

**Appendix 2: Representation from the Norman Cross Action Group****Norman Cross Action Group****6 Church Lane Stibbington Cambridgeshire PE8 6LP**

To The Chief Executive

Peterborough City Council

Long Causeway

Peterborough

14<sup>th</sup> March 2011

Dear Madam,

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

**General Introduction**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Residential Development.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Industrial/employment site**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### General.

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

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

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

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

Yours faithfully,



County Councillor Mac McGuire

Chairman