects when the proposal is considered in the context of other proposed developments including policy documents. It is the Local Planning Authority's responsibility to complete the AA in consultation with Natural England as the 'Competent Authority'. A very high level of certainty is required for the AA to be passed. If the AA is not passed planning permission cannot be granted and the impacts of the development would need to be assessed further.

Work on the AA is currently on going. A further update in respect of the AA will given in the Update Report.

Other Ecological Implications

The main ecological impacts of the development are considered in the supporting Environmental Statement (ES) following the carrying out of detailed survey work. The ES recognises that the nature of the site will change with the development and therefore puts forward a range of mitigation measures.

(i) Great Crested Newts (GCN)

GCNs have been identified as being present within a pond which is to be retained at the south of the site. They are also likely to be present within the proposed buffer area to Orton Pit SSSI/SAC. It is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring the submission and approval of a GCN Strategy. This will set out how GCNs will be protected during the constructional and operational phases of the development including the provision of new habitat areas. The condition will also include a requirement for monitoring and the provision of additional reasonable mitigation measures should the monitoring show that these are required. Each reserved matters application will be required to set how the strategy is being complied with and, where appropriate, provide further details such as the precise location of newt fencing. This approach has been agreed with Natural England.

Notwithstanding the above the applicant will also need to apply to Natural England for licenses before the trapping and translocation of any GCNs located within 500 metres of the pond or in the buffer area is carried out on the site.

(ii) Bats

The existing bridleway through the site has been identified as a flight route and foraging area used by bats. There are also a number of trees within the site identified for removal (see section f below), which have medium to high potential for bat roosting.

A survey of three trees identified for removal has been carried out in association with the detailed application for the new access road. They were not found to contain any roosts. Further survey work will be required where appropriate as development parcels come forward. It is recommended that this is secured via a condition.

Lighting associated with the development has the potential to impact upon the identified flight path. The applicant has advised that light spillage will be minimised through the use of directional lighting but acknowledges that there may be disturbance to some more light sensitive species. It is proposed that this impact be compensated via the new buffer zone to Orton Pit which will offer an alternative flight route and foraging habitat. A condition is recommended preventing the construction of lighting within the buffer zone to ensure that it is suitable as a bat flight path.

This approach is considered to be acceptable and has been agreed with Natural England.

Licenses will need to be obtained from Natural England if a roost is found in any tree identified for removal before it can be felled.

(iii) Badgers

Evidence of badger activity has been identified on the site. In order to ensure connectivity of habitat the framework plan has been amended to incorporate an additional green corridor to link the woodland to the south of the site with that at Alwalton Hill. The detailed application for the road also includes the provision of two badger tunnels and associated fencing to provide safe movement between these areas of woodland and the retained woodland to the north around junction 1.

(iv) Reptiles

Survey work has indicated that the site has suitable habitat for reptiles. In order to compensate for the loss of this habitat new areas of habitat are proposed.

(v) Water Voles

There are number of existing ditches within the site which could potentially support water voles. However, the survey work has not identified any presence. As the development progresses new surveys will be carried out and mitigation measures put in place as appropriate.

(vi) Breeding Birds

Concerns were raised by Natural England regarding the impact of the development upon breeding birds, particularly 6 UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species (these are the Skylark, Grey Partridge, Yellowhammer, Linnet, Lapwing and Reed Bunting). The applicant has reviewed these impacts further. In view of the creation of the buffer zone to Orton Pit and the establishment of a non publicly accessible open space (OS5) the applicant is of the view that sufficient new habitat will be created on site. This updated assessment has satisfied Natural England.

(v) Barn Owls

No evidence of barn owls has been found on site but there is suitable foraging habitat. In view of this the supporting Environmental Statement recommends the provision of nesting boxes within non publically accessible open space, in order to provide connectivity of foraging habits through Jones Covert Woodland and through into Orton Pit.

Having assessed the above, the impact of the development on species within the site is considered to be acceptable. Conditions requiring the preparation of a Biodiversity Strategy, to ensure that areas of habitat mitigation are provided as development progresses, along with the provision for updated survey work (surveys remain valid for approximately 2 years) are recommended. Each reserved matters application will then need to demonstrate how it is complying with this strategy.

(vi) Water Quality

A number of measures are proposed such as reed beds in the attenuation ponds which will help filter and clean the surface water run off from the site before it enters the northern tributary of the Stanground Lode. These measures will help protect the existing water quality of the Lode. This approach is acceptable in principle to both Natural England and the Environmental Agency. In order to ensure that the water quality is maintained it is recommended a condition be imposed which requires the monitoring of the water quality leaving the site along with the provision to allow the implementation of any appropriate and reasonable remediation measures.

Response to Wildlife Trust Representation

The Wildlife Trust has raised a concern about the potential culminative effects arising from increased nitrogen deposition resulting from additional traffic on Fletton Parkway. It notes that the draft Local Transport Plan (LTP3) predicts higher levels of nitrogen which Stoneworts are sensitive to. This issue has been reviewed as part of the AA process. The LTP3 contains only a high level assessment and is not supported by technical data unlike the application itself. In view of the more detailed technical information in support of the application the AA concludes that there would be no adverse impact on Orton Pit. As set out above, this is supported by Natural England.

f) Landscape Implications

The application site is not affected by statutory or non statutory landscape designations. Neither are there any Tree Preservation Orders.

Trees/Woodland

The proposal would result in the loss of approximately 0.14 hectares of the existing shelterbelt adjacent to junction 1. This loss is comparable with that approved as part of the Alwalton Hill development (0.17 hectares) and considered to be acceptable given the need to accommodate a new vehicular access into the site.

There are no other existing areas of woodland within the site. There is an area of existing woodland to the south west of the site in the Alwalton Hill site and another private area to the south (known as Two Pond Coppice and Chamber's Dole) which splits the employment and residential development areas.

The Alwalton Hill woodland is to be retained and enhanced as part of that development. When the parcels adjacent to this woodland within the application site are developed their detailed layout will need to take into consideration the presence of the woodland and respond to it accordingly. It is proposed that the woodland to the south be enclosed initially by security fencing (which will need to be appropriately installed) and then by post and rail fencing with shrub planting adjacent to open space OS1.

Concerns were raised by the Natural Networks Partnership that the southern area of woodland (Chambers Dole/Two Pond Coppice) is not within the application area. These woodlands are within third party ownership. The Environmental Statement/Access Management Strategy have demonstrated that this area is not required to help mitigate the impact of development on Orton Pit SSSI/SAC. The application is not, therefore, unacceptable without its inclusion. Some people may try to access the woodland from the employment area but given the nature of the use this possibility is considered to be minimal.

The supporting Environmental Statement identifies 36 individual trees within the application site. Of these, 1 is a category A tree, 15 category B trees and 10 category C trees. Category A trees are classed as those of a high quality and amenity value. Category B trees are classed as being of moderate quality and amenity value and category C trees of low quality and value.

23 are identified for removal. The trees to be removed would, however, include the category A tree and 4 of the category B trees. Although there is a general presumption against the removal of category A and B trees the loss of these trees is accepted in this instance given their location within the development. Category C trees is not classed as being a constraint to development,

Proposals for replacement planting are expected as the development plots come forward, including the buffer planting to the A1(M) referred to in section (c) above. New landscaping is also proposed as part of the detailed application for the new access road.

Hedgerows

The development will result in the removal of some 1200 linear meters of existing hedgerows. Their removal is required primarily to accommodate the new access road and to make the development parcels workable areas. Of the hedgerows to be lost, 1 section, that along the bridleway is classified as being an 'important' (i.e. of importance because of its age and/or its ecological habitat) hedgerow under the Hedgerow Regulation 1997.

As part of the development new native hedgerow planting is proposed totalling some 3000 linear metres including along the new access road. In view of this mitigation the loss of existing hedgerow is considered to be acceptable.

In order to protect the retained trees and hedgerows within the site and adjacent areas of woodland it is recommended that a condition be imposed upon any planning permission requiring that (where appropriate) the subsequent reserved matters applications be accompanied by detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessments and details of the tree protection measures. A condition requiring the submission of an overarching Landscaping Management Strategy is also recommended.

g) Drainage and Flood Risk

Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk

A Surface Water Drainage Strategy has been submitted with the application. It is proposed to drain the site via a series of ditches and pipes into one of three attenuation ponds located within the employment area. These ponds will in turn drain via the Old Great North Road to the northern tributary of the Stanground Lode which runs through the core area site. From here water will drain into the existing Beeby's Lakes located on the south of the A15 within the area known as Hampton Leys. Finally water will enter the River Nene, having also passed through Crown Lakes.

The surface water drainage proposals are supported by detailed technical information in respect of flow levels, catchment areas within the site and flood risk which has been assessed by the Environment Agency. Following the submission of further information the Environment Agency has confirmed that it has no objections to the development on the grounds of flood risk subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the submission of further more detailed information, based upon the agreed Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy, as part of each reserved matters proposal.

No objections to the development have been received from the Middle Level Commissions, the adjoining drainage authority.

Roxhill has confirmed that it intends to manage and maintain the new attenuation ponds through a private management company (rather than adoption by the City Council). On the request of the Environment Agency and for the avoidance of any doubt the proposals for the long term management and maintenance of these water bodies will be covered in the associated S106 Agreement.

A concern has been raised that the application is supported by a low specification scheme which would result in risks to the existing residents, in particular the flood risk measures only allow for a 1 in 100 year event. The Environment Agency has advised that the level of assessment which includes an allowance

for climate change is appropriate as there is no risk from fluvial flooding within the employment site. In light of the advice from the Environment Agency the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

Foul Drainage

It is proposed that foul drainage to the site be routed to an existing sewer in Orton Goldhay. Anglian Water has confirmed its acceptance of this connection point in principle and that adequate capacity is available within the system at this location.

In light of concerns raised by Natural England in respect of potential adverse impacts upon Orton Pit SSSI/SAC a proposed new sewer through the buffer zone has been removed. It is now proposed to route a new foul sewer through the centre of the site, along an alignment similar to that of the new access road. A condition requiring the submission and approval of a more detailed Foul Drainage Strategy is recommended on any permission. This is to ensure that the drainage system is adequate and that no changes to the route are subsequently made which might adversely impact upon Orton Pit SSSI/SAC.

Notwithstanding any planning permission which may be granted, the applicant will require approval from Anglian Water under separate legislation to connect up to the existing foul drainage network. Anglian Water will also be responsible for delivering any off site infrastructure improvements which may be needed to accommodate foul waste water from the development including any improvement to Flag Fen Sewerage Treatment Works (STW). The need for improvements to Flag Fen STW to support the wider growth of the city was identified in the Addendum to the Water Cycle Strategy which forms part of the evidence base for the Adopted Core Strategy. Anglian Water has been consulted in relation to the wording of the proposed foul drainage condition and has not raised any issues.

The Counter Drain, located on the east side of the city, carries the discharge from the Flag Fen STW to the River Nene. Improvement works to increase the capacity of the drain to prevent flooding of adjacent land have been identified as being necessary to support the proposed overall level of growth for the city. The applicant has agreed to pay a proportional financial contribution as part of the S106 Agreement towards these works. Similar contributions will be sought from other major developments as they come forward. The Environment Agency has not raised any objection to this approach subject to the S106 being completed.

h) Energy Efficiency

In order to deliver energy efficiencies as part of the development and to meet the environmental objectives set out in policies CS10 (Environment Capital) and 11 (Energy Efficiency) of the Adopted Core Strategy it is recommended that a condition be imposed upon any permission requiring energy efficiency measures 10% over and above those required by the Building Regulation standards in operation at the time when the reserved matters application is submitted (unless the standards require a zero carbon development). As an alternative, a proposal which exceeds the other requirements on the above policies which the Local Planning Authority considers to be of greater benefit in achieving the policy objectives will also be considered. This approach is to allow flexibility over the course of the build out in response to changing technologies and priorities. Each development will be expected to demonstrate as part of its reserved matters application how it complies with this condition. This approach has been agreed with the applicant.

Roxhill has also advised that it is intended to look at the provision of electric car parking charging points, as part of the layout of the individual development tranches.

CPRE has commented that the buildings within the development should include easily seen green measures. This is noted but may not result in the Council's policy objectives being met as effectively as possible. As such it is considered that the approach set out above is a more appropriate response.

A concern has been raised that this development is a missed opportunity in respect of energy efficiency. This comment is noted but in the view of officers' with the imposition of conditions planning policy would be complied with. A higher level of energy efficiency cannot therefore be required. Notwithstanding this, there is nothing to prevent an occupier from incorporating additional energy efficiency/sustainability measures or technology.

i) Other Technical Matters

Archaeology

There are no registered Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Registered Battlefields or Historic Parks or Gardens within the application site or adjacent to it. The nearest designation is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (a former Napoleonic Prisoner of War Camp) located to the south west of the core application area adjacent to the Old Great North Road and the A15 some 2.2km from the site.

An initial desk based assessment which included a walk over of the site was submitted as part of the supporting Environmental Statement. This concluded that there were no significant concentrations of artefacts which would indicate the presence of buried archaeological remains.

At this stage the City Council's Archaeologist has recommended, in accordance with PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Environment', that a condition be imposed any planning permission which may be granted requiring the implementation of a programme of archaeological work before development commences on each tranche. Discussions are on going between the applicant and the Council's Archaeologist to determine the level of additional assessment required, if any, in light of the conclusions of the walk over survey.

Minerals Extraction

The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy proposals map identifies the site as a mineral safeguarding area. The purpose of mineral safeguarding areas (MSA) is to ensure that mineral resources are adequately taken into account in all land use planning applications. The presence of a MSA does not preclude other forms of development taking place, but flags up the presence of minerals so that this can be considered and minerals usage not unknowingly or needlessly sterilised. Policy CS26 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy does not require the Minerals and Waste Authority to be notified of planning applications in certain circumstances, including where the application is for development on land which is allocated in other adopted local development plan documents. Where the Minerals and Waste Authority is notified of an application in respect of an MSA it will consider a number of factors including economic circumstances and the need for the development.

In this instance, subsequent to the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD being prepared, the Core Strategy was been adopted. This allocates land at Great Haddon for both employment and residential development. Although it does not include precise boundaries the amount of development allocated could not be accommodated on a substantially different area to that of the current planning application. The presence of the Adopted Core Strategy is therefore an important material consideration.

The supporting Environmental Statement, prepared before the sale of the site to Roxhill, sets out a permission was previously granted for minerals and waste extraction on the site but that there is no intention of implementing this permission because it would not be economically viable to do so. A representation has also been submitted directly in relation to the Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD to justify the removal of the MSA on economic grounds.

In light of the presence of the Adopted Core Strategy which is a material consideration officers are of the view that there is an overriding requirement for the development. The application has also been supported by additional economic justification. The Minerals and Waste Authority has not raised any objections to the development.

As a result of the previous consent for mineral extraction, part of the site was identified as a Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS). RIGS do not have the same statutory protection as other designations such as SSSIs etc but Local Planning Authorities are encouraged to protect them through the planning process. Policy LNE18 of the Adopted Local Plan states planning permission will not normally be granted for development which would be likely to have an adverse effect on a RIGS unless there are demonstrable reasons for the proposal which outweigh the need to safeguard the nature conservation of the site. The location of these sites was not, however, marked on the accompanying proposals map nor additional guidance produced by the City Council. However, the site has now been allocated for development in the Adopted Core Strategy, a more recent policy document. If the presence of the RIGS was a constraint to development this would have been assessed as part of the allocation assessment process.

Ground Conditions

The supporting Environmental Statement covers the issue of ground conditions. It concludes that there are no known areas of ground contamination within the employment site. This conclusion is accepted by the Council's Pollution Control Section. For the avoidance of any doubt it is recommended that a condition be imposed upon any planning permission which is granted requiring the approval of a scheme of medial measures to deal with any unsuspected areas of contamination which may be uncovered during the development of the site.

Householder Recycling Centre

As referred to under section 2 above, the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy identifies Peterborough as a possible location for a new Householder Recycling Centre (HRC) whilst the Site Allocations DPD identifies the Great Haddon employment area as a potential site within Peterborough. A new site for a HRC is required as the city's existing facility at Dogsthorpe is at capacity, has insufficient space for expansion, and is outdated.

This development does not, however, give rise to the need for a new HRC. In addition, all of the site's waste will be managed and taken away by private contractors. As such the building of this facility, a contribution towards it or the provision of land at a nominal fee cannot be required as part of this application. Through the S106 negotiations, however, the applicant has agreed to safeguard a piece of land (1.5 hectares in size) for 6 years. During this period the applicant will not be able to sell the land and the City Council will have the option of purchasing it at market rates. At the end of the agreed period should the Council not have purchased the land the applicant will be free to dispose of it as they wish. Given that the HRC is not required as part of this development this approach is considered to be reasonable.

Park and Ride

The City Council's Third Long Term Transport Strategy (LTP3) is now adopted. One of the provisions which it includes is the potential for a Park and Ride facility in the south of the city and the Great Haddon employment area has been identified as a potentially suitable site. As with the HRC the development does not give rise to the need for such a facility and the provision of land at a nominal rate or a financial contribution towards the provision of such a facility cannot therefore be required as part of this application. Rather, it has been agreed that the safeguarded site referred to above could also be used for this purpose. Should the Council wish to pursue both options the safeguarding of a single site does not rule this out, rather the Council would need to approach the applicant on a commercial basis as any other interested party would do to buy extra land. Given Park and Ride is not a requirement of this development this approach is considered to be reasonable.

Site Waste Management Plan

Policy CS28 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy which has been approved by Council and is due for adoption on 19 July 2011, pending its approval by Cambridgeshire County Council, requires the submission of a Site Waste Management Audit and Strategy for developments with a value over £300 000 in order to promote better waste management, waste minimisation and re-use. A condition requiring the submission and approval of a Site Waste Management Plan is, therefore, recommended.

Fire Hydrants

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service has requested that fire hydrants be secured via a condition or through the S106. As individual developments come forward there will be a requirement under the Building Regulations to provide fire hydrants. It is not, therefore, considered necessary to control the matter under the planning process.

j) Other Responses to Representations Received

The representations received in relation to the application have largely been covered under the relevant sections of the report above. The following have not been and so are specifically covered below:-

Piecemeal Submission/Master Planning

Concerns have been raised by Cambridgeshire County Council that the information submitted in respect of this application has been made on piecemeal basis and that as such a new application should be submitted. Other objectors have raised concerns that the documents and drawings are unclear as to the true intentions of the scheme and that there should be a clear master plan.

It is recognised that this is a complex application with a lot of supporting information. There have also been in depth technical discussions on a number of aspects of the scheme particularly transport and ecology. It is, therefore, inevitable that information will have been submitted over a period of time. A new application cannot be required on the grounds that information has been submitted in a piecemeal way and indeed, the purpose of the addendum to the Environmental Statement and the updated Design and Access Statement and Planning Statement has been to draw together the submitted information into a more usable form for reconsultation.

Neither is it accepted that the documents and drawings are unclear as to the true intentions of the scheme or that there is a need for a masterplan. If planning permission is granted the key parameter plans and documents will be approved at this outline stage and this information will be used to inform the associated planning conditions and reserved matters submissions.

Inadequate Consultation

Concerns have been raised that the public consultation on this application has been inadequate. The consultation process has been set out in section 6 above and is not, therefore repeated here. The statutory requirement for consultation on planning applications is the display of site notices and advertisement in the newspaper (as this is an application for major development and also accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment (the Environmental Statement)). There is only a requirement for a 21-day consultation. There is no statutory requirement to send individual neighbour notifications or to hold public consultation events.

The consultation which has been carried out on the application has been substantially in excess of the statutory requirements. Furthermore, as a result of criticism from the first round of public consultation significantly more letters were sent out to Yaxley residents to advise of the second round of consultation. Flyers for the public consultation events were also put in local publications to make sure as many people as possible were aware of them. In addition, the time given for responses has been in excess of the statutory requirement. Furthermore, the Local Planning Authority has continued to accept representations outside of the formal consultation periods.

During the consultation period officers have also met on three separate occasions with the Norman Cross Action Group (in September 2010, January 2011 and February 2011).

It is not, therefore, accepted that consultation has been inadequate.

MOD cables

A concern was raised by a local resident through Shailesh Vara MP in connection with the road application that there maybe military underground communication cables located under the site of the one of the proposed attenuation ponds. This matter is reported here as the concern is also of relevance to this application.

No such cables were identified by the applicant in the supporting Environmental Statement. Notwithstanding this contact was made with the Ministry of Defence which confirmed that it has no communications in this location.

Decision Process

Concerns have been raised that Peterborough Councillors will be making a decision affecting Huntingdonshire District Council residents and it has been suggested that a referendum should be held to determine the application with a binding result. Due process has been followed in the consideration of the application and officers from HDC and CCC have been involved throughout. There has also been extensive consultation with local residents in Huntingdonshire.

Name of Development

The NXAG has objected to the use of the name Great Haddon. This is not a planning consideration.

Scheme Does not Accord with Policy

The impacts of the development have been assessed in detail above, and are summarised in section 8 below. The scheme is considered to comply with policy for the reasons given.

Conditions

It has been suggested that all conditions relating to the development should be agreed by Cambridgeshire County Council, Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC) and Yaxley Parish Council. The conditions have been shared with the County Council and HDC and they have had the opportunity to comment on the wording the highway conditions which are relevant to them including the trigger point for the link between the site and the Great North Road. It is not appropriate for a Parish Council to be consulted in relation to the wording of conditions.

Human Rights

Concerns have been raised that the development would have an adverse impact upon human rights. The impact of the development on the amenity of the surrounding residents has been assessed in this report. The impacts are considered to be acceptable and have been mitigated where possible. These impacts also have to be balanced against the contribution which the development would make towards delivering job led growth as set out in the Core Strategy. Furthermore the site has been allocated in the Adopted Core Strategy and the principle of development in this location accepted. In establishing the acceptability of the principle of development the Core Strategy has been through a clear and transparent process including examination in public. It is not, therefore, considered that the application could reasonably be resisted on the grounds of human rights impacts.

k) S106

The applicant has agreed to enter into a S106 Obligation and the process is currently ongoing. The following Heads of Terms have been agreed:-

- Travel Plan including contributions towards the monitoring thereof (£5 000 per building or pro rata amount if floor space below 5 000 sq.m);
- Provision of a bus services for employees;
- Contribution towards off site highway improvements including provision of new traffic lights (£ 3 300 000 towards widening works to Fletton Parkway);
- Safeguarding of 1.5 hectares of land for a HRC or Park and Ride facility for 6 years;
- Contribution towards the Green Grid Strategy objectives (£50 000);
- Contribution towards improvements to the Green Wheel/National Cycleway Network (£11 000);
- Long term management and maintenance of the SUDs
- Contribution towards the upgrade of the Counter Drain (amount to be confirmed);
- Nature Conservation Objectives (if not addressed solely via conditions)

This requirements accord with both national and local policy and in your officer's opinion comply with the 5 tests and the principles set out in ODPM Circular 05/2005 (see Section 2 above) and the Tesco/Witney case in which the House of Lords held that the planning obligation must at least have a minimal connection with the development.

8 CONCLUSIONS

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

- The principle of development is acceptable in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008) and policies CS3 and CS5 of the Adopted Core Strategy;
- Following detailed assessment of the transport modelling the impact of the development on the surrounding highway network is considered to be acceptable in accordance with policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport' as amended January 2011;
- Through the provisions of the Travel Plan and bus service for employees, to be secured as part of the S106 Agreement, the development is considered to make adequate provision for sustainable travel in accordance with policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy;
- It is accepted that as a result of the development the existing rural character of the site would be permanently altered. However, a strategic decision has been made to develop this site for employment purposes in the Adopted Core Strategy. In this context, the visual impact of the

development is considered to be acceptable in accordance with policies CS5 and CS16 of the Adopted Core Strategy;

- Following review of all aspects of the development such as transport, noise, odour etc the impact of the development on the amenity of the neighbouring residents is considered to be acceptable in accordance with policies CS14 and CS16 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport';
- The potential impacts of the development on Orton Pit SSSI/SAC can be acceptably mitigated via the creation of a buffer zone and through the access control measures proposed. The development is, therefore, considered to be acceptable in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity';
- Other ecological impacts of the development can also be acceptably mitigated so the development accords with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity';
- The impact of the development on existing trees and hedgerows within/adjoining the site is considered to be acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions requiring more detailed assessment as development comes forward and protection measures. New landscaping will also be planted, including the provision of new hedgerows. The development is, therefore, considered to be acceptable in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and policies LNE 9 and 10 of the Adopted Local Plan (First Replacement);
- Following assessment of the submitted information it is considered that the site can be adequately drained and will not give rise to an increased risk of flooding in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk';
- Via the imposition of a condition it is considered that the development will make a contribution towards the Council's Environment Capital objectives in accordance with policies CS9 and CS10 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

9 RECOMMENDATION

Subject to (a) the prior satisfactory completion of an obligation under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in respect of the provision of a Travel Plan including contributions towards the monitoring thereof; the provision of a bus services for employees; a contribution towards off site highway improvements; the safeguarding of 1.5 hectares of land for a HRC or Park and Ride facility for 6 years; a contribution towards the Green Grid Strategy objectives; a contribution towards improvements to the Green Wheel/National Cycleway Network; provision for the long term management and maintenance of the SUDs; a contribution towards the upgrade of the Counter Drain (to be confirmed); Nature Conservation Objectives (if not addressed solely via conditions); (b) the passing of the Appropriate Assessment; the Head of Planning Services be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- C1 Application for approval of reserved matters namely access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale; shall be made to the Local Planning Authority no later than eight years from the date of this permission. Such development shall be begun no later than ten years from the date of this permission or, if later, two years from the approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development meets the policy standards required by the development plan and any other material considerations including national and local policy guidance and in accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C2 Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition C1 above, relating to the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in respect of any part of the development of the site before any development commences within that part of the site. Development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development meets the policy standards required by the development plan and any other material considerations including national and local policy guidance and in accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C3 Not more than 324, 500 sq.m. gross external floor area shall be developed pursuant to this outline planning permission. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, this shall comprise not more than 48 675 sq.m. of B1; 129 800 sq.m. of B2 and 146 025 sq.m. of B8 floor space.

Reason: To accord with the transport modelling on which the impacts of the development on the surrounding highway network have been assessed, and to ensure that the Strategic Road Network can continue to operate as part of the national system of routes for through traffic and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of safety of traffic on the strategic road network, in accordance with policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy, Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport' (as amended Jan 2011) and Section 10(2) of the Highways Act 1980.

- C4 Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the access arrangements and land use allocations shown on the Development Framework Plan (plan no. PST021-DFP-201) and approved Parameter Plans (plan nos PST021-DFP-202 (primary movement network), PST-DFP-208 (landscape framework) or in accordance with such modifications of the Development Framework Plan as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To restrict the development to that applied for and for which the environmental, transport and infrastructure impacts have been assessed and to ensure that the development meets the policy standards required by the development plan and any other material considerations including national and local policy guidance.

- C5 Building heights shall not exceed a maximum height of 15 metres except on tranche E7 (as identified on the Framework Plan PST021-DFP-201) where the maximum building height shall not exceed 17 metres. Building heights shall be measured from the highest existing ground level within each tranche except those abutting the Orton Pit buffer zone as shown on the approved Framework Plan PST021-DFP-021 where they shall be measured from the existing level directly next to the buffer zone, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Levels shall be taken from the Topographical Plans reference 24545/100/04- 07.

Reason: To protect residential and visual amenity and the ecological interests of the Orton Pit SSSI/SAC in accordance with the assessment in the supporting Environmental Statement in accordance with policy CS16 of the Adopted Core Strategy, Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) and the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010.

- C6 Notwithstanding the submitted information, the development shall achieve as a minimum an energy efficiency of 10% above the Building Regulations standard in place at the time of reserved matters submission, unless this requires a zero carbon development. The reserved matters application for each development tranche shall be accompanied by a sustainability statement/assessment which demonstrates how the above standard will be achieved.

As an alternative to the above energy efficiency requirement, a proposal which exceeds other requirements in Policies CS10 and 11 of the Adopted Core Strategy and which is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be of greater benefit in achieving those policy objectives may be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration as part of each reserved matters application.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to deliver energy efficiencies in accordance with policies CS10 and CS11 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

- C7 Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (reference 15188/400/001 Rev D January 2011). The submission of the reserved matters for each tranche shall be accompanied by a detailed scheme for the provision, implementation, ownership and maintenance of the surface water drainage infrastructure for each parcel or plot of

developable land as specifically identified on drawing number 15188/400/05 Rev D. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details before the development is first occupied.

Reason: In order to ensure that the risk of flooding, both at the site and to third parties, is not increased as a result of the development in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'.

- C8 Prior to the commencement of development a foul drainage strategy including details of any pumping stations and any phasing thereof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any unit.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate foul drainage provision and to ensure no harm is caused to features of ecological interest (Orton Pit) in accordance with policy U1 of the Adopted Local Plan and policies CS12 and CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

- C9 Prior to the first occupation of any unit or the first public use of the new access road from Junction 1 of Fletton Parkway, whichever is the sooner, a 30-metre buffer zone measured from the edge of Orton Pit SSSI shall be provided as identified on the approved Framework Plan reference PST021-DFP-201. The buffer zone shall include the access management measures as identified for zones 3 and 4 in the approved Access Management Strategy. The monitoring and management of these areas and features shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the measures set out in the approved Access Management Strategy and any other maintenance which maybe required on an ad hoc basis in perpetuity.

The reserved matters application for land parcels OS2 and OS5 as identified on the approved Framework Plan PST021-DFP201 shall include amongst other matters the following measures:-

- a) security fencing to the boundary of the employment land tranches (type to be agreed) and post and rail fencing;
- b) an 8 metre wide ditch within the buffer zone, designed to retain water at all times (OS2);
- c) a new linear water body approximately 10 metres wide with a deep central channel and shelves planted with reed beds (OS5);
- d) weir systems
- e) a shallow bank beyond the ditch;
- f) hibernacula;
- g) details of hedgerow planting;
- h) general habitat including retention of any appropriate existing features and improvement measures to promote biodiversity;
- i) details of existing and proposed levels.

No lighting shall be erected within this buffer zone.

Reason: In order to minimise the effects of shading on habitats and species in, and to prevent unauthorised public access into, Orton Pit SSSI/SAC in order to protect the integrity of the site, and to provide new ecological habitat as set out in the supporting Environmental Statement Volume 4, Chapter 6, in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) and the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010.

- C10 No buildings or other structures (temporary or permanent) shall be erected within 5 metres of the boundary of any development tranche adjoining the 30 metre the buffer zone to Orton Pit SSSI as identified on the approved Framework Plan reference PST02-DFP-201/

Reason: In order to minimise the effects of shading on habitats and species within Orton Pit SSSI/SAC from shading from buildings associated with the adjacent development in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) and the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010.

- C11 Prior to the commencement of development, or within any other such period as maybe agreed with the Local Planning Authority, an overarching Great Crested Newt Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plans and particulars submitted for each reserved matters application shall demonstrate compliance with the Strategy and include specific measures set out within individual tranches.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, monitoring of the strategy and the mitigation measures therein, including the specific measures set out within individual development tranches, shall be carried out during the build out of the development and for five years thereafter. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the applicant shall submit a single annual monitoring report for the site, to include the individual development tranches, to the Local Planning Authority for written approval for the first five years following the commencement of development. The timing of the monitoring and the submission of the monitoring report shall thereafter be reviewed and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

If after evaluating the submitted monitoring results the Local Planning Authority considers remedial measures are necessary it will serve notice on the applicant requiring a scheme of remedial measures. The remedial measures shall be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. Within one month of receiving such written notice, the applicant shall submit such a scheme of remedial measures (including a timeframe for implementation) and the approved remedial measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and programme unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard, enhance and manage the ecological interests of the site and to inform the translocation, protection of species and habitat creation/enhance in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) and the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010.

- C12 Prior to the commencement of development, or within any other such period as maybe agreed with the Local Planning Authority, an overarching Biodiversity Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plans and particulars submitted for each reserved matters application shall set out what specific measures are included within individual development plots to enhance biodiversity and demonstrate compliance with the Strategy.

The overarching Strategy shall include but not be limited to details of the following:

a) appointment of a suitably qualified Ecological Clerk of Works and details of ecological supervision;

b) Details of habitat and species protection measures during the construction and operational phases of the development;

c) Details of habitat creation and enhancement, including: measures to ensure connectivity of habitat where appropriate that avoids conflict with new roads; provision of new fences; and the phasing of delivery and the management/maintenance regime for these areas particularly;-

- OS5;

- OS38, OS39 and OS40 (including retention of ponds 1, 2 and 15 as identified on Figure 6.8 of the ES addendum; Appendix 6.2) and new surface water attenuation ponds (OS1 and OS3) as identified on the approved Framework Plan reference PST021-DFP-201;

- buffer zone to Orton Pit SSSI/SAC;

- An indication of the type of measures which can be included within individual development plots to enhance biodiversity.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, these areas should provide opportunities for great crested newts, reptiles, badgers, bats, water voles (if appropriate) and breeding birds including owls; aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates and (aquatic) plants;

d) Proposals for the translocation of protected species in particular reptiles, great crested newts and any other protected species that may be subsequently identified;

e) A methodology and strategy for the submission and approval of updated survey work during the build out of the development including specific measures in relation to bats;

f) A scheme of monitoring for the retained/ enhanced areas of habitat creation and wider biodiversity measures within the scheme, including any specific measures set out within individual development tranches. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the monitoring period shall be not less than the build out period of the development and five years thereafter. The applicant shall submit a single monitoring report, to include individual development tranches, annually for the first five years following commencement of development and thereafter reviewed with appropriate report monitoring periods agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority;

g) A provision shall be made to enable the Local Planning Authority to consider if any remedial measures are necessary as a result of evaluating the submitted monitoring results, including a provision for the Local Planning Authority to serve notice on the applicant requiring a scheme of remedial measures. The remedial measures shall be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. Within one month of receiving such written notice, the applicant shall submit such a scheme of remedial measures (including a timeframe for implementation) and the approved remedial measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and programme unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

The above is not expected to duplicate the Access Management Strategy or the Great Crested Newt Strategy but should make cross-reference to these documents where appropriate.

Reason: To safeguard, enhance and manage the ecological interests of the site and to inform the translocation, protection of species, habitat creation, remedial measures and to promote the biodiversity of the site in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy, Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) and the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010.

C13 Monitoring of the quality of the water exiting the site from the attenuation ponds before it enters the northern tributary of the Stanground Lode, shall be carried out on an annual basis for the first five years following the first occupation of any building or the first public use of the access road, whichever is the sooner. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the applicant shall submit a single annual monitoring report for the site to the Local Planning Authority for written approval. The timing of the monitoring and the submission of the monitoring report shall thereafter be reviewed and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

A provision shall be made to enable the Local Planning Authority to consider if any remedial measures are necessary as a result of evaluating the submitted monitoring results, including a provision for the Local Planning Authority to serve notice on the applicant requiring a scheme of remedial measures. The remedial measures shall be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. Within one month of receiving such written notice, the applicant shall submit such a scheme of remedial measures (including a timeframe for implementation) and the approved remedial measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and programme unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the quality of water in the Stanground Lode in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy, Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation).

C14 Prior to the commencement of development, clearance works or remediation works on each parcel of land as identified on the approved Framework Plan reference PST021-DFP-201, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, up to date survey work shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The updated survey work shall be carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in the Biodiversity Strategy and the Great Crested Newt Strategy. Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority surveys shall be carried out for Great Crested Newts, Reptiles, Breeding Birds, Water Voles, Bats, Badgers, Aquatic and terrestrial Invertebrates, and aquatic plants. If development does not thereafter commence within 2 years of the survey date new surveys will need to be undertaken in accordance with the above process, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect species within the development area from harm in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation), CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010.

C15 Prior to the first public use of the new access road from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway into the development, or within such other period as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, a scheme to monitor Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) concentrations and nitrogen deposition within Orton Pit SSSI/SAC, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the monitoring shall commence no later than 3 months after the first public use of the road (to enable the collection of baseline data) and continue for a period of 5 years after the complete build out of the development. All monitoring shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and submitted in the form of a single report at intervals to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Should the Local Planning Authority consider that any remedial measures are necessary as a result of evaluating the submitted monitoring results; the Local Planning Authority will serve notice on the developer requiring a scheme of remediation. Within one month of receiving such written notice, a scheme of remediation, including a programme for implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remedial measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To validate predictions regarding nitrogen deposition made in the Environmental Statement and to ensure the integrity of Orton Pit SSSI/SAC is protected in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) and the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010.

C16 No tree, hedgerow or woodland shown as being retained on drawing numbers 2489LO/11A Rev D (Tree Retention and Removal Plan Fig 8.11) and 2489LO/12 Rev C (Hedgerow Strategy Fig 8.12) shall be felled, topped, lopped or grubbed in any way without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. If any retained tree as shown on the approved drawings is damaged or removed during a development phase, a revised scheme and implementation timetabled shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure the retention of trees, hedges and woodland as identified in the Environmental Statement in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy and policies LNE9 and 12 of the Adopted Local Plan (First Replacement).

C17 Prior to the commencement of development, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, an overarching Landscape Management Strategy, including details of phasing for the strategic landscape areas shown on approved parameter plan PST021-DFP208 (Landscape Framework), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plans and particulars submitted for each reserved matters application shall demonstrate compliance with the Strategy and include specific measures set out within individual tranches. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the Strategy shall include the following details:

- Long term design objectives;
- Management responsibilities;
- Maintenance schedules including replacement planting for any trees/shrubs which fail;

Where this strategy relates to the buffer to Orton Pit SSSI/SAC it is not expected to duplicate the Access Management Strategy but should make cross-reference to this documents.

The management plan shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable contained therein and as approved unless changes are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policies LNE 9 and 10 of the Adopted Local Plan (First Replacement) and policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

- C18 The reserved matters particulars for tranche E7 (as identified on the approved Framework Plan PST21-DFP201) shall include new buffer planting to the A1M, as identified on the approved landscape parameter plan drawing number PST21-DFP208, to be not less than 15 metres in width.

Reason: In order to ensure an appropriate visual finish to the development in accordance LNE9 and 10 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

- C19 The hard and soft landscaping scheme to be submitted as reserved matters shall include the following details;
- Proposed finished ground and building slab levels;
 - Planting plans including trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting;
 - An implementation programme (phased developments);
 - Hard surfacing materials;
 - Boundary treatments;
 - Refuse areas;
 - Cycle parking provision including details of the cycle stands.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved reserved matters application prior to first occupation/ use. In the case of soft landscaping works these shall be carried out no later than the first planting/seeding season following the occupation/use of the development.

If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policies LNE 9 and 10 of the Adopted Local Plan (First Replacement) and policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

- C20 The plans and particulars for each reserved matters applications for those tranches containing, and/or located adjacent to (including outside of the application site), any retained trees/hedgerows, shall include :
- An arboricultural method statement (to be carried out in accordance with section 7.2 of British Standard 5837-2005);

- An arboricultural impact assessment (to be carried in accordance with section 6 of BS 5837-2005);
- A tree/hedgerow protection plan (to be carried out in accordance with section 7.2 of BS 5837-2005).

The above shall include an assessment of the impact of buildings, hard standings, changes in ground levels from existing, drainage infrastructure and any other utilities.

The tree/hedgerow protection measures shall be erected prior to the commencement of any works including site clearance and thereafter retained until construction work is completed unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be built out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policies LNE 9 and 10 of the Adopted Local Plan (First Replacement) and policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

C21 Prior to the commencement of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, a detailed scheme of improvements to J1 of Fletton Parkway based upon the principles shown on drawing 15188/200/021 Rev B shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include but not be limited to the following:

- The interface with and tying into existing highway infrastructure and also future infrastructure improvements to be delivered as indicated on the following drawings:

Preliminary Scheme Layout A1139 Fletton Parkway Junction 17 to 1 Improvement Option 2 – Drawing number 8389/01/01.

A1139 Fletton Parkway Junction 1 to 2 – Drawing number 5096274/HW/GA/001/A.

New access road to serve the development from junction 1.

- Details of the form of construction of the highways, drainage, signing, lining, lighting, new structures/modifications to existing structures.
- Full Stage 1 and 2 safety audits.
- Details of all traffic signals, position of heads and poles, ducting, controllers, controller maintenance bays and controller specifications (including UTMC if necessary).

No part of the development shall be occupied or brought into its intended use until the highway improvements, referred to above, have been implemented in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of providing a safe means of access to the development which does not prejudice the safety of the users of the existing public highway in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport' as amended January 2011.

C22 The plans and particulars to be submitted as reserved matters shall include details of the following, as appropriate:-

- Details of how the new vehicular accesses into the site tie into the existing highway network (junction 1/the Great North Road)
- Details of how the new cycleways tie in to the existing foot/cycle bridge over the Fletton Parkway and the designated bridleway through the site
- Details of the internal access roads/cycleways/footways and junctions within the site;
- Segregated access points for pedestrians and cyclists that do not require the use of the vehicular carriageway to enter and leave each development parcel;
- Details of the access into each individual development parcel for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.

- Full Stage 1 and 2 safety audits (if appropriate).
- Pick up and set down points and circulation areas for the private bus service required as part of the employment area travel plan.
- Car parking, circulation areas and loading and unloading areas

No part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until the roads/footways and cycle ways linking that part of the development to the existing public highway (including the Fletton Parkway foot/cycle bridge) have been implemented in accordance with the approved details. Nor shall any unit be occupied or brought into use until the access, parking and internal layout have been implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of providing a safe means of access to the development which does not prejudice the safety of the users of the existing public highway in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport' as amended January 2011.

C23 No more than 24,338 square metres of B1, 86,534 square metres of B2 and 146,025 square metres of B8, gross external floor area, shall be occupied, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, until the link between the internal road serving the employment land and the Old Great North Road has been implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and in accordance with the approved details. The plans and particulars for the reserved matters application for the new link with the Old Great North Road shall include the following:

- The design of the junction of the access road with the Great North Road and the tying into existing highway infrastructure including the bridleway through the employment site;
- The design of the physical HGV prohibition measures and associated signage strategy;
- Stage 1 and 2 safety audits.

Reason: In the interests of providing a safe means of access to the development which does not prejudice the safety of the users of the existing public highway in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport' as amended January 2011.

C24 No more than 24,338 square metres of B1, 86,534 square metres of B2 and 146,025 square metres of B8, gross external floor area, shall be occupied, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, until the work to improve Fletton Parkway as shown in outline on Peterborough City Council Drawings in the table below has been carried out to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and is open to traffic:

Great Haddon Township Preliminary Scheme Layout A1139 Fletton Parkway Junction 17 to 1 Improvement Option 2	8389/01/02	April 2011	Peterborough City Council	None
A1139 Fletton Parkway Junctions 1 to 2	5096274/HW/GA/001/A	18 Jan 2011	W S Atkins	None

Reason: To ensure that the Strategic Road Network can continue to operate as part of the national system of routes for through traffic in accordance with Planning Policy guidance Note 13 'Transport' (as amended January 2011), policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Section 10(2) of the Highways Act 1980 and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of safety of traffic on the strategic road network.

C25 Prior to commencement of development, a detailed scheme of improvements to the A1(M) J17 Trunk road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

- i. how the improvement interfaces with the existing highway alignment and carriageway markings including lane destinations,
- ii. A full structural assessment of the existing northern bridge of J17 A1(m);
- iii. full construction details relating to the highway improvement, including any modification to existing structures or proposed structures, with supporting analysis;
- iv. full signing, signalling and lighting details;
- v. confirmation of full compliance with Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Policies (or approved relaxations/departures from standards);
- vi. an independent Stage 2 Road Safety Audit (taking account of any stage 1 Road Safety Audit recommendations) carried out in accordance with Departmental Standards (DMRB) and Advice Notes.

The highway improvements shall be based on the scheme indicated in outline on the following drawing: Drawing No 15188/100B/037 Revision - Dated 29 March 2011 submitted By Peter Brett Associates.

Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, no part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until the highway improvements, referred to above, have been implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the Strategic Road Network can continue to operate as part of the national system of routes for through traffic in accordance with Planning Policy guidance Note 13' Transport' (as amended January 2011), policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Section 10(2) of the Highways Act 1980 and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of safety of traffic on the strategic road network.

- C26 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 8 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions shall be constructed other than those expressly authorised by any future planning permission.

Reason: In order that the potential traffic impacts of any additional floorspace on the surrounding highway network can be assessed in accordance with Planning Policy guidance Note 13' Transport' (as amended January 2011), policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Section 10(2) of the Highways Act 1980 and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of safety of traffic on the strategic road network.

- C27 Prior to the commencement of development, unless otherwise agreed, a Site Waste Management Plan, including a waste management audit and strategy, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Site Waste Management Plan at all times unless the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority has been given to any variation.

Reason: To promote the better management of waste and to ensure waste minimisation and re-use, in accordance with policy CS28 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2011 (version for adoption).

- C28 All site clearance, remediation, development and other operations on site shall take place in accordance with a Construction Management Plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before these operations start for each parcel of land. Unless otherwise agreed in writing, the Construction Management Plan shall include but not be limited to:
- a) phasing of development;

- b) a scheme for the monitoring, reporting and control of construction noise and vibration, including hours of working and scope for remedial action identified as a result of any monitoring, of construction noise, vibration and dust emanating from the site during the construction phase;

- c) a scheme for the control of dust;
- d) a scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for construction vehicles and cleaning of affected public highways. The vehicles cleansing system shall be a static system that is capable of washing the wheels and underside of the chassis. The access road shall be hard surfaced between the cleaning facility and the highway and must be kept free of mud/debris at all times.
- e) A contingency plan including, if necessary, the temporary cessation of all construction operations, to be implemented in the event that the approved vehicle cleansing scheme fails to be effective for any reason;
- f) a scheme of working hours for construction and other site works.
- g) A scheme of HGV haul routes through the site and construction access from Fletton Parkway Junction 1 including details of the measures to ensure that all construction vehicles can enter the site immediately upon arrival and also method of segregating construction traffic from general employment area traffic/pedestrians and cyclists.
- h) A scheme for parking of contractor's vehicles and details of the location of contractor's welfare/site office facilities.
- i) A scheme for access and deliveries showing adequate space for vehicles to park, turn, load and unload clear of the public highway or the main employment area access roads.
- j) Details of the location and layout of all materials storage and plant storage compounds.
- k) details of the means of enclosure of the application site for the construction phase, including details of all types of fencing proposed and a plan showing the location of all the fencing;
- l) appointment of a suitably qualified Ecological Clerk of works and details of ecological supervision;
- m) a scheme for dealing with complaints.

There shall be no construction access from the Great North Road.

The above should be prepared in conjunction with and make reference to the Biodiversity Strategy for the site and the tree protection details.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan at all times unless the written agreement of the local planning authority has been given to any variation.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents; in the interests of highway safety and convenience; and to protect the ecological interest of the site and adjoining Orton Pit SSSI/SAC, in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 9 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation), Planning Policy Statement 23 (Planning and Pollution Control), Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 (Planning and Noise) and policies Cs14 and CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

C29 In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing within 7 days to the Local Planning Authority and once the Local Planning Authority has identified the part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination development must be halted on that part of the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority..

A competent assessment must be undertaken, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme, together with a timetable for its implementation, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The measures in the approved remediation scheme must then be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a validation report must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to deal the impacts of unsuspected contamination in order to protect human health and Controlled Waters, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance 23 (Planning and Pollution Control).

- C30 The plans and particulars for each reserved matters submission, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall include a detailed lighting scheme incorporating information in respect of location; appearance; hours of use and lux levels. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation/use.

Reason: In order to protect residential amenity and the ecological interests of the site as set out in chapter 6 of volume 4 of the Environmental Statement, in accordance Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity', Planning Policy Guidance 23 (Planning and Pollution Control) and policy CS21 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

- C31 The rating level of noise emitted from each development shall not exceed 35dB $L_{Aeq, 1 \text{ hour}}$ between 07:00 and 23:00 Monday to Friday and 30dB $L_{Aeq, 5 \text{ minutes}}$ at any other time. The noise levels shall be determined at the nearest noise sensitive premises. The measurements and assessment shall be made according to BS:4142:1997. The reserved matters application for each development tranche shall include a statement setting out how the development will comply with this standard. If there are justifiable reasons for an alternative noise level, that justification shall be submitted with the reserved matters application and considered by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be operated in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of neighbouring residential in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 'Noise'.

- C32 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the details and particulars of the reserved matters for each development tranche shall include an odour assessment.

Reason: In order to protection the amenity of the neighbouring residents in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 23 'Planning and Pollution Control'.

- C33 Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, no development shall take place within any parcel of land as identified on the approved Framework Plan reference PST21-DFP-201 until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate level of further assessment work which builds on the conclusions of the field walking survey and the supporting Environmental Statement in accordance with Planning Policy Statement (PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment), and policy CS17 of the Adopted Core Strategy.

- C34 The plans and particulars to be submitted as reserved matters shall include, a statement demonstrating compliance with the Framework Travel Plan if the reserved matters application falls below the thresholds set out for B1, B2 and B8 Uses in the approved Framework Travel Plan (Section 4.3), or if the reserved matters application exceeds the thresholds, a stand-alone workplace Travel Plan in accordance with the Framework Travel Plan and to include individual initiatives, targets, management regime and radiation measures.

Reason: To ensure a more sustainable form of development, to minimise the need to travel by private car, and to accord with the transport modelling and targets set within the Framework Travel Plan on which the impacts of development on the surrounding highway network have been

assessed, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport' (as amended Jan 2011).

- C35 Prior to the first public use of the access road from junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway or the link to the Old Great North Road automatic traffic counters shall be installed and be ready for use. Prior to installation the nature and type of counter shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to allow the volume of traffic entering and leaving the site to be monitored as set out in the Framework Travel Plan in accordance with policy CS14 of the Adopted Core Strategy

Informatives:-

1. With regards to condition 10 above, the applicant is advised that the layout and design of buildings in parcels E1, E4 and E6 as shown on the DFP Plan reference PST021-DFP201 should seek to minimise potential impact from shading on the SSSI/SAC over and above that assessed in Environmental Statement.
2. With regards to condition 7 the Environment Agency has advised for the avoidance of any doubt, that this condition relates to catchments 1a, 1b and 1d as defined within the approved Flood Risk Assessment.

The Environment Agency will confirm the level of detail that is required as part of the submission of the reserved matters for each tranche, in terms of the provision, implementation, ownership and maintenance of surface water drainage infrastructure.

3. Anglian Water has advised that it has assets close to or crossing the site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore, the site layout should take this into consideration and accommodate those assets either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the applicant will need to ask for the assets to be diverted under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991 or in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.
4. Anglian Water is obliged under the Water Industry Act 1991 to provide water and waste water infrastructure for new employment developments when requested to do so. With regards to Condition 7 the applicant should show how the phasing of the foul drainage infrastructure ties into the improvements works required at Flag Fen sewage treatment works.

A copy of Anglian Water's full advice is attached for information.

5. With reference to condition 14, every effort should be made to retain trees identified through the survey work as having medium to high bat roosting potential. Where this is not possible, a detailed inspection of each tree to be removed should be made to identify whether a roost is present. Where a roost is identified, detailed mitigation will need to be provided and licenses obtained from Natural England. Where it is not possible to undertake a full tree inspection i.e. by tree climb (the justification for which will need to be provided), emergence surveys must be undertaken.
6. The granting of planning permission does not remove the applicant's responsibility towards the protection of certain wild animals and plant species (including Great Crested Newts, Bats and Badgers) contained within other legislation such as the Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2010 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and other European Directives.
7. The applicant is reminded that under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) it is an offence to take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is being built or in use. You should assume that nesting birds will be present on site between 1 March and 31 August

inclusive unless a survey has shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present. Planning approval for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution. The protection of nesting wild birds remains unchanged.

8. The applicant is reminded that tranche E6 will need to allow for vehicle access to open space OS5 for maintenance purposes. This access should be clearly shown on the reserved matters plans.
9. The development will result in the creation of new street(s) and/or new dwelling(s) and/or new premises and it will be necessary for the Council, as Street Naming Authority, to allocate appropriate street names and property numbers. Before development is commenced, you should contact the Technical Support Team Manager - Highway Infrastructure Group on (01733) 453461 for details of the procedure to be followed and information required. This procedure is applicable to the sub-division of premises, which will provide multiple occupancy for both residential and commercial buildings.
Please note this is not a function covered by your planning application but is a statutory obligation of the Local Authority, and is not chargeable and must be dealt with as a separate matter.
10. This development may involve the construction of a new or alteration of an existing vehicular crossing within a public highway.
These works **MUST** be carried out in accordance with details specified by Peterborough City Council.
Prior to commencing any works within the public highway, a Road Opening Permit must be obtained from the Council on payment of the appropriate fee.
Contact is to be made with the Transport & Engineering - Development Team on 01733 453421 who will supply the relevant application form, provide a preliminary indication of the fee payable and specify the construction details and drawing(s) required.
11. The development is likely to involve works within the public highway in order to provide services to the site. Such works must be licensed under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. It is essential that, prior to the commencement of such works, adequate time be allowed in the development programme for; the issue of the appropriate licence, approval of temporary traffic management and booking of road space. Applications for NR & SWA licences should be made to Transport & Engineering – Street Works Co-Ordinator on 01733 453467.
12. The development involves extensive works within the public highway. Such works must be the subject of an agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. **It is essential that prior to the commencement of the highway works**, adequate time is allowed in the development programme for; approval by the council of the designer, main contractor and sub-contractors, technical vetting, safety audits, approval of temporary traffic management, booking of road space for off-site highway and service works and the completion of the legal agreement. Application forms for S278 agreements are available from Transport & Engineering - Development Team on 01733 453421.
13. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the need to make a formal application to the council for an agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 if it is the intention that any of the highways proposed as part of this development are to be adopted. Prior to the commencement of the construction of these highways, adequate time must be allowed in the development programme for technical vetting, approval of temporary traffic management, booking of road space for any off-site highway and service works and the completion of the Section 38 agreement. Application forms for Section 38 agreements are available from Transport & Engineering - Development Team on 01733 453421.
14. It is an offence to deposit anything including building material or debris on a highway which may cause interruption to any user of the highway (including footways). In the event that a person is found guilty of this offence, a penalty may be imposed in the form of a fine. It is the responsibility of the developer and contractor/s to ensure that no building materials or debris are placed on or remain within the highway during or after the construction period.

15. It is an offence to deposit anything including building material or debris on a highway which may constitute a nuisance. In the event that a person is found guilty of this offence, the local authority may by notice require the person who deposited it there to remove it forthwith and if he fails to comply the local authority may make a complaint to a magistrates' court for a removal and disposal order under this section. In the event that the deposit is considered to constitute a danger, the local authority may remove the deposit forthwith and recover reasonable expenses from the person who made the deposit. It is the responsibility of the developer and contractor/s to ensure that no building materials or debris are placed on or remain within the highway during or after the construction period.
16. The applicant is reminded that a formal order in respect of the proposed diversion of the bridleway will need to be made. Please contact the Council's Rights of Way Officer on 01733 453472 for further information.
17. The applicant is reminded, notwithstanding any planning permission which may be granted, that a new license will need to be obtained from Natural England.
18. Cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the Council's Cycle Parking Guidance.
19. In relation to Condition 31, the Local Planning Authority will only agree an alternative noise level where it can be clearly demonstrated that it would not result in any significant detrimental impact on nearby residential amenity.
20. In relation to the monitoring and remediation measures required by Conditions 11 (GCN Strategy) and 12 (Biodiversity Strategy), the applicant will need to take a lead role in co-ordinating the submission of an annual monitoring report, and ensuring remedial measures are carried out within approved timescales, through the appointment of an appropriately qualified ecologist.
21. In relation to the highways conditions 3, 21, 23, 24 and 25 any change to the floor space agreed within those conditions must be supported by technical information and justify to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that there is no adverse impact on the surrounding highway network.

Norman Cross Action Group**6 Church Lane Stibbington Cambridgeshire PE8 6LP**

To The Chief Executive

Peterborough City Council

Long Causeway

Peterborough

14th March 2011

Dear Madam,

In re Peterborough Site Allocations Document Para 3.11; Policy SA1; Site Reference SA1.4 and in re Outline planning Applications 09/01368/OUT and 09/1369/OUT

General Introduction

The City Council has but one opportunity to get this development right. It is a substantially bigger development than the existing Hamptons developments and Yaxley itself. The development of this site is extremely important to all of us and to future generations. It is the wellbeing and protection of our rural environment that is at stake. This development will change the character of the surrounding area, and its communities, forever.

The City Council has an ambition to build a high class mixed development that will encourage industry to relocate to Peterborough. Unfortunately, this overdeveloped site will simply reinforce the view that Peterborough provides relatively cheap housing for commuters and low skilled jobs for its residents. It will not attract managers to live in Peterborough City but they will continue to choose the villages and market towns of Huntingdonshire, East Northamptonshire, Rutland and Lincolnshire. Even the choice of the name for this development echoes Huntingdonshire not Peterborough.

For the last ten years the City Council has publically expressed its intention to provide highly skilled and professional employment opportunities 'to match that of Cambridge'. These aspirations were espoused in a number of official documents including the Councils review of secondary schools, the establishment of a university for Peterborough, in investment strategy applications to EEDA and promotions with the Greater Cambridgeshire and Greater Peterborough Enterprise Partnership. These aspirations remain largely unfulfilled. For example the employment site at Alwalton Hill and Residential Development site at Hampton Leys both of which have planning permission and are close to this proposed development have not started to be developed. As presently presented this development does not fulfil Peterborough City Councils key ambitions either.

The plans regarding both employment and residential development are unsound as given the rural location of the site, its dislocation from the centre of Peterborough or any major transport interchange it represents significant overdevelopment of the site.

We are at a loss to understand why there is no master plan given that this is a new town in both size and scope. What we have is an ill conceived and designed set of plans, which do not produce a coherent picture of the proposals.

We object to these outline plans and to the soundness of the Site Allocation Document Para. 3.11.

Residential Development.

In terms of layout we would expect the site to be developed from the 'village centres' outwards in accordance with best design practice.

There needs to be proper segregation between the Development and Yaxley, the A15 and the Old Great North Road. In the words of the developer's consultant: 'We have worked hard on the plan so that Yaxley and other places aren't **completely** (our italics) subsumed into greater Peterborough'. Good design would afford not only a natural tree and landscape border extending in at least 75 meters from the road (and at least the presently indicated green wedge around the village) but also very low density housing on the fringes becoming greater the nearer to the centre. This would preserve most of the existing bucolic appearance of the A15, and Old North Road whilst preventing the coalescence of what is essentially a new town with the village of Yaxley. Furthermore it is logical and right that the same treatment should be incorporated in the Northern boundary given the rural nature of the bridleway and Millennium Green Wheel which presently passes through open fields. Accordingly

the housing density is too high and should be reduced, by our estimates, to 2500 or 3000 dwellings.

The traffic generation from the proposed number of houses (and the employment site) will be significant and the present plans do not demonstrate that the problems can be addressed adequately. The developer's own consultant has said that 'not all the houses will have two cars'. They must be expecting at least an average of one and a half cars per household; that is in excess of 8000. One obvious way of solving this problem would be to reduce the number of houses. Accordingly the number of houses should be reduced to between 2500 and 3000, roughly the size of Yaxley.

It is doubtful if this would result in a shortfall in the number of houses actually delivered over the plan period as the average build rate over either five or ten years would not have delivered the planned number of houses. If the planning authority is concerned about a theoretical shortfall, then they will be able, nearer the end of the plan period, to bring forward sites identified for the next plan period by way of a Supplemental Development Plan.

Dealing with some of the specifics of the plans, we object to the excessive number of junctions onto both the A15 and Old Great North Road. With reference to the A15 there are six traffic lights controlled junctions including the extra junctions on the Yaxley bypass (also known as the Yaxley loop but referred to herein as the Yaxley bypass). During the evening rush hour traffic is already backed up to the A1M junction 16. There is the probability of increased shunt accidents because of so many junctions. The junctions on the Yaxley bypass itself will further slow traffic, which would have an adverse effect on traffic choosing it rather than London Road Yaxley. There are also too many different proposed speed limits.

In respect of Stilton and Folksworth, their traffic uses the A1M junction as the major access point. The slowdown in traffic flows caused by the lights on the A1M and the traffic lights on the A15 will increase journey times, increase accident risk and general inconvenience. These villages suffer demonstrable harm from the development as presently envisaged.

With reference to the Old Great North Road, there appear to be six junctions including that from the Employment site on this road. None of the proposed junction designs prevents a right turn for those exiting the development and driving down the country lane, through Haddon and thence via the Bullock Road and others to Northamptonshire and westwards. Given the difficulty with the A1M junction, and the A605 running at above design capacity, regular closures due to accidents on the A1 around Wansford, rat running will be common. This represents demonstrable harm to the residents of Haddon and those living beside the Bullock Road and on the Old North Road.

It is not necessary for us to put forward alternative proposals but in the spirit of cooperation we would suggest the following solution.

Create an outer ring road within the development. This could run behind the extended tree belt increasing separation from existing developments. This would run from the employment site proposed entry to the Old North Road to the spine road through the development and thence to a slightly realigned Yaxley bypass. There would be a junction here representing the only access to A15 but would serve to give access both North and South of Yaxley.

The Yaxley bypass should be realigned so that it runs east of the proposed development on the bypass. This would obviate the need for people to cross the bypass to get to DC7 or R20 and R36 getting to DC3 etc.. It would also make the bypass less of an internal spine road and more of a bypass and thus the route of choice for through users of the A15.

At the detailed stage there will be a need to ensure that the parents are not able to access the school from the Yaxley bypass.

Residential site R37 should be deleted and become part of the green buffer. This site coalesces/links the development directly with Yaxley and traffic will enter London Road and add to the congestion.

We notice that the open space around the scheduled ancient monument, which appears to contain war graves, is still shown as football pitches. This is a desecration and one presumes that the applicant would not wish such desecration of its own war dead. At the very least it shows disrespect for the ancient monument.

Industrial/employment site

The site is being overdeveloped and the treatment of the boundary at E7 appears to leave no tree belt or separation between the A1M, other than the embankment. In general the A1M may be characterised as a motorway running through open countryside. This defines in part the entrance to Peterborough. This scale of development redefines Peterborough as a primarily warehouse and industrial centre sprawling into the country side. It will reinforce the impression given by the existing plans for Great Haddon residential development that the whole development is blue collar. If the city has a belief that this development will deliver high class jobs and executives to Peterborough then it is sadly mistaken.

Accordingly, and notwithstanding the generality of the above objection, we specifically object to the height of the industrial buildings. The site is on a hill that rolls up and away from the A1M. The buildings will dominate the 'skyline'. The effect on this visual approach to Peterborough needs to be softened as does the view in from the Millennium Green Wheel. On these plans the Green Wheel will be simply be a trip from town to Industrial site.

We also object to the lack of tree and landscaping on the border between the A1M and the development.

We believe that not enough work has been done on the visual aspect of the colour of these buildings and the difficulty of colour choice given the requirement to cater for two distinct views into the development.

We object to the traffic and transport arrangements and our reason are fully rehearsed in the section on 'Residential Development' above. However, for the avoidance of doubt we specifically object to the Employment Sites access onto the Old Great North Road. All HCV and vans etc. shall enter and leave the site via the Parkway system. Cars should use a link via the suggested outer ring road, or the Parkway system. The routing for all non car traffic into and around the development should be governed by appropriate planning conditions in the event that planning permission is granted.

No signage (for example Company names or logos or To Let boards) to be erected along the A1M nor the A15 or Old Great North Road.

General.

No access/egress during construction phase of construction vehicles of any type (including cars) via A15 or Old Great North Road. The hours of working on and deliveries to the site to be restricted to 8am to 6pm Mon to Fri and 9am to 1pm Saturday. There shall be no Sunday or Bank or Public Holiday working. This is to reduce noise impact on residents in the area.

Before any building work is commenced Yaxley bypass to have been constructed. Again, the management of construction traffic should be achieved through the use of appropriate planning conditions.

The planning conditions mentioned in this document will need to be approved by the relevant local authorities. Notwithstanding the generality of the foregoing they should be agreed by Huntingdonshire District Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and Yaxley Parish Council as a minimum.

We remain implacably opposed to the name Great Haddon. This is an urban extension of the Hamptons. At the worst given its proximity to Norman Cross why not call it that?

Yours faithfully,



County Councillor Mac McGuire

Chairman

Summary of representations received following first round of public consultation:-

Petitions

A standard letter was circulated to residents in Yaxley, this asked two questions with a yes/no response:-

- (1) whether residents objected to the development plan;
- (2) whether residents objected to stopping traffic along the A15.

In total 1429 of these letters were received. 1392 people objected to the development plan i.e. the principle of development at Great Haddon, the remainder (37) did not. 1422 letters object to the stopping of traffic along the A15, the remainder (7) do not. The letters were received in batches during January 2010.

A petition with 44 signatures received from the residents of Dry Leas objecting to Great Haddon on the grounds that it will increase traffic on the A1260 Nene Parkway and consequently the already unbearable traffic noise and pollution. In addition it requests that Peterborough City Council actively looks for ways of reducing the traffic noise nuisance from the A1260 Nene Parkway between junctions 31 and 32 (see section 7b).

Individual Letters

541 individual letters were received covering both the core and employment applications. These raise the following issues/concerns which are of relevance to the determination of this application. For ease of reference they have been divided into topic areas:-

Principle of Development (see section 7a).

- Object to the principle of development at Great Haddon;
- The development is not wanted;
- There is no need for the development;
- Loss of countryside/arable land;
- Impact on food production;
- Concern that this is a greenfield development. There must be alternative brown field sites available.
- Peterborough should not be allowed to expand on greenfield land.
- The development should not build on green belt land;
- The proposal will not make sure that the city grows in the right way;
- Permission should not be granted for Great Haddon until Hampton is completed. Want to avoid a hotch potch of half completed developments;
- Question the number of new jobs '9000' referred to.

Transport (see section 7b)

- Development will adversely affect the A15 which is already a busy road;
- Strongly object to the proposed changes to the Great North Road and the building of a new road only 30 metres from house.
- There is no need for a connection to Fletton Parkway. The new road could be routed round the back of existing properties within the development site;
- Members of PCC previously advised that a new link from the employment land to the Great North Road would not be permitted;
- The proposed link to the employment land will create a rat run. There is a dangerous blind bend near the Haddon underpass;
- The Gt North Road will be used heavily as a raceway;

- Concern about the impact of the development on the village of Haddon. It is a small village without footpaths or street lights. An increase in traffic would be dangerous and an accident waiting to happen. The planning officers should visit Haddon before making any decisions;
- Better use should be made of the existing Great North Road which should be made a dual carriageway;
- A new road should be created within the development to link the employment land with the core area. The Western Peripheral Road should then be restricted to prevent HGV access;
- Increased vehicles will result in increased congestion;
- The proposal would create a bottle neck at the new traffic lights on London Road and Gt Haddon;
- Concern that the development would result in additional traffic on the A1260 Nene Parkway adjacent to property. The level of noise from the Parkway is already unacceptable and there are no sound reduction measures in place.
- Put in a Park and Ride for the city with one base at Gt Haddon;
- Most people living in Gt Haddon will work in and around Peterborough, therefore they will want to access the Fletton Parkway (A1139). This will result in traffic jams between junctions 1 and 2. To enable some cars to go north or east it would be an advantage to extend the old A1 (after it passes under the A1(M)). A new road link through the development should be provided to connect to the internal access road system;
- Consideration should be given to installing a driverless train system on Great Haddon and Hampton similar to the system in Singapore;
- Proposed road design is not practical.
- There is insufficient infrastructure in the wider city area to accommodate Great Haddon.

Impact on Surrounding Areas/Residential Amenity (see sections 7c and d)

- Detrimental impact on the surrounding villages and the residents quality of life;
- Additional noise, dust and pollution will adversely affect existing residents along the Great North Road;
- The proposed increase in the amount of employment development would result in increased noise, smells and increase in consumer and commercial traffic and increased rubbish;
- Concern about the additional noise from the new industrial/employment area. Are mitigation measures going to be insisted upon to ensure the net increase in noise is zero;
- Is the developer going to provide a proper acoustic fence along the A1(M)?
- Concern with emissions, leakages and noise from employment site;
- Loss of visual amenity to existing properties adjacent to the development;
- Concern about potential odour and traffic from the Householder Recycling Centre;
- The developers have not considered the people who live in the area. They do not live in the area so the development will not affect them.
- Concern about loss of property values;
- Object as the development would result in urban sprawl.
- Concerns with proposed waste recycling centre (noise, smells, nuisance, pollution);
- No road surface improvements proposed as part of A1260 – existing traffic causes noise/nuisance/pollution, additional traffic will exacerbate this;

- Health impacts of noise, dust and pollution during construction.

Ecology/Landscape (see sections 7e and f)

- Loss of wildlife;
- Proposal would adversely affect Great Crested Newts;
- The development would adversely impact upon birds;
- Air Pollution may affect Orton Pit SSSI;
- Harmful impact upon the landscape character;
- Loss of trees;
- Insufficient separation between wildlife and human activity;
- Object to the loss of countryside there is little open space before the A1M.

Drainage/Flood Risk (see section 7g)

- Will there be new sewage provision or will the development rely on existing infrastructure;
- Concern about the water table and potential for flooding given that the development is to be built on open land;
- Concern regarding flooding given the high level of the water table;

Other (see section 7j)

- Consultation/communication on the application has been inadequate;
- All of the residents of Yaxley should have been informed on the proposal;
- The plan is ill conceived and ill thought through;

Comments in Support

- No objection in principle;
- Support the provision of a householder recycling centre;

Friends of the Earth-

Object to the proposals on the following grounds:-

- 1) Poor commitment to green aims and visions. The objectives are qualified by terms such as 'encouraging', 'facilitating' etc. A number of the objectives also rely on there being sufficient S106 funding. All of the green measures should be firm proposals;
- 2) The plans place too much emphasis on the use of the private car. Cycle routes are poorly located and provided. Pedestrian routes to Peterborough are poor. Consider that a Park and Ride site is required within the employment land.
- 3) The sustainable energy proposals are too weak.
- 4) The proposal appears to encroach into the west side of the site of special conversation interest. Request that this is checked by the Local Authority;
- 5) Disappointed that the proposed Recycling Site is only intended as a Materials Resource Facility (see sections 7b, e and h).

COUNCILLORS

Shailesh Vara MP raised the following concerns:-

- That a number of residents are not aware of the proposals as they have been occupied by other matters over Christmas. In the long term it would be good

for the Council to show it has gone out of its way to allow residents to be heard;

- It is important that jobs created are long term and not merely whilst the houses, roads etc are being built;

In addition 5 letters were received from Shailesh Vara MP forwarding letters from his constituents. These raise the following issues/concerns:-

- Developer publicity events in May/June 2008 does not appear to have been well publicised. If had been aware of the event would have attended;
- The growth in this particular area is unnecessary as there are units and offices standing empty all over Peterborough. Why build more? Brownfield sites should be used first;
- Concern over the changes to the roads through Haddon itself and a proposed bus route. The road through Haddon is single track and would be too narrow to take a bus route. The hill up to Haddon is a blind bend and is dangerous at the best of times. Can foresee accidents occurring, with increased traffic using the village as a cut through to avoid congestion or as a daily road to Oundle;
- In the 1990s Peterborough City Planner had said that a link between the A1139 and Normans Cross via the Great North Road would never be allowed on the grounds of bad planning. Connecting the A1139 to Norman Cross would then create a rat-run with again another dangerous blind bend near the A1(M) underpass;
- Suggest an alternative road route is provided through the development and to the Parkway thereby avoiding Haddon village;
- Potential for the development to result in rat running through Haddon village to the A605. This is a single track road without footway etc and not designed to take the volume of traffic likely to use this route. If 10% of vehicles use this route that is an extra 250 movements per day;
- The peace and quiet of Haddon village will be destroyed and life will change for the worse;
- The proposed industrial area will cause environmental pollution to the Haddon area from all sorts of emissions, leakages and noise. What will be the impact of TV reception with large box type warehouses that all too often block signals;
- Assume that 'New Road' as appears on the OS map where it is situated leading from Keeper's Cottage to Orton Southgate will be open to public use. If so, why couldn't this have been opened before. This road would reduce mileage from Haddon to Orton Southgate considerable;
- Have always thought Haddon was 'Great' without having the name added to it;
- Concern about the impact on wildlife. At present have a good representation of the greater crested newt, Muntjac and Roe deer. When the A1(M) upgrade with implemented, there was a special tunnel inserted to allow the deer and badgers to road at will. This will all have been in vain;
- At which point does the cross over of Council's occur- i.e. Peterborough City Council and Huntingdonshire District Council. Will they interact or go merrily on their own separate ways as they currently do?

(see sections 7a, b, d, e, j)

Consultation Responses received in relation to the access road application (10/00320/FUL)

Summary of responses following the initial consultation.

Four letters of objection were received these raised the following matters:-

- Object to the principle of connecting New Road with junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway; The link is not required and will create a rat run.
- The nature of the Great North Road and Haddon Road would be completely (adversely) changed from what are currently pleasant and safe roads used by cyclists, families with children and people from the surrounding villages using the Green Wheel.
- The connection is unnecessary. Future residents of Gt Haddon could gain access to the employment area and Fletton Parkway via a road directly from the development to the proposed mini roundabout.
- Traffic impacts on Haddon village, the road infrastructure is not suitable for additional traffic volume;
- The impact of the development on residents has not been considered. Will the link become the main route for construction traffic? What measures will be put in place to protect against noise, dust and dirt pollution?
- Wider impact of the development on nature of Haddon village and its community;
- Concerned about increased traffic along the Gt North Road, given the sharp bend in the road which is a safety hazard. It is designed for local traffic only.
- The application does not include any details of traffic volumes, the Gt North Road is likely to become a rat run;
- Concerned about additional noise pollution. The existing fencing along the A1M does not provide adequate protection;
- Concerned about the potential for flooding. There is none at present. Can the applicant's guarantee that their surface water attenuation measures will work and that there will be no danger of flooding when the roads and factories are built on farm land.
- Concern over the impact on the bridle way on wildlife, vegetation and the Green Wheel.
- Residents have previously been told by planner that a through road would not be allowed.
- Connection to the core area of Gt Haddon could be achieved via a new road through the development thereby negating the need to connect into with New Road/the Gt North Road.
(see sections 7b, d, e, g)

Letter from *Haddon and Local Residents Action Group*- This raises the following issues:-

- Object to the opening up of a through road from junction 1 of the A1139 Fletton Parkway to Norman Cross as this will create a 'rat run' with a dangerous blind bend. Only access from the Fletton Parkway should be considered.
- Local residents have been assured in the past by planners that this link would not be allowed.
- The impact of local residents appears to have been overlooked in the proposals. The nature of the Great North Road and Haddon Road would be completely (adversely) changed. At the moment they are pleasant rural roads used by cyclists, farm vehicles, horses, dog walkers, families with children and people from surrounding villages.
- What additional mitigation measures will be put in place to protect existing residents from additional noise, dust and dirt pollution? Expect a full acoustic scheme to protect residents.
- Flood Risk. There is no history of flooding. Can the applicants guarantee that their surface water management will work
- Concerned that the proposed diversion of the bridle way and the impact on wildlife, vegetation and the Green Wheel route.

(see sections 7b, d, e, g)

Summary of Responses on the revised plans- Note these removed the vehicular link from the employment area to the Great North Road.

6 letters raise concerns about the proposal on the following grounds:-

- The proposed Gt Haddon development is not within the development plan;

- No objections to the current proposal including of a turning head so that lorries cannot exit onto the Great North Road;
 - Plans shown potential future link through to the Great North Road. Object strongly to this. Officers in the Planning Department said this link would not be allowed (when the Alwalton Hill application was under consideration);
 - Object to the through link on the basis that rat runs would be created via Haddon Road and the villages beyond;
 - There would be no means to physical prevent HGVs continuing southwards from the roundabout;
 - Lorries and other vehicles bound for Alwalton Hill warehouses would be directed by their satellite navigation from junction 17 of the A1(M) up the Great North Road and into the development via New Road and the proposed new roundabout;
 - The exit of Haddon Road onto the A15 at the Norman Cross Premier Inn hotel is already a dangerous blind junction with traffic entering the A15 from the roundabout at speed. During peak hours traffic exiting Yaxley to join the A1(M) will prohibit easy right hand exits from the Haddon Road causing additional traffic jams back down the 'New Road' and the A15;
 - A better option would be for an alternative exit onto junction 2 of the Fletton Parkway across the yet to be agreed and developed Hampton/Haddon development area;
 - There is no need to create a through road. There is an alternative route via which to access the development;
 - The safety of the Haddon access point to the Green Wheel would be compromised;
 - Concerned that the traffic flow around the A1(M) A605 junction and junction 1 of the Fletton Parkway has not been accurately analyzed. The northbound slip road off the A1(M) which leads to the A605, the Services and the A605/A1 roundabout is hazardous. Traffic coming off the A1(M) swerves across lanes on the realisation that the main slip road will not get them to the Ortons or the Showground. The traffic in peak periods queues into Peterborough from the A605 and the A1 entries. This proposal will add traffic in this area;
 - The rural environment of the area would be destroyed.
- (see sections 7a and b).

Letter from the Haddon and Local Residents Action Group. This raises the following issues:-

- The Groups initial observations of the proposal still stand- only access to the Alwalton Hill development should be considered;
 - The residents do not want the Great North Road and Haddon Road linked to the employment area. If and when the housing development is built there is a simpler, greener and more cost effective way to link up the two developments without altering Haddon Road and the Great North Road.
- (see section 7b).

Copy to Councillors North, Seaton and Scott.

This page is intentionally left blank