



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH
ON 6 NOVEMBER 2012**

Members Present: Councillors Serluca (Chairman), Casey (Vice Chairman), Hiller, North, Stokes, Todd, Harrington and Ash.

Officers Present: Nick Harding, Group Manager Development Management
Simon Machen, Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services
Jez Tuttle, Senior Engineer (Development)
Gemma Wildman, Principal Strategic Planning Officer
Julia Chatterton, Flood and Water Management Officer
Carrie Denness, Senior Solicitor
Louise Tyers, Compliance Manager
Karen S Dunleavy, Governance Officer

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lane, Shabbir and Sylvester.

Councillor Ash was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Lane.

2. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Members' Declaration of Intention to Make Representation as Ward Councillor

Peterborough Dairies, 3 John Wesley Road, Werrington, Peterborough

Councillor Harrington declared that he owned a commercial property near to the site of the application and would not vote on this item.

Councillor Serluca declared that she would be standing down as Chairman for this item.

4. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 9 October 2012

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2012 were approved as a true and accurate record.

5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters

Change to the Order of the Agenda

The Chairman requested the Committee's agreement to change the order of the agenda for the development and enforcement items as there were a number of applications which had members of the public registered to speak. The new order of the agenda would be:

- (i) 12/01352/FUL - Horsey Way Service Station, Whittlesey Road, Stanground, Peterborough
- (ii) 12/01340/FUL - Netherton Post Office, 5 Winslow Road, Netherton, Peterborough
- (iii) 12/01354/HHFUL – The Retreat, Leicester Road, Thornhaugh, Peterborough
- (iv) 12/00463/MMFUL – Thornhaugh Landfill Site, Leicester Road, Thornhaugh, Peterborough
- (v) 12/01100/FIL – Peterborough Dairies, 3 John Wesley Road, Werrington, Peterborough
- (vi) 12/01008/MMFUL – Land to the West of Willow Hall Farm, Willow Hall Lane, Thorney, Peterborough
- (vii) 12/01458/R3FUL – Land at Newborough, North of the B1443 Bukehorn Road, East of Peterborough Road

The Chairman announced that application 12/01314/FUL – Unity Hall, Northfield Road, Millfield, Peterborough, had been withdrawn.

Resolved: To change the order of the agenda.

5.1 12/01314/FUL - Unity Hall, Northfield Road, Millfield, Peterborough

This application had been withdrawn.

5.2 12/01352/FUL - Horsey Way Service Station, Whittlesey Road, Stanground, Peterborough

The site was located at an existing petrol filling station on the northern side of Whittlesey Road (A605) and on the junction with Coneygree Road to the east. The surrounding character comprised the Fenman Public House to the east, two storey flatted development to the north, a detached residential dwelling to the west and a playing field on the opposite side of Whittlesey Road to the south. The site was bounded to the north and west by a 1.8m fence and mature conifer hedge to the west and mature trees to the north. The site contained a petrol forecourt area to the eastern side with five pumps and to the western side, a retail shop selling a range of convenience goods. Directly along the northern boundary was a car wash facility. Nine car parking spaces for customers and staff are provided at the front of the shop. The site was accessed from Coneygree Road and Whittlesey Road. There were a number of mature trees to the northern and eastern boundary and soft landscaping to the Whittlesey Road frontage.

The application sought planning consent for alterations to the existing shop to create a Burger King take-away/restaurant and shop facility. The works would include a small extension 8m x 4m x 2.8m (height) to the northern side of the building to provide toilets. The extension would have a flat roof. There would be some elevational changes to the existing building, including re-location of the entrance, new fascia, insertion of a serving window and removal, in part, of the forecourt canopy. Twenty two car parking spaces would be provided, including two disabled parking bays. A car wash facility along the northern boundary would be removed and one petrol pump would also be removed.

The proposal would reconfigure the internal layout of the existing shop to provide both a small restaurant and takeaway and to continue to provide the shop facility. A new refuse compound would be created with attached secure staff cycle store. The proposal would provide nine full time staff and fourteen part time staff. The petrol filling station would operate twenty four hours a day Monday to Sunday, as existing. The opening hours for the Burger King takeaway/restaurant would be 9.00 am to 11.00 pm Monday to Saturday and 9.00 am to 10.00 pm on Sundays.

The recommendation was to GRANT the application subject to relevant conditions.

Councillors Harper and Walsh addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The aim of the application was to increase the profitability of the site.
- The Local Highways Authority was concerned at the number of vehicle trips especially at peak times.
- The Cardea development would lead to an increase in dwellings and therefore an increase in traffic.
- The traffic which had been taken off the Whittlesey Road by the Stanground Bypass would return.
- There would be chaos at the site when tankers arrived to deliver fuel.
- Some residents lived within meters of the development and there would be an unacceptable loss of privacy to local residents including an increase in anti-social behaviour and music from cars.
- What monitoring would be done around the odours from cooking?
- There were already problems with litter.
- Stanground Academy had a healthy eating policy in place and also promoted sports. There was concern that as the site was on the way home for a number of children.
- There had been a judicial review against Tower Hamlets Council when the fact that a school promoted health eating was not considered during the planning process.
- The application should be rejected as unsuitable due to the impact on the neighbourhood and the health of young people.

Mr Chris Goodwin and Mr Michael Watling addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The proposed parking bays at the site would only be 20 feet away from some properties and people would be parked up to eat their purchases.
- Appleyard were not good neighbours and they had not consulted with local people on their application.
- Local residents were the important issue. The area was a peaceful, quiet residential area.
- The photographs showed by the Planning Officer did not show that the site was located at a very busy T Junction which was controlled by a set of traffic lights.
- Drivers already had to queue to leave the petrol station and there was chaos when fuel tankers arrived.
- Other suitable sites were located not very far away.
- The Committee should reject the application on the grounds of safety.

Following questions to the speakers, Members made the following comments:

- There was disappointment that the applicant had not consulted with local residents.
- The Committee was here to listen to the views of the public and it was very clear that there was local objection to the development.
- There would be a loss of amenity to local residents especially as the current barrier of trees between the car wash and flats would go.
- There was concern at the possible over activity in a concentrated area and the level of noise.
- The Committee were impressed at the number of people who had attended today to make objections.
- The access to and from the site appeared to be dangerous and the increase in traffic would have an impact on local amenity.

In response, Nick Harding advised that neither the Local Highways Authority nor the Police had any objections. The trees which would be removed as part of the application were of no significance and would not be able to be protected.

Jez Tuttle stated that the Local Highways Authority did have initial concerns and had asked for more work to be undertaken, which had now been done. There had only been three accidents over the last three years so the area was not an accident problem. The Whittlesey Road had the capability of carrying the additional traffic.

Following debate a motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application due to the unacceptable impact on the local amenity.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to refuse the application, against the recommendation of officers.

Reasons for the decision:

Due to the unacceptable impact on the local amenity including the increase and proximity of parking to local residents.

5.3 12/01340/FUL - Netherton Post Office, 5 Winslow Road, Netherton, Peterborough

The site was an A1 (shop) unit with living accommodation above, located within the Netherton Local Centre, one mile west of the city centre. The local centre was made up of a small collection of shops, hot food takeaways, and various service establishments, such as a vets and was served by a small area of parking adjacent to Ledbury Road containing twenty nine parking spaces.

Permission was sought for a change of use of the application site from A1 (shop) to A5 (Hot food takeaway).

The recommendation was to REFUSE the application.

Mrs Audrey Goodwin of the Longthorpe and Netherton Residents Association addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents. In summary the issues highlighted to the

Committee included:

- There were already plenty of hot snack and takeaways in the area.
- The current balance of trade at the Centre was excellent.
- 1300 people had signed a petition against the proposal.
- There was living accommodation about the shops.
- The current fish and chip shop closed by 9pm.
- There was concern over litter and 15 takeaway containers had recently been found in surrounding areas.
- There were 2,000 students at a nearby school which encouraged healthy lifestyles.
- There was concern that there would be an increase in anti-social behaviour, drug dealing and fear of crime.
- There were already four similar establishments in Netherton.

Following questions to the speakers, Members made the following comments:

- The views of the MP, local councillors and officers should be supported.
- There were already two A5 uses already in the parade of shops.
- The parade of shops served the needs of the local community. Another similar shop tipped the balance of the shops from local need to a wider need.

The Legal Officer clarified that in the Tower Hamlets case the application was not quashed because of a healthy eating policy being in place but because the Planning Committee had been advised that the policy was not a material planning consideration when it should have been considered.

Following debate a motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application as per the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to refuse the application, as per officer recommendation.

Reasons for the decision:

The proposed change of use from an A1 retail unit to A5 hot food takeaway was likely to result in increased levels of rowdy/nuisance and anti-social behaviour already experienced within the area. As such, the proposal will result in an increase in crime and disorder and increased noise and general disturbance to the occupants of surrounding residential properties, to the detriment of their amenity and contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy R9 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005) and policy PP02 of the emerging Peterborough Planning Policy (DPD).

5.4 12/01354/HHFUL - The Retreat, Leicester Road, Thornhaugh, Peterborough

The property was located in a very small settlement off the A47 comprising Home Farmhouse, its former agricultural buildings (converted to residential use), two pairs of semi-detached former agricultural workers cottages (mid and late Victorian period) and two new detached infill dwellings.

The area was considered to be open countryside and has no village boundary as defined

in the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005 and in the emerging planning policies (DPD) 2012.

The property was situated in a large site in wooded shallow valley and was located to the north east of the former Home Farmstead, which comprised three grade two listed buildings. The supporting information advised that the application property was set in part of a former quarry. The existing dwelling was a small storey stone faced property under a hipped Collyweston slate roof. The dwelling was in need of renovation and modernisation.

Permission was sought to extend the property and increase its height to make it two storeys in height.

The height of the dwelling would be increased from 4.7 metres to 10 metres to apex. The property would be extended to the North West with a two storey extension for 9.6 metres.

The footprint of the property would increase from approximately eighty seven square metres to one hundred and forty five square metres.

The ground floor extension would be finished in brick with all upper parts of the extension and new first floor above the existing cottage would be rendered. Clay or slate tiles were the proposed roof materials.

The recommendation was to REFUSE the application.

Mr and Mrs Witherington who were the applicants addressed the Committee. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- The proposed extension started from the staircase.
- The building was already L shaped.
- It was not a massive side extension.
- Statements had been made about the height of the building.
- The second storey was level with the back gardens of the nearby properties.
- The height of the development on surrounding properties was not an issue. The loss of view from those gardens was not a material consideration.

Members had no questions and made the following comments:

- From the site visit it was clear that the area was a collection of properties of different heights and styles that did not fit in together. This was part of the charm of the village.
- The design appeared to be the contention and whether it would fit in with the surrounding area.
- A bit more discussion was needed to try and get agreement between the applicants and officers.
- The arrangement of the windows was also an issue.

Following debate a motion was put forward and seconded to approve the application, with conditions delegated to officers.

RESOLVED: (7 For, 1 Against) to grant the application, with conditions delegated to

officers.

Reasons for the decision:

The surrounding area of the development was already a collection of properties of different heights and styles. The façade of the property, including the materials used, to be agreed with officers.

The meeting adjourned at 3.30pm and reconvened at 3.45pm.

5.5 12/00463/MMFUL Thornhaugh Landfill Site (including the “Bradshaw Land”), Leicester Road, Thornhaugh, Peterborough

Thornhaugh 1 Landfill Site was located about 2 kilometres west of the A1 at Wansford immediately to the south of the A47 Leicester Road. The village of Thornhaugh lies approximately 1km to the north east beyond the A47. The site had an area of 30.8 hectares. The site (except the area known as the Bradshaw land) has current permission for use as a landfill site accepting stable non reactive hazardous waste (SNRHW), asbestos, gypsum and other high sulphate bearing wastes and non hazardous commercial and industrial wastes. The current operative permission expired on 31 December 2013 but the remaining consented void would take approximately 8.7 years to fill at current rates. The area of land known as the Bradshaw land had permission for extraction and there were some remaining reserves in this area. The site contained a county wildlife site to the west where it adjoined Bedford Purlieus Site of Special Scientific Interest. The site contained a population of Great Crested Newts which had been translocated to the County Wildlife Site (CWS) and were managed by Augean, the applicant. The site was accessed by a single point of access off the A47.

The proposed development involved the following:

- The deferment of the end date of the landfilling of the site to 31 December 2028 with final restoration completed one year later;
- Extension to the landfill area by inclusion of the Bradshaw Land (phases 4B and 4C);
- Temporary use of part of the adjacent Cook’s Hole site for storage of material excavated from phase seven (for return and use in the restoration of the Thornhaugh one site);
- Revisions to the pre and post settlement landforms except phases three and seven which were already capped/restored and no change in the maximum permitted height of the landform;
- Revised restoration and landscaping;
- Restoration of the whole site to a nature conservation use; and
- On site recycling of inert waste including imported material for use on site in the restoration or for sale and use off site.

Recommendation was to GRANT the application subject to relevant conditions.

Following questions to the speakers, Members made the following comments:

- Members were impressed with how well the site was run.
- It was acknowledged that the site was now receiving less material due to recycling.

Councillor Casey proposed, seconded by Councillor North to approve the application.

RESOLVED: (Unanimously) to grant the application, subject to relevant conditions, as per officer recommendation.

Reason:

As per the reasons outlined in the Committee report.

Councillor Casey took the Chair for the following item.

5.6 Peterborough Dairies, 3 John Wesley Road, Werrington, Peterborough

The application site comprised an area of open landscaped grassland within the curtilage of the industrial building currently occupied by Peterborough Dairies. The wider site was occupied by a large B2 General Industrial Unit which received deliveries of fresh milk for processing before being distributed to local businesses within Peterborough and the wider area. There was an associated car park immediately at the site entrance and a large area for the turning and manoeuvring of delivery vehicles to the rear. The application site was located within the identified Werrington General Employment Area and was accessed via the Werrington Parkway. The surrounding units are occupied by a variety of general industrial and storage/distribution businesses.

The application sought planning permission for the erection of temporary residential accommodation to allow the owners of Peterborough Dairies to live on the site of their business until it was established. The temporary accommodation was to provide three bedrooms and requisite living space within a temporary structure of dimensions: 19.8 metres (length) x 6 metres (width) x 2.3 metres (height to ridge).

The recommendation was to REFUSE the application.

David Shaw and Vicky Chawdry, the applicants, addressed the Committee. In summary the issues highlighted to the Committee included:

- Peterborough Dairies was a small, independent dairy.
- It was a new business model in its infancy and there was a need to be available 24/7.
- Mrs Chawdry or her husband needed to be present as deliveries were made all through the night.
- Mr and Mrs Chawdry had two children and if they were based on site the business could be run more efficiently.
- A number of conditions were being suggested including that residential use should be temporary for three years; only employed staff could use the building and that the building was sound proofed to a suitable level.
- A decision had been made to put more money into the business but Mr and Mrs Chawdry also wanted to bring up their family. There was a need for the family to have a comfortable life. The family were only asking for a three bedroomed property which was nothing out of the ordinary.
- Mr and Mrs Chawdry were determined to make their business grow.

Following questions to the speakers, Members made the following comments:

- Members were concerned that approving this application would create a precedent in allowing residential developments in industrial areas. Whilst having sympathy with the family it would be unacceptable to allow a family to live in an industrial area.
- It was noted that planners had been minded to accept this development if it was six feet smaller but this had not been accepted by the family.

Following debate a motion was put forward and seconded to refuse the application.

RESOLVED: (4 For, 1 Against, 1 Abstention) to refuse the application, as per officer recommendation.

Reasons for the decision:

The proposed temporary residential unit was considered far larger than that which could reasonably be deemed ancillary accommodation in relation to the existing business on the site. The level of accommodation proposed was tantamount to the creation of a permanent dwelling and, given the location of the site within an identified General Employment Area, represented wholly inappropriate development. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policies H7 and OIW6 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) (2005).

Councillor Serluca re-took the Chair.

5.7 12/01008/MMFUL - Land To The West Of Willow Hall Farm, Willow Hall Lane, Thorney, Peterborough.

The site covered an area of approximately sixty five hectares in a rural location to the east of Peterborough. The area proposed for extraction was broadly within an area allocated for sand and gravel extraction and has high voltage electric pylons running through it on a southwest to northeast diagonal. That part of the site allocated in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD as M1F was bounded to the south by the Green Wheel network, and the additional area was a field to the south of the Green Wheel. Beyond the Cats Water Drain to the west lay the existing Eyebury quarry and landfill site. Bar Pastures Farm Scheduled Monument lay immediately to the north, along with arable fields which extend to the A47. Willow Hall Lane, Willow Hall Farm and Willow Hall Farm cottage lay adjacent to the east of the proposed extraction and infill area. Willow Holt, a residential property, lay to the south east of the site.

A haul road was proposed to run east from the extraction / infill area, across Willow Hall Lane, through open fields to an area currently used for the processing and storage of sand and gravel extracted from the Briggs Farm / Priors Fen agricultural reservoir. From there, the proposed haul road followed the line of the existing Briggs Farm / Priors Fen haul road east until joining the B1040 approximately halfway between Thorney and Whittlesey. The entire proposal site lay within the generally flat topography of the Fens landscape.

The development would seek to extract approximately 2,250,000 tonnes of sand and

gravel from the extraction area to the west of Willow Hall Lane over a nine-twelve year period. The site would be progressively restored with approximately 1,900,000 tonnes of inert fill material in three phases from north to south. The restoration included:

- A landscape enhancement area on and adjacent to the Bar Pastures Farm Scheduled Monument;
- A habitat corridor linking the Eyebury 'southern extension habitat corridor', the Cats Water Drain and extending to the hamlet around Willow Hall;
- Landscape enhancements along Willow Hall Lane; and
- Biodiversity enhancements along the length of the Cats Water Drain and the processing and storage area situated between Willow Hall Lane and the B1040.

The Green Wheel was proposed to be diverted during the course of operational works, before reverting to the current alignment and being upgraded to bridleway standard, with the diverted foot/cycle path to be retained in perpetuity.

A controlled crossing point for plant and machinery was proposed over Willow Hall Lane approximately halfway between Bar Pastures Farm and Willow Hall Farm. The proposal was EIA development, under Schedule 1(19) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, and was accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

The recommendation was to GRANT the application subject to relevant conditions.

Members debated

- Following clarification sought by Members, the Group Manager Development Management confirmed to that the proposal was to bring the land back to an agricultural state in the future;
- Following a question raised by Members regarding vehicle movement and how this would effect nearby residents, the Group Manager Development Management advised that the company had been consulted over the highway implications in regards to the junctions on the existing Briggs Farm / Priors Fen haul road east until joining the B1040 approximately halfway between Thorney and Whittlesey. Following a consultation with the company, they agreed to repair any damage that may be caused by the use of the road for the extraction of sand and gravel in the future. Members were also advised that the Cambridgeshire Highways had been consulted over the application and there had been no objections to the proposal.

Following debate a motion was put forward and seconded to grant the application.

RESOLVED: (7 For, 1 Abstention) to grant the application, as per officer recommendation.

Reasons for the decision:

To approve the officer recommendation for the following reasons: 25% of proposed extraction area which lay outside allocation MF1 of Cambs & Peterborough Mineral & Waste Site Specific DPD. The site was not allocation for inert landfill.

5.8 12/01458/R3FUL - Land At Newborough, North Of The B1443 Bukehorn Road, East of Peterborough Road, Peterborough

The application site was located in the open countryside and had comprised arable fields. It was bounded to the north by Old Pepper Lake Drain, to the east by Highland Drain, the south by the B1443 (Thorney Road) and to the west by the A1073 (Crowland/Peterborough Road). Hill Farm was located 700m south west of the proposed siting of the mast.

Planning permission was sought for a temporary one year period for the installation of a seventy metre high meteorological ("met") mast. The mast was a steel tube construction and was guyed at a number of levels in four directions.

Access to the site would be from Crowland/Peterborough Road via an existing track.

The met mast was required to measure wind speed and rainfall to gain a picture of the meteorological conditions in the area. This information would be required in the submission of any future planning applications made for wind farms on this and nearby sites.

The recommendation was to GRANT the application subject to relevant conditions.

The Group Manager Development Management, advised the Committee that a further two objections had been received following publication of the additional information report. The two objections were that the application should be refused on the following basis:

- That the application was premature given that PCC had not received a wind farm application for the area; and
- If a wind farm application was not received and approval had been granted for installation, then the installation of the mast would be a waste of time and money to approve and construct.

Members commented on the latter of the two objections received regarding the financial investment of installation of the mast and that the cost and time involved would be at the applicants own risk not PCC's and would not hold any bearing on the planning application.

Following a debate, a motion was put forward and seconded to grant the application.

RESOLVED: (7 For, 1 Against) to grant the application as per officer recommendation.

Reasons for the decision:

The application was approved as it was in line with the wider public concern to do so.

7. Draft Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document

The Committee received a report from Julia Chatterton – Strategic Planning, Housing and Environment regarding the Draft Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document. The report was submitted to the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee following recent and forthcoming changes in legislation around flood and water

management, the adoption of the Core Strategy and the expected adoption of the Planning Policies Development Plan Document (DPD).

During consideration of the report the Committee was requested to:

Offer any comments on the Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document, (SPD) in accordance with the Committee's delegations under paragraph 2.5.1.5 of the Council's Constitution, before it was presented to Cabinet for adoption.

Key points within the report included:

- Aims of the Flood and Water Management SPD
- Flood risk management and improvements to networks and water courses;
- PCC's Responsibility under European legislations to ensure that there was no determinations in the quality of any water environments;
- Improve water quality in and around new developments;
- Peterborough City Council was a lead local flood authority and the management responsibility for co-ordinating the level of flood risks from heavy rainfall;
- To assist developers to meet European, local and national policy;
- The objective of the SPD was to provide guidance to applicants and decision makers on:
 - a. How to assess whether or not a site was suitable for development based on flood risk grounds. This element supported the main river flood risk requirements of policy CS22 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD).
 - b. The use of different sustainable drainage measures within Peterborough. This element supported the surface water requirements of policy CS22 in the Core Strategy DPD and policy PP20 of the Planning Policies DPD.
 - c. How development would ensure it protected aquatic environments. This element supported policies PP16 and PP20 of the Planning Policies DPD.
- Once adopted, this SPD would form part of Peterborough City Council's Local Development Framework (LDF).
- The next stages of public consultation from January 2013 – early 2015.
- If approved the Draft Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document would be utilised in future planning applications.

Comments and responses to questions included:

- Members commented on the importance of the Draft Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document; and
- Members identified a few errors in the LDS that required amendment

RESOLVED:

The Committee recommended the Draft Flood and Water Management Supplementary Planning Document for approval and adoption by Cabinet.

Reasons for the Decision:

- There was no statutory duty to prepare this SPD. However, without it, developers could be confused or misinformed as to how they can deliver fit-for-purpose development schemes in Peterborough that meet flood and water management requirements. This

- could have an impact on development coming forward as additional time would need to be spent on applications where flood or water management issues occur; and
- This policy document, supported by Peterborough's water management partners, improves current and future service delivery through the more efficient processing of planning applications and future drainage approval applications.

8. Peterborough City Centre Development Plan Document (DPD)

The Committee received a report from the Principal Strategic Planning Officer regarding a report, which was submitted to Committee following approval of the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS) by Councillor Cereste - Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Economic Development, Business Engagement and Environment Capital, which identified that the Council would prepare a City Centre Plan during the period 2012 – 2014.

During consideration of the report the Committee was requested to:

Become informed of the proposals contained in the consultation draft of the City Centre Development Plan Document (DPD) and to comment on the document before it was submitted to Cabinet for approval for the purpose of public participation.

Key points within the report included:

- The overall strategy for the development of Peterborough to 2026 – City Centre Plan;
- Anticipated significant growth over the next 10 to 15 years for the city;
- Plans for widespread improvements, growth and regeneration;
- The city's growing population now and in the future;
- The consultation draft version of the City Centre Plan;
- The eight Policy Areas;
- Opportunity Areas;
- Public consultation on the draft City Centre Plan – January to March 2013;
- Public consultation on final version of the plan - January to March 2014;
- Submission to government – Spring 2014;
- Independent examination – Autumn 2014;
- Adoption – late 2014 or early 2015; and
- Hoping for adoption in Council in December.

The Committee received a presentation of the report from the Principal Strategic Planning Officer, which had provided detail of the boundary map for the city centre. The map was split into eight areas and the Committee were provided with a summary of the issues for each area.

The Committee also received a video presentation from the Principal Strategic Planning Officer which provided detail on how the city may appear by 2026, following implementation of the LDS development plans.

Comments and responses to questions included:

- Members commented that the vision for the city was brilliant and encouraging and trusted that the media would reflect the positive vision of the authority;

- Members commented that the city required development over a shorter period than ten years to create vibrancy for the area;
- Members commented that some parts of the city had already received development improvement, however, it would be financially impossible to speed up future development plans in order to deliver the LDS before scheduled;
- Members commented that narrow boats had been present on the river Nene Embankment for a number of years without incurring any mooring costs and that consideration should be given by PCC to review the situation in order to aid the up-keep of the area;
- Members commented that there were Edwardian houses in the city centre that had turned into business or commercial development use and that encouragement should be provided to developers by PCC to turn the houses back into residential properties;
- Members commented that there should be a range of activities organised for the city in order to encourage the public to visit in the evenings;
- Members commented that consideration should be given to St John's heritage leisure, culture and tourism aspirations to include provision of a concert hall;
- Members commented that the recent demolition of the corn exchange had improved the city centre area;
- Members commented that PCC should consider further ways to encourage developers into the city and to consider the redevelopment of areas such as the bus station, office space and the market in order to attract people into the city;
- Members commented that the previous Northgate development that had been proposed ten years ago had not received any improvements.

Following Members comments the Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering provided the following responses:

- The LDS was a land use planning document, which had its limitations and was subject to submission to an inspector, which had to be evidenced;
- The length of time taken to deliver city developments arising from previous plans had been limited due to the recent economic downturn and the fact that consumers preferred to shop on the internet;
- Previous versions of the LDS had been utilised in order for the Committee to approve major planning developments such as Station Quarter;
- The redevelopment of the old District Hospital site and the Trusts preferred bidder, was due to go out to public consultation in February 2013.
- Plans were underway to explore improvement ideas for the city centre evening economy;
- New shops had recently been introduced to the city which included Primark, Carluccio's restaurants and Cowgate and Bridge Street shop front improvements.
- Recent developments which had attracted millions of pounds of financial investments for the city.

The Principal Strategic Planning Officer advised Members regarding the venues identified to deliver the public consultation sessions for LDS. Members commented that consideration should be given to include Serpentine Green as a venue to conduct a consultation session.

RESOLVED:

The Committee noted and commented on the LDS before its submission and recommended to Cabinet for approval for the purpose of public participation.

Reasons for the Decision:

The Committee was recommended to make its comments known to assist Cabinet in reaching its decision.

1.30pm – 5.37pm
Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank