

**PETERBOROUGH**



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD AT 1:30PM, ON  
TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2017  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Chair), Casey (Vice-Chairman), Councillors Ash, Bull, Clark, Amjad Iqbal, Hiller, Martin, Stokes and Serluca.

**Officers Present:**

Nick Harding	Head of Planning
Gemma Wildman	Principal Planner
Stephen Turnbull	Planning and Highways Lawyer
Dan Kalley	Senior Democratic Services Officer

**38. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bond.

**39. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Hiller declared that he was the Cabinet Member responsible for the Local Plan as outlined at Item 5, but was not pre-determined.

**40. MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTENTION TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS AS WARD COUNCILLOR**

There were no declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillors were received.

**41. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 17 OCTOBER 2017:**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2017 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

**42. PETERBOROUGH LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED SUBMISSION**

The Planning Committee received a report in relation to the Peterborough Local Plan Proposed Submission.

The purpose of the report was to enable the Planning Committee to consider and recommend to Cabinet and ultimately Full Council the approval of the Proposed Submission Local Plan for public consultation in January 2018.

The Principal Planning officer stated that the report highlighted the differences between the report presented on 19 September and the report before Committee at the meeting.

The net result was a reduction in the number of houses, using the new government 'Local Housing Need' method of 1,673 homes. Most notably this negated the need for the development outlined for Castor and Ailsworth. Members of the Committee were informed that with changes in dates from 2011 - 2036 to 2016-2036 the Council was meeting the 5 year land supply.

In response to questions from Members, the Principal Planning Officer stated:

- There were only 46 dwellings short of the target outlined in the 5 year housing supply.
- The extra 350 dwellings identified at Fengate South made provision for the increase in numbers due to the site being able to deliver a large quantity of homes.

David Carlisle, on behalf of HCA, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the points highlighted included:

- HCA welcomed officers making upward local adjustments to reflect the likely student housing needs and their commitment to help meet unmet needs from Cambridge.
- The Memorandum of Cooperation agreed between Peterborough, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire needed to be revisited in light of up to date housing numbers once confirmed next Spring.
- The ambitious economic growth plans of Peterborough and the Combined Authority needed to take into account the need to build more homes than envisaged by the Local Plan.
- The Council needed to make an uplift of housing provisions based on their economic ambition and the establishment of a University and Enterprise Zone.
- There was no consideration of the quantum of local affordable housing needs or other indicators that are not part of the population projections.
- There was only a modest buffer of around 8% above the new Local Plan requirement, which was smaller than other local authorities.
- The HCA were uniquely positioned to help Peterborough City Council accelerate delivery with a secure pipeline of housing.
- The 3-5% increase above current housing objective was based on indicative numbers from DCLG tables on housing requirements and grouped different areas in Cambridgeshire..
- Peterborough was a high growth area, which was at odds with number of houses that will be provided in the local plan, especially with the University and Enterprise Zone.
- HCA would boost housing delivery, they currently were on target to build one million homes by 2020, as the statutory body of DCLG they were confident of delivering that number of houses.

Martin Chillcott, on behalf of Protect Rural Peterborough, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The group would continue to publically oppose the Great Kyne development, even though it had been removed from the current version of the Local Plan.
- The new Government guidelines were welcomed, as they served to protect rural areas where possible.
- Evidence it is wrong development and site for anything like this.
- There were a number of archeological remains within the village envelope which needed protecting.
- The proposed development was incompatible with the local setting of the village.
- There would be a large impact on the historic landscape of the village and would be visible to areas from far away.

- There were a number of risks to the social and environmental wellbeing of the area if the development went ahead.
- Any future proposals could open the door to 5000 homes, which was way in excess of what the village could handle.
- Not against any development, had to be at the right scale, which would re-invigorate the village. The group was open to 100 new homes in castor and ailsworth.
- Neighbourhood plans were recently approved, 90% were in favour of small scale growth as per the past couple of years.
- Villages did want to grow and have a strong community spirit.
- Residents of the village were welcoming to others visiting their area, visitors enjoyed the tranquility of the village and would be appalled with the scale of the development that was being proposed.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to questions from Member. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The 30% outlined for affordable housing was part of the Strategic Housing Assessment and Local Plan viability report. Members were informed that this was the target however each development needed to be judged on its merits.
- It was confirmed that the Local Plan was Peterborough's plan and had nothing to do with the Combined Authority.
- The Committee were informed that officers had the choice of sticking with the original method of coming up with housing numbers. However, it was agreed that the government's methodology was better for Peterborough.

The Planning Environment Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- The development outlined in Eye, Thorney and Newborough took into account the school expansions forecast. The number of dwellings outlined was only a guide at this stage for future planning applications.
- It was important to keep developing the town centre, ensuring the commercial aspect was attractive to large retailers. Improving what was already on offer to residents of Peterborough.
- The infrastructure of the Highways system needed to be be closely monitored to ensure it could cope with higher levels of traffic.
- Peterborough was considered one of the most traffic friendly cities in the Country and it was important that this was maintained.
- It was important to protect and increase the number of affordable houses within the City.

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. The Committee **RESOLVED** (9 in Favour, 1 Abstention) to recommend the Proposed Submission ('Publication Draft') Local Plan to Cabinet who will subsequently be asked to recommend the Local Plan to Full Council for the purpose of both its final consultation for six weeks and its subsequent submission to the Secretary of State for the purpose of independent examination.

Chairman  
1:30pm – 2.30pm