

10/01461/OUT: REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE TO PROVIDE OFFICE (USE CLASS B1) AND RETAILING USE (USE CLASSES A1, A3 AND A4) WITH ASSOCIATED VEHICULAR ACCESS/EGRESS, CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING AT FORMER ROYAL MAIL SORTING OFFICE, BOURGES BOULEVARD, PETERBOROUGH, PE1 1AE

VALID: 29 OCTOBER 2010
APPLICANT: ING RED UK (PETERBOROUGH) LTD
AGENT: GL HEARN
REFERRED BY: HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES
REASON: WIDER PUBLIC INTEREST
DEPARTURE: NO

CASE OFFICER: MISS A McSHERRY
TELEPHONE: 01733 454416
E-MAIL: amanda.mcsherry@peterborough.gov.uk

1 SUMMARY/OUTLINE OF THE MAIN ISSUES

The main considerations are:

- Retail implications of the development
- Whether the proposed uses are compatible with the policy expectations for the redevelopment of the site
- Transportation impact and connectivity
- S106 planning obligation
- Provisions of the development plan

The Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services recommends that the application is **APPROVED**.

2 PLANNING POLICY

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

Development Plan Policies

Relevant policies are listed below with the key policies highlighted.

Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)

Policy CS3 – Spatial Strategy for the location of employment development
Policy CS4 – The City Centre
Policy CS10 – Environment Capital
Policy CS12 – Infrastructure
Policy CS13 – Developer contributions to infrastructure provision
Policy CS14 – Transport
Policy CS15 – Retail
Policy CS16 – Urban Design and the public realm
Policy CS17 – The Historic Environment

Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005

OIW5 – Office uses in city and district centres

T6 – Development affecting the Primary public transport corridor
T8 – Connections to the existing highway network
R5 – Conditions to restrict floorspace on out of centre retail developments
CC7 – Proposals for key city centre uses
CC12 – Railway Station Opportunity Area
CC15 – Car parking
CC16 – Cycle parking
LNE9 – Landscaping implications of development proposals

Peterborough Planning Obligations Implementation Strategy
Peterborough Station Quarter Development Brief – adopted Council Strategy (2008)

Material Planning Considerations

Decisions can be influenced by material planning considerations. Relevant material considerations are set out below, with the key areas highlighted:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Consultation Draft (2011) – A sequential approach to the consideration of retail proposals outside an existing centre should be applied and the retail impact should be assessed.

Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)

Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Planning and Climate Change (2007)

Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4): Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth

- Policy EC10 – Determining planning applications for economic development
- Policy EC14 – Supporting evidence for planning applications for main town centre uses
- Policy EC 15 – The undertaking of a sequential assessment of available sites that are in the City Centre / closer to the City Centre than the application site
- Policy EC16 - The retail impact assessment should be based on a 5 year period from when the application is made and should be appropriate to the scale and nature of the proposal and its likely impacts
- Policy EC17 – Where no significant impact are identified , planning applications should be determined taking in to account the positive and negative impacts of the proposals and the likely cumulative effects of recent retail development
- Policy EC18 – Application of car parking standards for non-residential development
- Policy EC19 – The effectiveness of conditions for main town centre uses

Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13): Transport (2011)

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;
- 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.

CIL Regulations in particular that the obligations in Section 106 must be:

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

3 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Outline planning permission is sought, for the redevelopment of the site to provide:-

- offices (Use Class B1) 6,000sqm GEA,
- an A1 foodstore 4,300 sqm GEA with a net sales area of 3,000 sq m (of which 900sq will be for comparison goods)
- 850 sqm GEA of A1, A3 and/or A4
- Revised site access/egress from Mayors Walk
- Car and cycle parking
- Highway and environmental improvement works, including new pedestrian/ cycle crossing on Bourges Boulevard

All matters are reserved, except for access.

4 DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located within the city centre boundary and Railway Station Opportunity Area as defined by saved policies of the Local Plan. The site is adjacent to but not within the central retail area as defined by the Local Plan. The Bourges Boulevard public transport corridor runs along the eastern boundary of the site, together with part of the cycle route network.

The existing Great Northern Hotel site is positioned to the south of the site, to the north is railway station land that is used for car parking and the fire station site, and to the west of the site are the railway platforms and tracks. Beyond Bourges Boulevard to the east of the site is the North Westgate Opportunity Area and the city centre multi storey car parks associated with the Queensgate shopping centre.

The application site covers an area of 1.293 ha (3.2 acres), and was formerly the Royal Mail sorting office site. This use was relocated and the buildings subsequently demolished and the site is now being used as a temporary car park with 500 spaces, for commuter car parking.

5 PLANNING HISTORY

Application Number	Description	Date	Decision
11/00502/ADV	Construction of one non illuminated sign		Withdrawn
10/00007/SCREEN	Request for Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Opinion relating to proposed redevelopment of site	23.11.2010	EIA not required
10/00557/DISCHG	Discharge of conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of planning permission 10/00277/FUL - Redevelopment of the former Royal Mail Sorting Office to provide a temporary surface level car park consisting of 500 spaces	12.08.2010	
10/00277/FUL	Redevelopment of the former Royal Mail Sorting	14.04.2010	Permitted

	Office to provide a temporary surface level car park consisting of 500 spaces		
09/01072/FUL	Redevelopment of the Former Royal Mail Sorting Office site to provide a surface level car park consisting of up to 500 spaces for a temporary period of five years	19.11.2009	Permitted
09/00466/FUL	Redevelopment of the former Royal Mail Sorting Office site to provide a surface level car park consisting of up to 500 spaces for a temporary period of five years	07.09.2009	Withdrawn

6 CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

INTERNAL

Travel Choice – No objection. Recommend revisions to the submitted travel plan and that the implementation of the plan be secured by condition.

Landscape (Tree) Officer – No objection. Request conditions re tree protection plan, method statement and landscaping scheme.

Archaeology – No objection. Request a watching brief condition.

Wildlife Officer – No objection. Request conditions to secure biodiversity improvements.

Drainage Engineer – No objection. Requests conditions to secure surface water drainage details.

Building Control – No objection.

Transport & Engineering – No objection. The Bright Street roundabout is the critical junction in respect of this development. It has been demonstrated that whilst there will be increased flows, the traffic waiting to enter the roundabout on Mayors Walk will not queue back across the access in to / out of the application site. Conditions / Section 106 should be put in place as appropriate to secure the provision of the Bourges Boulevard crossing and towards the wider local improvements to Bourges Boulevard and the travel plan. In response to the points raised by objectors:-

- Why have such limited traffic assessment periods been considered appropriate?
Response: The assessment periods are appropriate for the uses proposed.
- No allowance has been made for traffic growth between the traffic survey date and anticipated opening date of the development. No impact assessment has been made at 10 years post development opening
Response: This part of the network is generally at or close to capacity at peak times. Capacity constraint has therefore been assumed given that growth on this part of the network is not possible.
- Bourges Boulevard improvements are not certain and this should have been factored in to the assessment
Response: Bourges Boulevard improvements are outside the scope of this application. This application must be considered on its merits.
- No committed development or plan allocated development sites have been factored in to the assessment e.g. Brotherhood Retail Park, South Bank etc
Response: South bank and brotherhood permitted developments will not impact on this part of the network to any discernable extent.
- Assumption that 30% of trips to the site on a Saturday would be 'pass by trips' is an over estimate....15% would be more appropriate

Response: It was agreed that due to the location of this site 30% was acceptable.

- Risk of excessive stacking at the Bright Street roundabout
Response: The modelling shows that whilst queuing does occur there are no safety issues.
- Parking spaces closest to the access junction risk causing congestion
Response: This has been noted and the bays closest to the entrance must be removed.
- On site layout is such that a single articulated vehicle entering the site would cause queuing back to the public highway
Response: To prevent this 'keep clear' markings can be implemented on the access road.
- No servicing / loading and unloading plans
Response: These were submitted with the application.
- No safety audit undertaken
Response: The crossing has been audited. An audit is not required for the access.
- No detail on the design or impact of the proposed pedestrian crossing on Bourges Boulevard
Response: The crossing was included in the modelling
- No detail of the modelling provided
Response: The modelling has been reviewed and accepted by the LHA
- Concerned that the traffic impact may compromise the potential redevelopment of the Great Northern Hotel Site
Response: This is outside the remit of this application to consider.
- The number of trips has been underestimated. It is not clear if any travel choice factors have been applied but in any event this would not cover the under estimate of trips
Response: The trip generation has been accepted and is appropriate.
- No provision has been made for Saturday working for the office element of the scheme
Response: This would be unlikely to have any significant impact.
- No assessment of access suitability, geometry or visibility has been made
Response: The access is considered acceptable by the LHA.
- The access is located too close to the roundabout or the station access
Response: This has been modelled and there are no safety concerns.
- It is not demonstrated on a plan that adequate visibility can be achieved
Response: The access is considered acceptable by the LHA.
- Right turn movements from Mayors Walk in to the site should be restricted on safety grounds
Response: Removing right turns would cause more safety issues on other parts of the network.
- No assessment of accidents has been made and the roundabout has a higher than expected accident rate and so additional traffic at this junction would worsen the accident risk
Response: It is not considered that accident rates will increase directly as a result of this proposal, furthermore PCC are currently considering a wider scheme for improvements.
- The junction capacity model used is inappropriate as it is best used for larger networks
Response: The modelling is considered to be appropriate.
- No assessment of the Mayors Walk access has been made and it is not clear if the queue lengths are given as max or average
Response: The modelling has been accepted by the LHA

- Bright Street roundabout (in parts) runs over capacity at the AM peak and Saturday peak. Post development all of the roundabout will be over capacity in the Saturday peak which will result in traffic backing up to the site access and to the bus station on Bright Street. Site access is not capable of dealing with PM peak flows even if backing up on Mayors Walk does not happen
Response: The modelling does show that there will be additional congestion, this is however acceptable considering the location and wider aspirations for this part of the City
- Proposed supermarket would not result in linked trips to the City Centre and would not be in line with Council's Environmental Capital Agenda
Response: It is considered that the assumed linked trips are acceptable

EXTERNAL

Fire Service – No objection. Requests condition to secure provision of fire hydrants.

Civic Society – Supports the proposal as:

- It will bring with it public realm improvements
- It will significantly improve the sense of 'arrival' at the station

but comments as follows:

- Care has to be taken when locating the crossing
- Elevations to Bourges Boulevard should be active frontages
- Consider that the height should not exceed 7 stories
- Junctions improvements from the site on to Mayors Walk are considered necessary
- There is the need to co-ordinate the landscaping of this site with existing landscaping on adjacent land

Peterborough Local Access Forum – Support the application as it will improve and enhance inclusive access for pedestrians & cyclist between the city centre and the Station Quarter. Also support enhancements to Bourges Boulevard.

Anglian Water – No objection. The foul water network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the development. Whilst the proposed surface water strategy is not currently acceptable, the matter can be dealt with by way of condition.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer – No objection. Requests condition to secure details of the measures to be put in place to minimise the risk of crime and disorder.

British Transport Police – No objection but questions / comments as follows:

- Is the existing walkway/cycle route from the station forecourt past this area to the car parks beyond to be maintained?
- Will the lighting levels of this route be maintained or improved with the construction of this building?
- The station suffers from low levels of anti social behaviour and alcohol related offences. I am concerned that the provision of licensed premises so close to the railway station will attract street drinkers to the area and levels of associated alcohol related public disorder, anti social behaviour will increase. This will impact on the number of calls for police attendance to the station and immediate vicinity as this type of behaviour is more likely to be reported due to the presence of rail staff and the number of people using the station. Although British Transport Police have a police post close to the station the officers are responsible for the rail routes in area that covers west Cambridgeshire; into southern Lincolnshire and also through Bedfordshire and north Hertfordshire. They therefore may not be on hand to deal with any incident at the station and local Cambridgeshire units may have to attend, thereby having an impact on local policing.

Network Rail – Objects:

- The proposal does not represent comprehensive redevelopment of the Station Quarter as promoted by Council policy and is pre-mature in advance of a wider masterplanning exercise.
- The retail assessment does not properly address all sequentially preferable sites i.e. other sites within the Station Quarter Area such as the corner of Bourges Boulevard & Crescent Bridge.
- The proposal does not properly assess the cumulative impact of the development on traffic capacity and so the development of other parts of the Station Quarter may be prejudiced.
- The site is not well linked to the City Centre
- The proposal should not be allowed to prejudice the refurbishment of the station.

Peterborough Cycle Forum – Objects. The crossing should be for cyclists as well as pedestrians, there is the need to improve the cycle links to / from the development, too little cycle parking is proposed.

NEIGHBOURS / THIRD PARTIES

Land Securities – Object for the following reasons:

a) Traffic Impact

- Why have such limited traffic assessment periods been considered appropriate?
- No allowance has been made for traffic growth between the traffic survey date and anticipated opening date of the development
- No impact assessment has been made at 10 years post development opening
- Bourges Boulevard improvements are not certain and this should have been factored in to the assessment
- No committed development or plan allocated development sites have been factored in to the assessment e.g. Brotherhood Retail Park, South Bank etc
- Assumption that 30% of trips to the site on a Saturday would be 'pass by trips' is an over estimate....15% would be more appropriate
- Risk of excessive stacking at the Bright Street roundabout
- Parking spaces closest to the access junction risk causing congestion
- On site layout is such that a single articulated vehicle entering the site would cause queuing back to the public highway
- No servicing / loading and unloading plans
- No safety audit undertaken
- No detail on the design or impact of the proposed pedestrian crossing on Bourges Boulevard
- No detail of the modelling provided

b) Planning Policy

- The proposal does not accord with the provisions of the development plan
- The development is not comprehensive redevelopment as envisaged but piecemeal
- It is not demonstrated how the development will enable or support wider regeneration (including as proposed by the Station Quarter Brief)
- Would meaningful linkages with the City Centre proper be formed, probably not and therefore the site will operate as an out of centre facility rather than edge of centre
- The retail assessment does not evaluate all the sequentially preferable sites

Ravenside Investments Ltd – Object for the following reasons:

- The proposal would be piecemeal development of the Station Quarter, undermining Policy CC12 and the Station Quarter Development brief, which seek comprehensive redevelopment of the area
- Failure to improve connectivity between the Station area and city centre. The staggered toucan crossing does not accord with the Council's strategic aspirations for downgrade of Bourges Boulevard
- The location and type of pedestrian crossing of Bourges Boulevard, would raise issues of highways impact and public safety, contrary to Local Plan Policy T1 and the development brief

- The site cannot be classed as 'edge of centre', as a dual carriageway separates the site and the city centre, and the existing pedestrian links are unsatisfactory and not DDA compliant. The local characteristics do not comply with the criteria of PPS4 and its practice guide.
- Development of this site would not enable rail led development in the opportunity area, contrary to the objectives of the development brief
- The proposed access and servicing arrangements for the mixed use proposal are unsatisfactory and untested in terms of their highway impact, contrary to Local Plan Policy T1.
- Two of the major landowners in the Station Quarter development area object to these proposals
- The location of the pedestrian crossing of Bourges Boulevard has a poor relationship to the existing pedestrian routes and between the station and city centre and so there are doubts over whether it would actually be used.
- Even with the proposed toucan crossing, it is still considered that there would be barriers to ease of pedestrian movement, contrary to PPS1
- It is questionable whether people visiting the site would have linked trips to the station and city centre.
- Policy CC12 does not contain any support for retail development on the site
- The car park layout and access to the servicing facility could result in vehicles queuing back on to the highway. The applicants state that servicing would be outside trading hours, this is unusual and likely to be unacceptable to an operator
- There is doubt about whether the levels of car parking can be achieved, and so whether the quantum of development being applied for can be achieved
- It is considered the application is premature in advance of a comprehensive master planning exercise for the area
- The brief states the site is suitable for 'rail led' development and that any retail use should be complimentary to the station.

Assael (for owner of land at Great Northern Hotel) – Objects

- Concerned that the traffic impact may compromise the potential redevelopment of the Great Northern Hotel Site
- The number of trips has been underestimated
- It is not clear if any travel choice factors have been applied but in any event this would not cover the under estimate of trips
- No provision has been made for Saturday working for the office element of the scheme
- No assessment of access suitability, geometry or visibility has been made
- The access is located too close to the roundabout or the station access
- It is not demonstrated on a plan that adequate visibility can be achieved
- Right turn movements from Mayors Walk in to the site should be restricted on safety grounds
- No assessment of accidents has been made and the roundabout has a higher than expected accident rate and so additional traffic at this junction would worsen the accident risk
- The junction capacity model used is inappropriate as it is best used for larger networks
- No assessment of the Mayors Walk access has been made and it is not clear if the queue lengths are given as max or average
- Bright Street roundabout (in parts) runs over capacity at the AM peak and Saturday peak. Post development all of the roundabout will be over capacity in the Saturday peak which will result in traffic backing up to the site access and to the bus station on Bright Street
- Site access is not capable of dealing with PM peak flows even if backing up on Mayors Walk does not happen
- Proposed supermarket would not result in linked trips to the City Centre and would not be in line with Council's Environmental Capital Agenda
- The development will not be an attractive one visually
- The proposal may prejudice the comprehensive redevelopment of the Station Quarter
- The proposal is remote from the retail core
- The proposal is not compatible with the Council's opportunity area policies and does not address the 'Boulevard Barrier' adequately
- The development increases traffic flow which goes against the Council's Transport Plan.

Private Individuals

Lightfoot – Objects – Should be no higher than Great Northern Hotel as this is an important building and the development is near to residential development

COUNCILLORS

Cllr Jamil & Cllr Swift - I believe that it is contrary to CC12 and doesn't represent a wholesale redevelopment of the area, and is simply a piecemeal application which will prevent other applications coming forward.

7 REASONING

7.1 Compatibility of Proposed Uses Given the Location in Relation to Plan (and other) Policy

Policy CS3

7.1.1 Policy CS3 of the Core strategy identifies that it expects 3.5 hec of employment land to come forward in the city centre. In this respect, the development proposed, which includes 6,000 sq m sq m of office space is compatible with the set objective. The policy recognises that:

- There has been very little recent speculative office development
- Pedestrian permeability is poor
- Bourges Boulevard is a significant barrier to movement between key locations

and consequently the policy goes on to:

- Prioritise new retail floorspace provision (particularly comparison goods floorspace) towards the North Westgate area
- Promote office development
- Encourage public realm improvements
- Outline that sites such as the Railway Station Quarter area will be given detailed policy coverage under the forthcoming City Centre Area Action Plan.

7.1.2 North Westgate is a site that is in a multitude of ownerships and there is little progress in terms of site assembly by the public or private sector. From this point of view, the site is not readily available for redevelopment. In addition and as suggested in the policy, North Westgate is most appropriately used for comparison retail as opposed to convenience retail. Work on the City Centre Area Action Plan (CCAP) is only at a very early stage and so there can be no incompatibilities between the proposal and the CCAP. Notwithstanding this, the proposal is compatible with Policy CS 4 as it will give rise to:

- public realm improvements
- improvements between the Primary Shopping Area / Central Retail area and the application site.

Policy CS15

7.1.3 Core Strategy Policy CS15 sets the retail strategy for the City which includes:

- supporting / regenerating the city centre through retail / other development in order to maintain the centre at the top of the retail hierarchy
- supporting / regenerating where necessary existing District & Local Centres to ensure they cater for the needs of the communities they serve
- the application of PPS4 when deciding planning applications

7.1.4 The strategy defines the City Centre as being the 'Primary Shopping Area' (PSA) and lists the District and Local Centres that form the retail hierarchy. The geographical extent of each centre is currently identified in the 2005 Adopted Local Plan though it should be noted that the boundaries to the District and Local Centres are also shown in the soon to be adopted Site Allocations DPD and the emerging Planning Policies DPD.

7.1.5 Core Strategy Policy CS15 goes on to state that new retail development will be:

- encouraged to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of centres
- be of a scale and nature appropriate to the role and function of the centre in which it would be situated
- such that major comparison goods proposals will be directed to the City Centre PSA as a first preference [it should be remembered that the application before the committee is primarily for convenience retailing]
- such that new/ additional convenience goods floorspace should be prioritised towards the City Centre (at a scale to serve major new residential development), Werrington Centre, new centres proposed within the urban extensions

The proposed development does not accord with the provisions of CS15 as outlined above, but there are a number of mitigating factors that make the proposal acceptable (see 7.1.6 and 7.1.7 below).

7.1.6 The application site is located outside of the City Centre PSA, but can be considered as being 'edge of centre' (as defined by PPS4) as:

- It is within 300m of the defined PSA (as it is only 30m from it)
- The proposed pedestrian route that forms an integral part of the development proposal will provide a safe and convenient link to the City Centre and will overcome the existing barrier to such movement created by the current form of Bourges Boulevard and the current crossing facilities

7.1.7 Whilst CS15 prioritises convenience floor space to the City Centre PSA, the Werrington Centre and the proposed urban extensions, in terms of the latter two, the proposal is in such a location (edge of City Centre) and of such a size that it would not draw trade away from such centres. With regard to the City Centre, the applicant submitted an appraisal of available site centre sites to see if any were suitable for the development. The conclusion of the assessment (which is agreed with by officers) is that there are no sites of a suitable size that are available for development. Given this, and in line with the provisions of PPS4, the next most suitable location is edge of centre. As previously discussed, the application site qualifies as being edge of centre. However, regard still has to be had towards the provisions of Adopted Local Plan Policy CC12.

Policy CC12

7.1.8 Policy CC12 identifies the application site as being part of the Railway Station Opportunity Area (RSOA) and indicates that priority will be given to railway operational requirements and ancillary uses. Whilst the development can't be said to fit with this priority it should be noted that a major station improvement has just begun construction and that this does not impact on the application site or vice versa. Policy CC12 goes on to list 'potential' uses for the RSOA as:

- Transport interchange
- Offices
- Hotel
- Leisure
- Conference centre
- 'Possibly' housing

On the surface it looks as if the proposal does not comply with this Policy as retail is not a named use. However there is nothing in the policy which specifically excludes other uses.

7.1.9 The supporting statement to the policy states that retail development on the site should not be of a type that is 'more properly located in the Central Retail Area' (CRA), explaining that this is because the current pedestrian access between the RSOA and the CRA (via the footbridge or subway) is unsatisfactory and discourages movement. Again whilst it first appears that the Policy is not complied with it is the planning officer's view that the wording of the policy implies that if these matters were addressed, the site could be considered suitable for retail use. With this in mind, and as has been discussed previously:

- The proposal includes the provision of improved pedestrian access between the site and the CRA

- There are no suitable or available sites within the CRA where the development could be reasonably located
- The proposal would not be damaging to CRA or any existing or proposed District Centre in terms of trade draw.

7.1.10 Policy CC12 goes on to stipulate that any redevelopment should:

- substantially improve pedestrian and cycle accessibility of the station area from Westgate, the bus station and Queensgate
- improve vehicle circulation and station parking improvements
- not be allowed to prejudice comprehensive development of the area

The proposal does not compromise these objectives as:

- it provides for much improved accessibility with the City Centre / CRA
- the transport assessment has demonstrated that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the local highway network
- the proposal is compatible with the station improvements that are currently under construction and with the emerging scheme for the part redevelopment of the Great Northern Hotel site.

and so this aspect of Policy CC12 is satisfied.

Policy CS4 & Station Quarter Development Brief

7.1.12 The site is located within the city centre boundary and Railway Station Opportunity Area. Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy identifies the land of the Railway Station Quarter Area as an area of regeneration or change. The Policy identifies the City Centre Area Action will identify and define areas of regeneration and redevelopment within the central area. The City Centre Area Action plan is still in the early stages of production.

7.1.13 To the north of the application site is the Mayors Walk road and beyond the Fire Station site, all of which are outside the Opportunity Area. Along part of the northern boundary of the application site there is an area of land that also falls within the Opportunity Area, this land is currently part of a larger area, and so it is not considered redevelopment of this site would in any way prejudice any of this land coming forward for redevelopment at a later stage, or leave any odd piece of land that could not be developed. There is also currently a vehicle access/exit point to this adjacent land in close proximity to the application site boundary, which if retained would give a buffer zone between any built development on both sites. Whilst this application is outline only, with only access committed, the access/exit point is at the north east corner of the application site, with the indicative layout showing the parking at the northern part of the site, with the built form in the southern half of the site. Whilst the layout is indicative only and will not be considered until the reserved matters stage it does show a form of development that would not in the Local Planning Authority's view prejudice the comprehensive redevelopment of the Opportunity Area, or the remaining land to the north of the site within the Opportunity Area.

7.1.14 Whilst not forming part of the development plan, The Council in 2008 adopted (following two rounds of public consultation) the Station Quarter Development Brief. The brief identifies how the vision for the area will be delivered by development including:

- the formation of a masterplan
- the creation of legible connections between the site and the city centre and specifically by addressing the severance affect that Bourges Boulevard has and improving the quality and character of Bourges Boulevard to make it less car dominated
- the creation of a vibrant and diverse quarter that accommodates competing land uses
- the provision of appropriate levels of car parking for rail users and shoppers

A masterplan was never prepared for the site and the Council has not plans to do so. Notwithstanding this, it has to be acknowledged that certain landowners may want to bring forward their own scheme for development. In such circumstances the development and design principles of the brief will be a material consideration. In addition landowners bringing forward proposals within the Station quarter area will be expected to contribute to the funding of the

necessary infrastructure required to deliver the regeneration through appropriate planning agreements with the Council under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 7.1.15 The provision of direct and high quality pedestrian connectivity between the Station Quarter and the City Centre is identified in the brief as being an essential with connections between the area and Westgate being identified as 'critical'.
- 7.1.16 The brief identifies that it would be appropriate to allow up to 4,000 sq m gross convenience retail floorspace in the area and that it would be inappropriate for comparison goods retail floor space to be located there. The brief goes on to say that exceptions can be made where:
- a) the need for retail development can be demonstrated
 - b) the proposal accords with PPS6 [now called PPS4]
 - c) it can be evidenced that the proposal would meet the vision objectives and strategy for the brief and the wider City Centre
 - d) it is demonstrated that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the CRA
 - e) the parking proposals are in accordance with the brief's transport strategy
- 7.1.17 With regard criterion a) Current National Planning Policy no longer requires applicants to demonstrate the need for their development and so this criterion is no longer a material planning consideration
- 7.1.18 With regard to criterion b) and PPS 4, it has been demonstrated elsewhere that whilst the application site is not within the City Centre PSA, it can be considered as being an edge of centre location. Also it has been shown that the applicant has submitted the appropriate material that assesses the availability of suitable alternative sites in / closer to the City Centre PSA and also the retail impact of the proposal. Officers are satisfied that appropriate alternative sites have been identified and robustly considered with the conclusion that there are no sites of suitable size that are better located and are truly available for development. Finally, officers are satisfied that the retail impact of the development on either the City Centre PSA or on existing centres will not be so significant to justify refusal of the application. Please see Section 7.2.
- 7.1.19 With regard to criterion c), it should first be noted that the floorspace of the store will be below the threshold of 4,000sq m gross set by the brief. With regard to fit of the proposal against the stated objectives and strategy of the brief, it is evident that the proposal accords with it as:
- it makes provision for the improvement of the critical pedestrian link between the site and Westgate which in conjunction with the City Council's proposals for enhancements to Bourges Boulevard, will change the character of that highway.
 - is a mixed use development made up of uses identified in the brief as being potentially suitable
 - it provides for appropriate amounts of parking that will not impact negatively on the overall design quality of the area or on traffic flows, provides for cycle movements and is conveniently located to the bus and rail stations
 - it will be designed so as to meet the provisions of Core Strategy Policy CS10 (Environment Capital)
 - the development of this part of the station quarter does not compromise the redevelopment of the other parts of the wider site as the station improvements are currently under construction and a redevelopment scheme for part of the Great Northern Hotel is approaching submission as a planning application.
- 7.1.20 One area where the proposals does not fully match the provisions of the brief is in the area of phasing. This is primarily as a result of the various sites around the station quarter coming forward individually rather than in any purposefully designed order. This fact does not weaken the proposals or result in any consequential impact on the deliverability of the other parts of the brief.

7.2 Retail Impact Issues

Introduction

- 7.2.1 Outline planning permission was originally sought for 5,400 sq m GEA A1 food store, and 700sqm GEA of A1, A3 and/or A4. The amended proposal now proposes a 4,300 sqm GEA food

store (with a net sales area of 3,000sqm of which 2,100 sq m will be convenience and 900 sq m comparison, and 850 sq m GEA of A1, A3 and/or A4.

7.2.2 A retail assessment and then a subsequent addendum to the retail assessment have been submitted in support of the proposal. Independent retail advice was sought on the original submitted proposal and on the basis of this advice, the applicant has submitted the revised proposal and addendum to the retail assessment to try and overcome the concerns raised. The City Council has sought independent retail advice on the amended proposal and retail addendum.

Sequential Approach

7.2.3 As required by national planning advice in PPS4 (and reflected in local planning policy), the applicant undertook an assessment to establish if there were any sites within the City Centre that were of size and available that they could accommodate the development centrally rather than it being located on an edge of centre site. The sites assessed were: North Westgate, Asda / Rivergate, ex Woolworth building ex Furnitureland Store. The Woolworth building is now occupied, and placing a new 'main food shop' store immediately adjacent to the Asda store would not be viable for a trader. The ex Furnitureland store is a former engine shed that has had multiple floor levels and this makes it wholly unsuitable for use as a food store. With regard to North Westgate, this site whilst being of sufficient scale would not actually be suitable for the following reasons:

1. it is the City Council's policy to direct mainly comparison good retail development to the site
2. the site is a multitude of ownerships and there has been little progress in terms of land assembly by any party and as such the site is unlikely to be available with the next 5 years

Retail impact

7.2.4 As required by national planning advice in PPS4 (and reflected in local planning policy), the applicant has submitted a report which assesses the impact that the development would have on existing retailing in the City Centre and at nearby District Centres.

7.2.5 In terms of the impact on existing comparison goods shopping, it has been estimated (and confirmed by the City Council's consultant) that it would draw negligible amounts of trade away from the City Centre or the District Centres at Bretton, Werrington and Orton. Even on a cumulative impact basis the effect on the City Centre would be not be significant.

7.2.6 Turning now to the convenience element of the proposal, it has been estimated that 18% of the store's turnover would be diverted from Asda with a further 10% derived from a combination of Waitrose and Tesco. The City Council's consultant has identified that other large stores likely to be most directly affected are Sainsbury at the Bretton Centre 6.2% and Tesco at Werrington 8.5% and concluded that this would not lead to any significant adverse impact on these centres. On a cumulative basis (taking in to account not only this development but also retail schemes that have recently been permitted, started construction or opened) the Consultant has identified the following impacts: Asda 20%, Sainbury Bretton (26%) and Tesco Werrington 23%. There is no benchmark that exists that indicates the impact level above which a centre begins to suffer as a result of trade draw. Whilst the trade draw for the centres at Bretton and Werrington look high, it should be noted that Bretton has recently had significant investment and that the redevelopment of Werrington Centre is due to begin soon.

7.2.7 The site is located within the city centre boundary, and adjacent to but not within the central retail area (as defined by the adopted Peterborough Local Plan). In accordance with the definitions of PPS4 the site location is considered to be an edge of centre site, due to its proximity to the central retail area (within easy walking distance) and because there is an existing and proposed new pedestrian route to the central retail area. The site is physically separated from the central retail area by the existing dual carriageway Bourges Boulevard. However there is an existing pedestrian bridge connection which links the west sides of Bourges Boulevard with the central retail area. It is acknowledged that this route is poor because of the long stepped ramps, which means that it is not compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act, as there is no lift for wheelchair users.

- 7.2.8 The applicant proposed as part of the development the installation of a new at grade pedestrian crossing of Bourges Boulevard in close proximity to the site, to improve the pedestrian connectivity and strengthen the sites position as an edge of centre site, with the potential for linked trips. This will be secured by condition and Section 106. The crossing must be provided before the development first comes in to use and the Section 106 will be worded so that either the Council or the developer will carry out the works to provide the crossing. Irrespective of who carried out the works, the crossing will be funded by the developer. A choice of who implements the crossing has been provided for because it is not yet known when the development will take place in relation to the planned wider improvements to Bourges Boulevard. It was envisaged that as part of the North Westgate Opportunity Area proposals that a similar at grade crossing of Bourges Boulevard would be provided to provide better linkages between this retail area and the station quarter area. Improved pedestrian/cycling links between the station and central areas is a requirement of Policy CC12, therefore the proposed S106 agreement for this application to secure the pedestrian crossing and public realm improvements is accordance with this Policy. Whilst siting is a reserved matter the applicant shows on the indicative layout a 10m public realm/landscaping area on the site frontage, which would be a further enhancement to the pedestrian environment between the station and central areas, in accordance with Policy CC12.
- 7.2.9 The proposed 850 sqm GEA of A1, A3 and/or A4 at ground floor level to provide active frontages along Station Road is considered to be of an acceptable level in retail terms. It is considered that these retail uses would compliment the existing station and surrounding uses and would not be of a level that would harmfully affect the vitality or viability of the adjacent central retail areas. This is considered to be in accordance with Policy CS15.

7.3 Offices

- 7.3.1 The application proposes 6,000sqm GEA of B1 office space. Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy promotes the city centre (the whole of the area to be subject to the CCAP) as an area suitable for employment development, with an emphasis on B1 development. It also encourages mixed use developments. The principle therefore, of the proposed 6,000sqm of B1 office accommodation on this city centre site is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy CS4.
- 7.3.2 Office use is also one of the accepted uses listed within the Railway Opportunity area Policy CC12 of the Local Plan, therefore office use is considered to be acceptable on this site. Indicative plans have been submitted to demonstrate how the quantum of office space could be provided on the site. Whilst the plans are indicative only, and are likely to change and be assessed under any future reserved matters application, they do demonstrate for the purposes of the outline permission that this quantum of office space could be accommodated on the site.
- 7.3.3 The Station Quarter development brief, which is an adopted Council Strategy, encourages mixed use developments within the opportunity area. The brief recognises the mix of uses depends upon the location within the quarter area, but that sites closer to the city centre are more likely to have a commercial focus. This site is adjacent to the city centre retail area, so the commercial focus proposed on the site is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the Council Strategy for this area.
- 7.3.4 Under Local Plan Policy CC7, the office element of the scheme is a key city centre use. There are currently no readily available vacant sites within the Central Retail Area and the application site is clearly an edge of centre (CRA) location. There is no evidence that office use on this site would have a detrimental impact on other City Centre uses, it is no in a primary retail frontage area and it would make provision for safe and convenient access by foot, cycle and public transport.

7.4 Transport

- 7.4.1 Policy CS4 states improvements to the public realm throughout the city centre will be promoted, with a particular focus on the pedestrian environment and connections between the railway station, bus station and Cathedral Square. It was the applicant's intention to put in a new at grade pedestrian crossing and propose improvements to the adjoining public realm in Bourges

Boulevard and Westgate to improve the pedestrian connection between the site and central area. In view of the Council's consideration of wider highway and public realm improvement in the area, a financial contribution has been secured instead, to ensure these pedestrian/highway/public realm improvement works are carried out. It will be a condition of the planning permission that the developer must provide a new crossing for Bourges Boulevard in order to improve the connectivity between the site and City Centre, particularly Westgate. The pedestrian/public realm improvement works secured by S106 is in accordance with Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy and Policy CC12 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005.

- 7.4.2 In terms of the traffic impact of the development, further information has been provided in respect of the modelling data used. The conclusion reached is that whilst there will be an impact on the Bright Street Roundabout western approach, the traffic will not queue back across from the Bright Street Roundabout. On this basis the Local Highway Authority raise no objections.
- 7.4.3 Amended plans in respect of the access have been submitted which resolve the concerns raised in respect of HGV access and egress. The new layout does however show issues with the car parking layout, however as the layout is indicative only this will be dealt with as part of any subsequent reserved matters application. The Local Highway Authority highlights that there will be a need for a safe pedestrian access along Station Road. This will be dealt with as part of any subsequent reserved matters application, however the indicative layout shows a 10m public realm area on the site frontage where this could be accommodated. Whilst the on site cycle parking is not shown on the plans at this outline stage, it will be required to be part of any future reserved matters proposals. The Travel Plans submitted appear to be comprehensive, they will be secured by planning condition with further details/information sought on implementation.
- 7.4.4 It is considered the proposal will not adversely impact on the traffic flows or capacity of the adjoining highway network. The access is considered to be acceptable to accommodate HGV and cars. The financial contribution secured by way of legal agreement will improve the public realm and pedestrian connection between the central area and station quarter area. The amended proposal is therefore is considered to be in accordance with Policies CS14, CS4 of the Core Strategy and Policies CC12 and T8 of the Local Plan.

7.5 Design

- 7.5.1 The application is only an outline application and so the appearance of the development is a matter that will be the subject of a future submission. However the amount of development is known in terms of floorspace and indicative plans have been submitted that show a basic layout and building heights. Officers are satisfied that:
- the proposed floorspace can be accommodated within the indicative heights (two storey food store/ car park and four storey office)
 - the proposed height will not create or contribute towards a canyon effect along Bourges Boulevard or damage cathedral views
 - there will be opportunities around the buildings to provide purposeful public realm areas

7.6 S106

- 7.6.1 Applying POIS to the proposed floorspace, the contribution will be £364,385. This is split as follows and has been arrived at through the application of the Council's adopted POIS policy. Associated with the POIS is the Peterborough Integrated Development Programme (IDP). Its purpose is to provide a single delivery programme for strategic capital-led infrastructure which will allow for appropriately phased growth and development in the period to 2031. This document builds on the previous version of the IDP completed in April 2008. The purpose of the IDP is to:
- Summarise key strategies and plans for Peterborough, highlight their individual roles and importantly show how they complement one another.
 - Set out what infrastructure and support Peterborough needs for the next 15 years or so, why we need it, who will deliver it, and what it might cost. For a variety of audiences, it shows, and gives confidence to them, that we have a coordinated plan of action on infrastructure provision.

- Form the basis for bidding for funding, whether that be from: Government; Government Agencies; lottery and other grants; charities; private sector investment; and developer contributions (s106 and potentially CIL).

7.6.2 In this context, the IDP is the fundamental bedrock to support two emerging policy documents of the City Council: the Core Strategy (CS) and the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme (POIS). The IDP identifies key strategy priorities and infrastructure items which will enable the delivery of the city's growth targets for both jobs and housing identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (commonly known as the East of England Plan) and the Core Strategy. The investment packages that are identified – and within them, the projects that are proposed as priorities for funding – are not unstructured 'wish-lists', instead they are well evidenced investment priorities that will contribute in an unambiguous manner to enhancing the area's economic performance, accommodating physical growth and providing a basis for prosperous and sustainable communities.

7.6.3 The IDP is holistic. It is founded on a database for infrastructure provision that reflects delivery by the private sector, the City Council and a range of agencies and utilities. This late 2009 review adds to the programme for Peterborough; and all partners are committed to developing the IDP's breadth further through engagement with a broader range of stakeholders, including those from the private sector.

7.6.4 The POIS covers the following items in addition a contribution of £614,275 is being made toward the required enhancements to Bourges Boulevard including the crossing (note that the provision of the crossing on Bourges Boulevard is being secured by planning condition).

Spend Calculation				
Infrastructure Type	Strategic Pool (%)	Amount	Neighbourhood Pool (%)	Amount
Transport and Communications	25%	157062.50	5%	31412.50
Emergency Services	8%	50260	0%	0.0
Environment	15%	94237.50	5%	31442.50
Total	48%	301560	10%	62825
Total cost £364,385				

7.6.5 The wording of the S106 allows the Council to use the money (£614275) towards a wider improvement scheme of Bourges Boulevard, or if this scheme is not sufficiently advanced in time to allow the crossing to be implemented before occupation of the development, the developer will use part of this money to allow implementation of a pedestrian crossing themselves. These requirements accord with both national and local policy and in your officer's opinion complies with the tests and the principles set out in ODPM Circular 05/2005 (see Section 2 above), the CIL Regulations and the Tesco/Witney case in that each element of the obligation is:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
- Directly related to the development
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

7.7 NPPF

7.7.1 NPPF policy mirrors current plan policy in that a sequential approach to the consideration of out of centre proposals should be adopted with an impact assessment being undertaken / considered. These matters have already been considered in this section (Section 7) and do not need to be reconsidered.

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 proposal:

- a) Cannot be reasonably accommodated with the city centre and more specifically within the central retail area
- b) Is located with the next available location which is edge of centre and so is in line with the sequential approach to the location of retail development
- c) Will result in improvements to the connectivity between the site and the City Center and in particular Westgate
- d) Will not result in a significant detrimental impact on the City Centre or Districts centres as a consequence of trade draw either individually or in conjunction with other recent developments, planning approvals or schemes under construction
- e) Contains a range of competing uses of a nature compatible with policy requirements
- f) Does not compromise the development of the other parts of the Station Quarter
- g) Is of a scale that would not be detrimental to cathedral views or be intrinsically be likely to result in a poor design or give no opportunities for the creation of high quality public realm areas
- h) Would not result in an unacceptable impact on the local road network or compromise highway safety or the implementation of the Primary Public Transport Corridor
- i) Provides an appropriate level of parking and gives opportunity for travel by public transport , walking and cycling particularly due to its good location.
- j) Can be controlled by condition in respect of design and layout, crime and disorder, environment capital/renewable energy), infrastructure / infrastructure provision, transport, biodiversity, flood risk and archaeology
- k) Provides for new office development in the City Centre

And is therefore considered to be in accordance with Core Strategy Policies CS4, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS14, CS16, CS17, CS22, the Peterborough Planning Obligations Implementation Strategy SPD, Local Plan Policies OIW5, T6, T8, T9, T10, T11, R5, CC7, CC12, CC15, CC16 and the Station Quarter Development Brief.

9 RECOMMENDATION

Subject to 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 physical and social impacts that the development will have, the Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- C1 Approval of the details of the siting, design and external appearance of the building(s), and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced.**
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.
- C2 Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition 1 above, relating to the siting, design and external appearance of any buildings to be erected, and the**

landscaping of the site, shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority and 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.

C3 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

C4 The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: In accordance with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

C5 The plans and particulars submitted to address a Reserved Matter should include an Arboricultural Method which is in accordance with BS5837-2005 Trees in Relation to Construction.

Reason: The site contains existing trees which may be desirable to retain as part of the approved landscaping scheme.

C6 The landscaping scheme to be submitted as a reserved matter shall include the following details:

- **Proposed finished ground and building slab levels**
- **Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting**
- **An implementation programme (phased developments)**

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policies LNE9 and LNE10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) and policy CS21 of the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C7 A landscape management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development. 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.

The Plan shall include the following details:

- Long term design objectives

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policies LNE9 and LNE10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) and policy CS21 of the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C8 No development shall commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority in writing.

Reason: to secure the obligation on the planning applicant or developer to mitigate the impact of their scheme on the historic environment when preservation in situ is not possible, in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 5 Planning for the Historic Environment and Policy CS17 of the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C9 If, during development, contamination not previously considered is identified, then the LPA shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the LPA. The development shall thereafter not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure all contamination within the site is dealt with in accordance with PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control.

- C10 Details of the surface water drainage system for the development (including storage facilities where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied.**

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area and of the water environment, in accordance with Policies U1 and U9 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005, and Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy DPD 2011.

- C11 The first floor of NB1 AND NB2 (see plan 1137 URB SG [08] 90 02 A01 shall be used for the retailing of a single convenience/food goods unit only and for no other purpose (including any other purpose within Class A1 of the Schedule to the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1995 (or as subsequently amended).**

Reason: The information submitted to support the application is based on a maximum 4,300 square metres of GEA floor space being taken up by a food store. The application has been considered in this light against the policies set out in PPS4 and has been found acceptable on this basis. Any changes in types of goods being sold should therefore be subject to further assessment via a planning application.

- C12 The proposed first floor foodstore shall comprises a maximum 4,300 square metres Gross External Area (3,000sqm total net sales floorspace (defined by Competition Commission, p64 Practice Guidance on Need, impact and the Sequential Approach) of which 2,100 sqm is convenience goods and 900 sqm comparison goods).**

Reason: The information submitted to support the application is based on a maximum 4,300 square metres of GEA floor space being taken up by a food store. The application has been considered in this light against the policies set out in PPS4 and has been found acceptable on this basis. Any changes in types of goods being sold should therefore be subject to further assessment via a planning application.

- C13 The ground floor NB4, and NB6 (see plan 1137 URB SG [08] 90 02 A01 comprising a total of 850 square metres Gross External Area shall be used for the retailing of A1, A3 and/or A4 only and for no other purpose (including any other purpose within Class A2 of the Schedule to the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1995 (or as subsequently amended).**

Reason: The information submitted to support the application is based on a maximum 850 square metres of GEA floor space. The application has been considered in this light against the policies set out in PPS4 and has been found acceptable on this basis. Any changes in types of goods being sold should therefore be subject to further assessment via a planning application.

- C14 Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, full details of car parking and cycle parking layouts shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, the details of the car parking shall include signing, lining access/egress points and the details of the cycle parking shall accord with Peterborough City Council Cycle Parking Guidelines. The car and cycle parking shall be laid out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development.**

Reason: In the interests of the safety of all highway users in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

- C15 Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, full details of the vehicular and pedestrian accesses to the site from the public highway shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The accesses to the site shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the development.**

Reason: In the interests of the safety of all highway users in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

C16 Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, full details of the proposed off site highway works (yellow box junction) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local planning Authority. The highways works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of all highway users in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

C17 Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved a Construction Management Plan (CMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The details within the CMP shall include:

- **Haul routes to and from the site**
- **Hours of working**
- **Parking turning and loading/unloading areas within the site**
- **Compound/Storage/Welfare facilities**
- **Wheel washing facilities (wheel washing facilities shall be capable of cleaning the wheels, body and underside of the chassis of the construction vehicles)**

Reason: In the interests of the safety of all highway users in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

C18 Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, the existing access to the site shall be closed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local planning Authority. The highways works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of all highway users in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

C19 The draft Framework Travel Plan submitted with this application shall be in place prior to commencement of the development. Within 3 months of the occupation of the development, multi-modal surveys shall be carried out to ascertain the existing office/superstore modal shares. Within 6 months of occupation of the development a detailed Travel Plan setting SMART targets shall be implemented using the multi modal surveys as a basis for the targets and outlining measures that shall be implemented to achieve those targets.

Reason: In the interests of promoting the use of non car modes to travel to and from the site in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

C20 Prior to the commencement of development (or by an alternative date agreed in writing with the local planning authority) details of the proposed pedestrian crossing on Bourges Boulevard shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. No part of the development shall come in to use (unless agreed in writing with the local planning authority) until the crossing has constructed in accordance with the approved details and is operational.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal provides for the necessary connectivity improvements to link better the site to the city centre in accordance with Policies CS14, CS4 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policies CC12 and T8 of the Local Plan.

C21 The development hereby approved shall have a target emissions rate 10% lower than required under building regulations at the time that building regulations approval is sought for the development.

Reason: To facilitate the City Council's Environment Capital agenda and to comply with Policies CS10 & CS11 of the Peterborough Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

If the S106 has not been completed within 3 months of the date of this resolution without good cause, the Head of Planning Transport and Engineering Services be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason stated below:-

R1 A request has been made by the Local Planning Authority to secure the proven physical and social infrastructure improvements necessary to support the development however, no S106 Obligations have been completed and the proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy IMP1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

Copy to Councillors Nadeem, Khan, and Jamil

This page is intentionally left blank