

**Application Ref:** 12/01414/FUL

**Proposal:** Installation of street furniture at external entrances to Queensgate shopping centre, comprising new Publicly Available Specification (PAS) 68:2007 rated bollards (static, removable and rising variations), vehicle blockers and PAS rated cycle racks. New gatehouse to be installed at one service entrance

**Site:** Management Office, Queensgate Shopping Centre, Westgate, Peterborough

**Applicant:** Hammerson

**Agent:** Mr Alan Down  
Workman LLP

**Referred by:** Director of Growth and Regeneration

**Reason:** Application of wider public interest

**Site visit:** 31.07.2013

**Case officer:** Mrs J MacLennan

**Telephone No.** 01733 454438

**E-Mail:** janet.maclennan@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

## 1 Description of the site and surroundings and Summary of the proposal

The application site involves the entrances to the Queensgate Shopping Centre. The Centre lies at the heart of the central retail area and is juxtaposed both modern and historic development.

### Proposal

The proposal is to install new Publicly Available Specification (PAS) 68:2007 rated street furniture at all external entrances to Queensgate shopping centre, including bollards (in rising, removable and static variations), planters and new vehicle blocker barriers to the service yards. The Truckstopper bollard by Safetyflex is proposed in most locations. This has an elliptical shaped sleeve in stainless steel and single black band the dimensions of the sleeve are c.130mm(w) x 220mm(d) x 1000mm(h).

The specific design details of the bollards at each location will be agreed by condition, however indicative design styles are provided at Appendix 1 to this report. The counter terrorism measures are proposed as follows:

1. Queensgate entrance off Westgate adjacent to John Lewis entrance:
  - Removal of existing chain, cycle racks and bollards and make good surfaces
  - Installation 14 no. PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearing. Two of the bollards would be sleeved with a 'shark fin' bicycle rack.
  - Installation of 1 no PAS68:2007 rated bollard and surface mounted vehicle blocker within service yard adjacent to 'Fleure'
  
2. Entrance to Westgate Arcade
  - Removal of existing bollards and street furniture and make good surfaces
  - Installation of 14 no. PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearing including 2 no. removable bollards at central point of build out. The bollards would be location 0.45m from the

kerb line and would follow the kerb line. Sleeve to bollards would have a 'Westminster' design. (This element has been revised since the initial submission which including bollards crossing the footway.)

3. Frontage to Long Causeway/Entrance to Queensgate

- Installation of 1 no PAS68:2007 rated bollard
- Installation of 6 no. PAS68 rated planters, Marshalls Rhinoguard Optima 952 with timber surround
- Installation of 6 no PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearance at Long Causeway entrance to Queensgate

4. Exchange Street/Cathedral Square entrances to Queensgate

- Installation of 6 no PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearance to replace existing bollards on Exchange Street, including 2 no. removable bollards
- Installation of 4 no PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearance and 1.2m from façade of entrance to Queensgate  
(This element has been revised since the initial submission and the bollards will now replace existing bollards.)

5. Exchange Street/St John's Square

- Replacement of existing bollards with 4 no. PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearance including 2 no removable bollards to be positioned adjacent to corner of fence line on church boundary to minimise vehicle approach line.

6. Argos entrance to Queensgate

- Replacement of existing bollards with 6 no. PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearance and make good existing surfaces.

7. Security Hut

- Erection of brick built security hut, dimensions: 1.8m x 1.8m x 2.35m in height to be positioned at entrance to Queensgate service yard.
- New PAS68:2007 rated surface mount Vehicle Blockers to entrance and exit

8. Queensgate Undercroft south end

- Installation of 4 no PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearance
- Installation of PAS68:2007 rated Vehicle Blocker

9. Queensgate undercroft north end

- Installation of 4 no PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearance
- Installation of PAS68:2007 rated Vehicle Blocker

10. Steps and car park entrance Bourges Boulevard

- Installation of 9 no PAS68:2007 rated bollards with 1.2m width clearance

## **2 Planning History**

No relevant planning history

## **3 Planning Policy**

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

## **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

### **Section 7 - Good Design**

Development should add to the overall quality of the area; establish a strong sense of place; optimise the site potential; create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses; support local facilities and transport networks; respond to local character and history while not discouraging appropriate innovation; create safe and accessible environments which are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping. Planning permission should be refused for development of poor design.

### **Section 8 - Safe and Accessible Environments**

Development should aim to promote mixed use developments, the creation of strong neighbouring centres and active frontages; provide safe and accessible environments with clear and legible pedestrian routes and high quality public space.

### **Section 12 - Conservation of Heritage Assets**

Account should be taken of the desirability of sustaining/enhancing heritage assets; the positive contribution that they can make to sustainable communities including economic viability; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. When considering the impact of a new development great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Planning permission should be refused for development which would lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance unless this is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh the harm/loss. In such cases all reasonable steps should be taken to ensure the new development will proceed after the harm/ loss has occurred.

## **Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011)**

### **CS04 - The City Centre**

Promotes the enhancement of the city centre through additional comparison retail floor space especially in North Westgate, new residential development, major new cultural and leisure developments and public realm improvements, as well as protecting its historic environment.

### **CS14 - Transport**

Promotes a reduction in the need to travel, sustainable transport, the Council's UK Environment Capital aspirations and development which would improve the quality of environments for residents.

### **CS16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm**

Design should be of high quality, appropriate to the site and area, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, be accessible to all users and not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents.

### **CS17 - The Historic Environment**

Development should protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment including non scheduled nationally important features and buildings of local importance.

## **Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012)**

### **PP02 - Design Quality**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes a positive contribution to the built and natural environment; does not have a detrimental effect on the character of the area; is sufficiently robust to withstand/adapt to climate change; and is designed for longevity.

### **PP12 - The Transport Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate provision has been made for safe access by all user

groups and there would not be any unacceptable impact on the transportation network including highway safety.

#### **PP17 - Heritage Assets**

Development which would affect a heritage asset will be required to preserve and enhance the significance of the asset or its setting. Development which would have detrimental impact will be refused unless there are overriding public benefits.

#### **Material Planning Considerations**

Crowded Places: The Planning System and Counter-Terrorism 2012 (DCLG)

#### **4 Consultations/Representations**

**Conservation Officer** – Objects - The proposals need further consideration and refinement. Whilst some elements are acceptable much of the work proposed in the public realm is insensitively designed and wholly inappropriate. There would appear to be little consideration given to the convenience and safety of pedestrians and disabled users. The combined effects of this approach to security will add significantly to the street clutter around the city and degrade the quality of the conservation area. This is not the correct approach to securing the centre or the wider city. This approach will set an unwelcome precedent which may well turn the city into an unwelcome looking fortress. This in turn will raise the perception of the issues, increasing fear and discouraging shoppers and visitors. There are a variety of other more subtle measures which could be employed to achieve the same ends.

**English Heritage** – Objects - The proposal would result in undesirable street clutter that will harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. The recent works to the public realm in Cathedral Square has enhanced the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of highly graded listed buildings in the vicinity. The installation of the bollards etc. would erode some of the quality of the public realm. The proposal would result in a degree of harm and while that harm would be less than substantial harm, there is insufficient justification to demonstrate that there would be wider public benefits from the proposal that would outweigh the harm. Recommends the application is refused.

**Ancient Monuments Society** - We do not wish to comment in detail, but would only ask if your authority's Conservation and Urban Design Teams have been consulted on the proposals. In view of the recent successful town centre improvements carried out by Peterborough Council, it seems essential to us that any further change to the public realm should be carried in consultation with the appropriate local authority department.

**Archaeological Officer** – No objection - Given the sensitivity of the area, all groundwork should be monitored and recorded by an appointed archaeologist. Recommends conditions.

**Police Architectural Liaison Officer** - I can confirm that Cambridgeshire Constabulary have had on-going, Pre Application discussions, with the Applicant and City Council, in relation to what is being proposed. The Police wish to provide our full support to the Queensgate Centre Management Team and the Centre Owners, in relation to the security measures outlined in this application. The measures adequately address vulnerability to crime.

**City Centre Management** - No comments received

**Transport & Engineering Services** – Objection - The bollards do not meet the criteria for location in the highway. Works within the highway would require a S278 Agreement. It is unclear which bollards would be located in which area. The bollards at location 2 (Westgate) would conflict with the positioning of signage which needs to be retained. The bollards should not extend into the parking bays. It is proposed that the bollards would match the existing bollards however, these do not meet current specifications as there is no reflective banding. Planters at location 3 (unit 2 Long

Causeway) restrict the width of a very busy pedestrian thoroughfare and would be a trip hazard. Bollards at location 4 (Cathedral Square entrance to Queensgate) would be an incongruous feature within the square and will obstruct pedestrians as this entrance is heavily used. Bollards in this location are unnecessary due to difficulty in manoeuvring a vehicle into this position due to existing street furniture. The bollards, if approved, will need to meet highway standards. Bollards at location 5 (Exchange Street) obstruct access to the jewellers. There are existing bollards at St Johns Square. Bollards at location 6 (Argos entrance to Queensgate) are acceptable in principle. Bollards at location 10 (Bourges Boulevard) are unacceptable as the Local Highway Authority are redesigning this area with a signalised junction and the bollards would be within the area for the traffic signal equipment. Cycle racks at location 1 and bollards at location 3 and 4 appear to cause a trip hazard/obstruct pedestrians - this would be a concern if mass evacuation was required.

**Peterborough Local Access Forum (LAF)** - Peterborough LAF have no comments to make on the planned application.

**Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue** – No objection - No major issues. The evacuation strategy for Queensgate is based on the malls evacuating first followed by the shops so it is predicted that a steady flow rate would occur instead of a mass exit. The impact of the proposed bollards should have little impact on the evacuation strategy. Consideration how the proposed bollards will impact on people with disability should be assessed.

### **Local Residents/Interested Parties**

Initial consultations: 217  
Total number of responses: 1  
Total number of objections: 1  
Total number in support: 0

No representations have been received from neighbouring occupiers.

**Peterborough Civic Society** - We are disappointed that some sections of newly installed paving on Exchange Street will need to be destroyed in order to install the new security bollards. We trust that a high standard of reinstatement will be insisted upon. We also note that there is a conflict between the Long Causeway proposals and the current application by Pret for outside tables ((Ref 13/00966/FUL). As to the remainder of the proposals we consider it essential that the City Council insists on a phased sequential implementation in order that access to the City Centre shopping streets from Queensgate is not inhibited (or appears to be) from all entrances at the same time. We assume that the City Council has been in discussion with Queensgate management over an agreement as to the future maintenance and replacement of those elements which lie within the highway.

## **5 Assessment of the planning issues**

### **a) Background**

There have been discussions between the applicant, the City Council and the Cambridgeshire Constabulary regarding counter security measures for the city centre. The most appropriate measures would be to have a wider ring of security measures around the city centre. However, this has proved difficult due to the required access for traders into the city centre, deliveries, bus routes, etc. In the absence of being able to overcome these constraints the proposed security measures are intended to reduce vulnerability to crime within the Queensgate Centre.

There have been changes to the initial submission for locations 2 (Westgate) and 4 (Cathedral Square entrance to Queensgate) as described above and re-consultations have been undertaken.

## b) Vulnerability to Crime

The UK faces a significant threat from international terrorism. Experience shows that crowded places are and will remain an attractive target for international terrorists by virtue of their crowd density. An important element in the Government's strategy for countering terrorism (CONTEST) is to create safer places and buildings that are less vulnerable to terrorist attack and, should an attack take place, where people are better protected from its impact. Designing-out crime and designing-in community safety are already central considerations in planning development. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 requires all local authorities to exercise their functions with due regard to their likely effect on crime and disorder, and to do all they reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder. Crime for these purposes includes terrorism, and good counter-terrorism protective security is also good crime prevention (DCLG, 2012).

One of the greatest threats is posed by the use of Vehicle Borne Improvised Explosive Devices (VBIEDs). VBIED attacks involve the use of a vehicle containing an explosive device, being either parked close to or driven into a target destination before being detonated. They are regarded as one of the most effective and common weapons available to terrorist organisations, as the load carrying capacity and mobility of vehicles provides terrorists with an effective, readily available method of delivery, with the capacity to inflict large scale damage and loss of life.

It is acknowledged that the proposed bollards would not prevent all threats to the Queensgate Centre however preventing vehicles from entering the centre would avoid mass impact. There are a variety of types of bollard which would achieve the required security and the style of bollard would be dependent on the location and also the need to conform to specifications for bollards within the highway.

There are a number of bollards located around the city centre however; the important consideration is for the type of bollard to achieve the standard for preventing vehicles accessing the Queensgate Centre. There is a need to strike a balance between addressing vulnerability to crime and ensuring that public spaces remain functional and attractive places.

The Cambridgeshire Constabulary Counter Terrorism Officer and Police Architectural Liaison Officer are in full support of the application which they consider adequately addresses vulnerability to crime.

## c) Design and Visual Amenity

The proposal is intended to discreetly enhance the security of the shopping centre at all entrances without compromising the visual amenity of the area.

**Location 1 – Queensgate entrance off Westgate adjacent to John Lewis entrance:** The bollards would be located under the overhang of the building and would align with the building columns. The existing chain and cycle rack would be removed and replaced with two shields providing cycle racks within the line of the bollards. The proposal would to some degree, tidy up the site and it is not considered that the bollards would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene. The vehicle blocker would be inside the demise of the access and would not be directly visible from the street.

**Location 2 - Entrance to Westgate Arcade:** There are existing bollards located in the build out around the canopy to the Westgate Arcade. The original submission proposed some of the bollards crossing the footway, whilst the positioning of the bollards provided a clearance width of 1.2m the proposal would have resulted in a cluttered appearance particularly as there would have been 3 each side of the entrance canopy and there is already a significant amount of street furniture at this entrance.

It is considered that the new positioning for the bollards which run along the back of the footway would be less cluttered. It is proposed that the bollards would have a Westminster design which would have a similar appearance to the existing bollards. It is considered that the bollards would

not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene. The Local Highways Authority (LHA) have advised that these do not conform to current specifications, however it is considered that an appropriate design could be agreed upon which both address the need for the bollards to respect the character and appearance of the area and conform to highway standards. These details would be secured by condition.

**Location 3 - Frontage to Long Causeway/Entrance to Queensgate:** It is proposed to locate 6 PAS68 rated planters Marshalls Rhinoguard Optima 952 (see Appendix 1) with timber surround outside the overhang of the Queensgate building to the front of Unit 2. The precise details would be secured by condition. The location of the planters would be an improvement to bollards and would enhance the frontage given that planning permission has been granted for Unit 2 Queensgate for a change of use to restaurant/café (A3) (ref. 13/01004/FUL) and permission has been granted for outside seating (ref. 13/00966/FUL). The 6 bollards at the Long Causeway entrance would align with the columns of the Queensgate building and their position would not be unduly prominent in the street scene.

It is noted that Peterborough City Council is currently preparing designs for a remodelling of the carriageway and footpaths outside the Long Causeway entrance to Queensgate. It is hoped to create a flexible performance space which will include large fixed seating and public art. It is not considered that the proposed bollards and planters would compromise these works. It is your officer's view that these plans are not in the public domain and therefore cannot impact on the outcome of this decision.

**Location 4 – Exchange Street/Cathedral Square entrance to Queensgate:** The scheme has been amended from the initial submissions which sought to relocate existing bollards closer to the entrance to Queensgate. It was considered that this would have resulted in a proliferation of bollards detrimental to the visual amenity Cathedral Square. The existing bollards would be replaced with PAS 68 bollards. The positioning of 4 bollards at the Queensgate entrance would not compromise the improvements undertaken to Cathedral Square.

**Location 5 - Exchange Street/St John's Square:** The principle of bollards in this location is already established as there are existing bollards, albeit they would not conform to the PAS 68 2007 standard. The bollards would be relocated closer to the boundary of the church. Subject to precise details the bollards would not detract from the visual amenity of the area.

**Location 6 – Argos entrance to Queensgate:** The principle of bollards in this location is already established as there are existing bollards, albeit they would not conform to the PAS 68 2007 standard. The existing bollards would be replaced with PAS 68 bollards. Subject to precise details the bollards would not detract from the visual amenity of the area.

**Location 7 - Security Hut:** The hut would be located within the service area of the Queensgate building and would not be directly visible from the street.

**Location 8/9 - Queensgate Undercroft south/north end:** The vehicle blockers would be in the demise of the Queensgate site and would not be directly visible from the street.

**Location 10 - Steps and car park entrance Bourges Boulevard:** This is not a sensitive location and the bollards would not unduly impact on the visual amenity of this area.

**d) Impact on the character and appearance of the Historic Environment**

The Queensgate Centre lies at the heart of Peterborough's historic core and abuts the City Centre Conservation Area boundary and lies adjacent to many Grade II listed buildings. Some of the proposed bollards/planters are located within the Conservation Area. Objections have been raised by the City Council's Conservation Officer who considers the proposal to be detrimental to the setting of the conservation area and contrary to policies CS16 and CS17 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

It is also the view of English Heritage that the proposal would lead to unnecessary street clutter and that the refurbishment works to Cathedral Square have greatly enhanced the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed buildings. The proposal would erode some of the quality of the public realm. The proposal would result in a degree of harm and while that harm would be less than substantial there is insufficient justification to demonstrate there would be wider public benefits arising from the application that would outweigh the resulting harm. The recommendation is one of refusal.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasises the need to conserve the historic environment and the new development should make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. It also states that 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significant of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'.

It is acknowledged that the application is not supported with any justification for the proposed counter terrorism measures however, it is widely accepted that crowded places such as shopping centres are an attractive target for international terrorism. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has produced a guidance document on this issue.

It is considered that with appropriate design the bollards and street furniture would not detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area or the setting of the listed buildings. Indeed, as with other street furniture and artefacts for example within Cathedral Square/St John's Square they would be part of the modern landscape and an example of how the needs of the present day can harmonise with the fabric of the past.

A condition would be appended to the decision requiring details of the reinstatement of the pavement to be submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that there is no harm to the refurbishment works to the Cathedral Square.

It is considered that the public benefit of protection from a large impact terrorist attack far outweighs the less than substantial harm likely to be caused to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed buildings and it is considered that the proposal accords with policies CS16 and CS17 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and the NPPF.

**e) Highway Implications**

Some of the bollards/planters would be located within the public highway and notice has been served on the Local Highway Authority (LHA). Works within the highway would require a S278 Agreement. The LHA recommends refusal of the application due to the height of the bollards/planters being insufficient to be easily perceptible to pedestrians and therefore would present a trip hazard.

The precise details of the bollards would be agreed by condition, including the height, particularly for those located in the public highway. The agent has advised that the 1m height could be achieved as the bollard sleeve can be amended to suit the requirement for 1m above finished floor level. Reflectors could also be accommodated for bollards within the highway. The final design and type of bollard to be located at each of the proposed locations would be agreed by condition due to the need to satisfy highway requirements.

The agent has provided details for the bollards to the Westgate entrance these have a 'Westminster' sleeve (see Appendix 1) and are similar to the bollards currently in place at this location. The LHA has advised that they are currently rationalising the type of bollards used and the bollards in this location should be a 'Glasdon Manchester' (see Appendix 1) or similar. It is not known whether the 'Glasdon Manchester' bollard would conform to PAS68 specification and hence serve the required purpose however, the bollards are available with a variety of sleeves for example the 'RhinoGuard Manchester' (see Appendix 1) is of very similar style. It is therefore



considered that a suitable bollard could be agreed at this location which would be sympathetic to the Conservation Area as well as conforming to highway standards.

The LHA also raises concerns regarding the entrances to the Queensgate which are heavily used by pedestrians who are likely to be obstructed by the positioning of the bollards particularly if there were to be a need to vacate the building in an emergency. The Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service has commented on the application and there are no major concerns. The evacuation strategy for Queensgate is based on the malls evacuating first followed by the shops so it is predicted that a steady flow rate would occur instead of a mass exit. The impact of the proposed bollards should have little impact on the evacuation strategy.

The LHA question the need for bollards at location 5 St Johns Square and outside the jewellers as there are already bollards at the junction with Cowgate and St Johns Square. However, these bollards/retractable bollards are spaced too far apart which enables cars to park illegally on the square. The bollards at location 5 would still be required to prevent vehicles accessing Exchange Street through the green space of St Johns Square.

In addition, although the bollards are positioned directly outside the jewellers this would not inhibit access for customers to this shop.

Whilst the ability for vehicles to manoeuvre into an appropriate position to be able to drive into the entrances is questioned by a number of consultees it is not within the field of expertise of the Planning Office to challenge these views. However, consultation has been undertaken with the Cambridgeshire Constabulary Counter Terrorism Officer and the Police Architectural Liaison Officer who have provided advice on the precise standards and specifications for counter terrorism measures.

The LHA has advised of works for a redesign of Bourges Boulevard to provide a signalised junction and crossing and that is it likely that the bollards would be positioned within the area where the traffic signal would be located. It is your officer's view that these plans are not in the public domain and therefore cannot be taken into account in determining this application.

Accessibility: Access to the shopping centre and all surrounding areas remains unchanged in all proposed areas. In terms of accessibility the Local Access Forum has raised no objections.

The spacing between the bollards is 1.2m and is set in line with the PAS requirements to ensure the functional effectiveness of the bollards is sufficient for their intended purpose, but also to ensure that mobility between the bollards is suitable for all pedestrians. The bollards are laid out specifically to ensure the additional security of the centre, but also to enable access to all areas of the centre remains unhindered. This distance also conforms with equality legislation.

#### **f) Archaeology**

The proposed work affects a sensitive area of Peterborough's historic centre where remains dating from the medieval period have been recorded. It is likely that parts of the proposed development area are expected to have been disturbed by modern interventions; past investigations have demonstrated that archaeological remains survive in very good conditions of preservation in undisturbed pockets of land throughout the historic city centre. The Archaeological Officer has no objections in principle to the proposed works subject to a programme of archaeological fieldwork is secured by condition in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF. This can be limited to a watching brief as the proposed ground impact is too limited to warrant further investigation.

## **6 Conclusions**

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

- the benefits of addressing vulnerability to crime outweighs the limited harm the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the setting of Listed Building surrounding the site;
- a suitable design of bollards/planters would be available which are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area in which they would be placed while meeting the required highway standard; and
- the proposal would not result in any adverse highway implication and would not impede the flow of pedestrians or people with disabilities

Hence the proposal accords with Policies CS14, CS16, CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD , Policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP12 and PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

## **7 Recommendation**

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

- C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 2 No development shall take place until details the bollards have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, dimensions and reference number (where applicable). The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance and that the bollards conform to highway standards, in accordance with Policies CS14, CS16 and CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 3 No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) to include a watching brief has been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions. The written scheme of investigation is expected to fulfil the conditions specified in a brief issued by this office.

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 paragraphs 128 and 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 4 No demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under (3).

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 paragraphs 128 and 141 of the National Planning Policy

Framework (2012), Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 5 Prior to the commencement of development precise details of the reinstatement of the paving/surfacing materials following the installation of the bollards/planters shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In other that the quality of the public realm is maintaining and in accordance with policies CS16 and CS17 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and policies PP2 and PP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Copies to Cllrs M Jamil, N Khan, M Nadeem

This page is intentionally left blank