

Appendix 3: Summary of representations received following first round of public consultation:-

Petitions

A standard letter was circulated to residents in Yaxley, this asked two questions with a yes/no response:-

- (1) whether residents objected to the development plan;
- (2) whether residents objected to stopping traffic along the A15.

In total 1429 of these letters were received. 1392 people objected to the development plan i.e. the principle of development at Great Haddon, the remainder (37) did not. 1422 letters object to the stopping of traffic along the A15, the remainder (7) do not. The letters were received in batches during January 2010.

A petition with 44 signatures received from the residents of Dry Leas objecting to Great Haddon on the grounds that it will increase traffic on the A1260 Nene Parkway and consequently the already unbearable traffic noise and pollution. In addition it requests that Peterborough City Council actively looks for ways of reducing the traffic noise nuisance from the A1260 Nene Parkway between junctions 31 and 32 (see section 7b).

Two petitions were received against the proposed site for gypsies and travellers. One petition has 41 signatures, the other 73. The petition objects to the location of the proposed site on the following grounds:-

- Impact on the landscape;
- Increased noise and litter;
- Highway issues due to traffic and narrow lanes;
- Sewage treatment;
- Lack of pavements/street lights;
- Car dependant site;
- Security and safety of isolated properties;
- Location and ability to access schools, shops and hospitals.

Individual Letters

541 individual letters were received in respect of both the core area and the employment area raising the following concerns. Issues relating directly to the employment area are not referred to below as these were addressed in the report to Planning and Environmental Protection Committee for that application. For ease of reference the comments have been divided into subsections:-

Principle of Development

- Object to the principle of development at Great Haddon;
- The development is not wanted;
- There is no need for the development;
- Loss of countryside/arable land;
- Impact on food production;
- Concern that this is a Greenfield development. There must be alternative brownfield sites available.
- Peterborough should not be allowed to expand on Greenfield land.
- The Council should look to improve and extend existing city facilities before merely agreeing to yet more housing development.
- The plan is ill conceived and ill thought through;
- The proposal will not make sure that the city grows in the right way;
- Permission should not be granted for Great Haddon until Hampton is completed. Want to avoid a hotch potch of half completed developments;

Transport

- Object to the proposed installation of the bus gate to the north of Yaxley;
- Concern that the bus route is too short to have any meaningful impact;
- There is only one bus service per hour along the A15 so question why want to impose restrictions on car users;
- The bus gate will not be an incentive to use public transport;
- The bus service is expensive and unreliable;
- Object to a bus only route as this has failed elsewhere in the city;
- Concerned that the additional bus services for the new community will be at the cost of reducing services enjoyed by local villages;
- Concern that the bus gate would be a big inconvenience to residents;
- The proposed bus gate would be a waste of money;
- The proposed bus gate would unfairly increase the cost of travel and time for local residents;
- The bus gate has been proposed with little warning or consultation of local residents;
- Concern that the bus gate would result in more traffic along Broadway, Yaxley;
- Concern about increased traffic through Farcet as a result of the development particularly the proposed bus gate;
- Concern about increased traffic through Stanground;
- Object to the proposed diversion of the A15;
- Development will adversely affect the A15 which is already a busy road;
- Additional strain on village roads as a result of the A15 closure;
- To protect Yaxley access into Great Haddon from the A15 should be removed. Access could be from the old A1 or Fletton Parkway;
- Pedestrians would be in danger from increased through traffic;
- The access points of Broadway and Ferndale are already congested during peak periods;
- Strongly object to the proposed changes to the Great North Road and the building of a new road only 30 metres from house.
- There is no need for a connection to Fletton Parkway. The new road could be routed round the back of existing properties within the development site;
- Members of PCC previously advised that a new link from the employment land to the Old Great North Road would not be permitted;
- The proposed link to the employment land will create a rat run. There is a dangerous blind bend near the Haddon underpass;
- The Old Great North Road will be used heavily as a raceway;
- Concern about the impact of the development on the village of Haddon. It is a small village without footpaths or street lights. An increase in traffic would be dangerous and an accident waiting to happen. The planning officers should visit Haddon before making any decisions;
- Better use should be made of the existing Old Great North Road which should be made a dual carriageway;
- A new road should be created within the development to link the employment land with the core area. The Western Peripheral Road should then be restricted to prevent HGV access;
- Increased vehicles will result in increased congestion;
- The proposal would create a bottle neck at the new traffic lights on London Road and Gt Haddon;
- The development would create heavy traffic to the east side of Hampton Vale. Traffic is already at a stand still at peak times;
- Traffic around Hargate School is already at a dangerous level;
- The traffic assessment does not take into consideration the completion of Hampton Vale;

- The development would result in increased traffic around junction 2 of the Fletton Parkway and short cutting through Orton Malbourne to the city;
- The proposal would increase rat running through Hampton Vale;
- The original Yaxley Bypass has not been considered as part of this development;
- Concerned if the Yaxley bypass is built in the position shown, it would raise environmental issues and be too close to housing resulting in noise issues. Heavy landscaping would be required before the road is completed. Traffic speeds will need to be limited as should HGV movements;
- The Yaxley Bypass which was supposed to be delivered as part of Hampton has never materialised;
- Proposal should include a bypass around Yaxley;
- Great Haddon should not be developed in the same poor way as Hempsted;
- Concern that the development would result in additional traffic on the A1260 Nene Parkway. The level of noise from the Parkway is already unacceptable and there are no sound reduction measures in place.
- Concern about proximity of the loop road to children accessing the schools;
- Works to the junction between Hampton Vale and Serpentine Green have not yet been completed. There are safety concerns over the current arrangement;
- Put in a Park and Ride for the city with one base at Gt Haddon;
- The A15 from the A1(M) to Fletton Avenue should be a dual carriageway or at least three lanes to ensure that it can cope with the demands of cars, lorries and buses going to and from the city;
- The layout of Great Haddon needs to be replanned to incorporate a bus loop;
- Concern about the distance to bus stops within the new development;
- The schools should be on the bus loops;
- There needs to be an underpass/bridge over the A15 for children going to the new secondary school from Yaxley;
- Traffic calming measures will be unpopular, expensive and detrimental to the area;
- Most people living in Gt Haddon will work in and around Peterborough, therefore they will want to access the Fletton Parkway (A1139). This will result in traffic jams between junctions 1 and 2. To enable some cars to go north or east it would be an advantage to extend the old A1 (after it passes under the A1(M)). A new road link through the development should be provided to connect to the internal access road system;
- Would support the inclusion of cycle lanes from Hampton to Norman Cross;
- Consideration should be given to installing a driverless train system on Great Haddon and Hampton similar to the system in Singapore;
- Proposed road design is not practical.
- Concern about impact on property/life if the closure of London Road does not happen. There has been a huge increase in the amount of traffic using London Road over the last few years and Hampton Leys has not yet been built. It is very difficult now to get out of the driveway.

Environment

- The bus gate would result in increased mileage and pollution including reduction in air quality, which would be contrary to Peterborough's Environment Capital objectives;
- The proposed bus gate would increase Peterborough's carbon footprint;
- The proposed bus gate is contrary to Government objectives for reducing CO2 omissions and reducing mileage;
- Object that no environmental impact study has been undertaken regarding the increased car journey distance (resulting from the bus gate);
- The proposed bypass running through the development would cause environmental issues (noise fumes etc) and be a risk to pedestrians;

- There is reference to traffic calming on the Great North Road. Currently there is none. If these measures are put in, it will increase noise, increase fuel costs and increase pollution. This is what the conservationists are urging us to avoid;
- Proposals to use the loop road will add congestion and noise pollution as well as carbon monoxide to the air for the people who live along the road;
- No road surface improvements proposed as part of A1260 – existing traffic causes noise/nuisance/pollution, additional traffic will exacerbate this;
- Combined Heating and Power System not financially viable as it won't be used 24/7. Each dwelling should utilise solar panels and ground source heating generated by neighbouring employment site;
- SUDS may affect Stanground residents;
- Health impacts of noise, dust and pollution during construction.

Impact on Surrounding Areas/Residential Amenity

- Concerned that the village of Yaxley would merge with the new township/lose its identity;
- Concern that the new housing would result in a loss of privacy to existing residents on London Road. The buffer zone will not be wide enough;
- Detrimental impact on the surrounding villages and the resident's quality of life;
- Additional noise, dust and pollution will adversely affect existing residents along the Old Great North Road;
- Is the developer going to provide a proper acoustic fence along the A1(M)?
- Yaxley cannot accommodate any further demand for facilities as a result of the development;
- Conflict regarding the infrastructure demands at Hampton which will be exacerbated by Great Haddon;
- Concern will increase anti-social behaviour in Yaxley;
- New schools should be open to Yaxley residents;
- In building this development there needs to be a benefit to the community;
- Proposal does not appear to include any provision for medical care. Concerned about impact on local health centre in the period between the first houses being occupied and the proposed medical centre being operational;
- With primary schools having falling numbers concerned about the effect of three new primary schools on the local community. Village schools are part of the community and don't wish to lose them;
- Loss of visual amenity to existing properties adjacent to the development;
- The proposed bus gate would isolate Yaxley from Peterborough and have an adverse impact upon local businesses;
- Little consideration has been given to the environmental impacts of the development on Yaxley and Farcet. The current weight limit of 7.5 tonnes is not enforced. Why is the Planning Department encouraging more HGVs through these villages without studying the impacts;
- The destruction of community spirit which will happen will eventually increase crime rates which of course leads to increased council tax bills and a further downward spiral of the area which has suffered enough already;
- Question the benefit to local residents of the proposal. It appears only negative ones exist, more traffic, more risk leaving the property, more noise, more pollution and difficulties when accessing Yaxley or Peterborough via the A15 potentially conflicting with neighbours;
- The developers have not considered the people who live in the area. They do not live in the area so the development will not affect them.
- Concern about loss of property values;
- Impact on character of Norman Cross Village;

- Object to loss of an established way of life;
- Noise and traffic disturbance from a major new junction on London Road;
- Object as the development would result in urban sprawl.

Infrastructure/ Community

- Will there be new sewage provision or will the development rely on existing infrastructure;
- Will there be a permanent police facility;
- Concern that there will be inadequate school places;
- Concern about the water table and potential for flooding given that the development is to be built on open land;
- Concern regarding flooding given the high level of the water table;
- There is no mention of the proposal on Hampton Vale, Hargate and the yet to be built Hampton Leys;
- What guarantee is there that the benefits of the scheme will be delivered. Experience of other schemes shows they often aren't;
- Disgrace that Peterborough City Council has not provided sufficient school places for Hampton;
- Proposal will have a detrimental impact on Serpentine Green and businesses such as Kiddicare;
- People who live in Great Haddon will commute to London and Cambridge.
- Every year the water board advise that there is a shortage of water. Where is the water going to come from for these new homes;
- Concern that there would be no church or recreation centre at Gt Haddon. Don't seem to be creating a sustainable environment despite Government concerns over public health and fitness. No church prevents a community centre for worship and community cohesion.
- The increase in population will put a strain on resources particularly health care;
- There is insufficient infrastructure in the wider city area to accommodate Great Haddon.

Gypsies and Travellers Site

- Object to the proposed site for gypsies and travellers. Concerns about crime and vandalism;
- The proposed gypsy and traveller site is unsuitable. It is too far away from schools, medical services and lacks basic facilities. More suitable sites are available;
- No need for the provision as other sites are underused.

Housing

- There should be more rented housing (35-40%);
- New homes are built to a poor quality and size;
- There are empty houses in Hampton. Concerned if new houses are built these will also be empty;
- Too much housing in a small space.

Ecology/Landscape

- Loss of wildlife;
- Proposal would adversely affect Great Crested Newts;
- The development would adversely impact upon birds;
- Air Pollution may affect Orton Pit SSSI;
- Concern about the protection of the wooded area near Yaxley. Loss of habitat would be tragedy;
- Landscaping scheme should preserve view from Great Fen Project to the Fens;

- Absence of buffer zone south of Shell Garage;
- Landscape buffer should be incorporated between Yaxley, Norman Cross and Great Haddon;
- The development will result in the loss of green space for recreation;
- Harmful impact upon the landscape character;
- Loss of trees;
- Concern regarding the impact of the development on the Scheduled Ancient Monument;
- There is an historic site within the development. This should be left open, not enclosed by housing;
- Insufficient separation between wildlife and human activity;
- Object to the loss of countryside there is little open space before the A1(M).

Other

- Consultation/communication on the application has been inadequate;
- All of the residents of Yaxley should have been informed of the proposal;
- Record of PCC planning is not good i.e. Eagle Way is blocked, cars on the street, Hempsted;
- Concern about Great Haddon proposals given the development at Hempsted.
- Great Haddon needs sufficient parking spaces close to each house in order to prevent the problems associated with parking on the road which has occurred in parts of Hampton;
- Adequate parking provision is required. Lessons should be learnt from Hampton where cars park everywhere. Parking bays are too small and there is inadequate visibility. Streets need to be of sufficient width;
- Acoustic Scheme and Integrated Transport Assessment not included;
- If the plans go ahead will the lessons be learnt from Hampton i.e. the need for adequate parking provision;
- Loss of trade from businesses that rely on passing trade on the A1;
- Concern that the development would not be viable in the current economic climate;
- Question where all the people in the development will work;
- Question the number of new jobs '9000' referred to. How will the new schools, shops and warehouses deliver this;
- There is a mismatch between the number of houses and number of jobs to be created. This many houses will require more jobs;
- The proposal would be a waste of tax payers money;

Comments in Support

- The development would be of benefit to the area (except the gypsy and traveller site);
- No objection in principle;
- Support the provision of a householder recycling centre;
- The park land to the rear of London Road would be pleasant.

Head Teacher of Yaxley School- Objects to the proposed closure of the A15 from Yaxley to Peterborough. Redirecting traffic through Farcet and Stanground would cause a burden on an already overburdened road and roundabout and cause danger to the students there. Redirection south will cause a burden on the A1 and for the commuters using the road. Lorries will be forced through Yaxley endangering children. Add to this the effects of fuel, time and CO2 emissions.

Manager of Serpentine Green- Proposal would impact on the free movement of staff and customers who travel from Yaxley and beyond.

RPS on behalf of Anglian Regional Co-Operative- Object on transport and infrastructure grounds. A more detailed objection will follow in due course.

Note- to date nothing further has been received.

Little Hampton Service Station, London Road- Object to the application as the proposal would seriously damage the viability of this business and ultimately lead to job losses and the loss of this facility. Will seek legal advice regarding the damage caused to the business and the pursuit of compensation.

Yaxley Mini Market- Object to the development on the basis of the diversion of the A15 and the proposed bus gate. Will be seeking legal advice regarding compensation.

Petrol Filling Station London Road- Object to the proposed bus gate as this will result in a significant loss of trade. Passing trade would effectively be removed.

Cambridgeshire Target Shooting Association (CTSA)- The CTSA is located on the south side of the A15 and would be adjacent to the proposed development. Object to the proposals on the grounds of noise, safety and security.

- Whilst noise levels from the small bore target shooting are very low, the Police have permissions allowing them to use the range resulting in high noise levels. These would present an unacceptable risk to people living in adjacent dwellings.
- Do not want to be exposed to any safety risk from unauthorised persons gaining access to the range whilst it is in use. Also concerned about safety of access with increased traffic flows.
- Need to ensure security of the site to prevent any unwanted outside interest in the firearms and associated equipment used legally on the site.

On basis of the above would recommend that no dwellings are built within 1 mile of the CTSA range. Would also recommend that professional advice is sought regarding noise levels from Police firearms to validate this recommendation.

Friends of the Earth- Object to the proposals on the following grounds:-

- 1) Poor commitment to green aims and visions. The objectives are qualified by terms such as 'encouraging', 'facilitating' etc. A number of the objectives also rely on there being sufficient S106 funding. All of the green measures should be firm proposals;
- 2) The plans place too much emphasis on the use of the private car. Cycle routes are poorly located and provided. Pedestrian routes to Peterborough are poor. The proposals make only token effort to improve bus journey times along the A15. Consider that a Park and Ride site is required within the employment land.
- 3) The sustainable energy proposals are too weak. It is insufficient to encourage solar hot water installations. These should be mandatory within the proposals. The proposals for a CHP are welcomed but concerned that the fuel source will not be sustainable. Pre-piping should be included within the proposals. Question why a wind turbine site has not been included. Similarly why is there no micro generation of energy provision.
- 4) The proposed affordable housing commitment (15%) is too low. If the country is coming out of recession should revert to 30%.
- 5) The proposal appears to encroach into the west side of the site of special conversation interest. Request that this is checked by the Local Authority;
- 6) Open Space. Note the reference to the development being 40% open space but some woodland is not publically accessible. It is suggested that the developer investigate its purchase to permit limited public access.
- 7) Cycle parking including within dwellings should be encouraged.

- 8) Disappointed that the proposed Recycling Site is only intended as a Materials Resource Facility.

Phil Newby- Concerned that the sustainability proposals are not very bold or visionary nor do the actual commitments appear to be very strong. Much will depend on the way the design code is written and passed down through further sales. Some of the individual elements of the strategy have been included as S106 items which is a concern. The delivery and scale of the district heating system is a good example. As the code levels tighten the heating ring is likely to be an essential and enabling piece of infrastructure that will be commercial necessity. As such, installation within the early phases will make long term sense and would not seem to be a S106 item.

Peterborough Play Partnership- Wish to see best possible play spaces created at Great Haddon. Wish to see play spaces designed into the development and not bolted on. Providing infrastructure in a timely manner will be vital.

Cllr Maddie Banerjee, Huntingdonshire District Councillor- The Great Haddon development will have maximum impact on the village of Yaxley. Suggest the following mitigation measures:-.

- The A15 London Road should not be blocked for the bus only lane. The effect will be devastating.
- The matured trees on London Road from Norman Cross to Peterborough create an avenue and a beautiful view. The developer should not cut down any tree on London Road;
- People who live in Norman Cross and Yaxley on London road are Huntingdonshire tax payers. There should be a buffer between their houses and the new development and this should be planted properly by condition;
- The new community that will come to live in Great Haddon will be using the Doctor's Surgery in Yaxley and Church services in Yaxley.
- The entrance to the village from London Road is Broadway. Suggest that another entrance in the south of the village through Waterslade Road is provided. S106 money could be used.
- The new community should also have their connection with Broadway and Waterslade Road, so that they can come to Yaxley for the doctors and the church;
- People living in Great North Road in Haddon should also have a buffer between their houses and the new development. Moreover they will have the new dual-carriageway built behind their houses. Noise attenuation measures should be conditioned;
- The Gypsy and Travellers pitches suggested in the development plan was 5 pitches. But now I hear there will be more pitches. It would be madness to spoil the whole area before it is built. Nobody wants more pitches. Please keep it just 5 or 6.

Letter received from **Shailesh Vara MP**. This raises the following concerns:-

- A number of residents are not aware of the proposals as they have been occupied by other matters over Christmas. In the long term it would be good for the Council to show it has gone out of its way to allow residents to be heard;
- Given the number of houses proposed hope that proper and detailed infrastructure to match the additional need will be created. As well as schools, roads etc it is vital that community facilities are made available for any future residents. Given experiences at Hampton want assurances that facilities like youth centres are built as the development progresses rather than at the tail end of the project by which time several thousand people will have been living in the development without facilities;
- It is important that jobs created are long term and not merely whilst the houses, roads etc are being built;

- Changes to the use of the A15 will cause considerable problems for local residents. Would like to see this particular aspect of the plan reviewed as these changes will significantly impact on the length and time of journeys made by local people.
- The proposals will diminish the green space between Yaxley and Peterborough in effect creating a Greater Peterborough. This is ominous and many residents living in towns and villages outside Peterborough will feel that this is a dangerous precedent to set;

In addition 6 letters were received from Shailesh Vara MP forwarding letters from his constituents. These raise the following issues/concerns:-

- The applicant's publicity events in May/June 2008 does not appear to have been well publicised. If had been aware of the event would have attended;
- Object to the proposed closing of the A15 between Yaxley and Hampton to all vehicles except buses. The desire/needs of Yaxley residents has been misinterpreted. Yaxley residents do not want extra traffic on Broadway nor their access to Hampton, Peterborough and the surrounding area affected;
- The closure will result in residents in Yaxley having to travel further at a time when people are being encouraged to drive less to reduce vehicle emissions.
- In lots of cases using public transport is not practical. The existing bus route through Hempsted does not work;
- The growth in this particular area is unnecessary as there are units and offices standing empty all over Peterborough. Why build more. Brownfield sites should be used first;
- Concern regarding the proposed gypsy site and the impact on the road between Haddon and Bullock Road toward Elton;
- The proposed gypsy and traveller site is adjacent to protected wildlife (great crested newts), SSSI and would, therefore, be in direct conflict with the developer's statement to keep human activity away from protected wildlife. Also, the site is too far away from amenities;
- Concern as to what constitutes a pitch. The site is likely to grow far beyond the initial plans;
- Concern about litter, burnt out vehicles that would be present near to the site and the impact that would have on the wildlife and general appearance of the landscape. Would there be sufficient policing in the area to cope with any problems arising;
- The gypsy and travellers site does not meet Government rules. The problems caused by bad siting are many; access, rubbish, extra vehicle activity, policing, piles of scrap metal etc;
- Concern over the changes to the roads through Haddon itself and a proposed bus route. The road through Haddon is single track and would be too narrow to take a bus route. The hill up to Haddon is a blind bend and is dangerous at the best of times. Can foresee accidents occurring, with increased traffic using the village as a cut through to avoid congestion or as a daily road to Oundle;
- In the 1990s Peterborough City Planner had said that a link between the A1139 and Norman Cross via the Old Great North Road would never be allowed on the grounds of bad planning. Connecting the A1139 to Norman Cross would then create a rat-run with again another dangerous blind bend near the A1(M) underpass;
- Suggest an alternative road route is provided through the development and to the Parkway thereby avoiding Haddon village;
- Potential for the development to result in rat running through Haddon village to the A605. This is a single track road without footway etc and not designed to take the volume of traffic likely to use this route. If 10% of vehicles use this route that is an extra 250 movements per day;
- The peace and quiet of Haddon village will be destroyed and life will change for the worse;

- The proposed industrial area will cause environmental pollution to the Haddon area from all sorts of emissions, leakages and noise. What will be the impact of TV reception with large box type warehouses that all too often block signals;
- Assume that 'New Road' as appears on the OS map where it is situated leading from Tollgate House to Orton Southgate will be open to public use. If so, why couldn't this have been opened before. This road would reduce mileage from Haddon to Orton Southgate considerable;
- Have always thought Haddon was 'Great' without having the name added to it;
- Concern about the impact on wildlife. At present have a good representation of Great Crested Newts, Muntjac and Roe deer. When the A1(M) upgrade was implemented, there was a special tunnel inserted to allow deer and badgers to cross the road. This will all have been in vain;
- At which point does the cross over of Councils occur- i.e. Peterborough City Council and Huntingdonshire District Council. Will they interact or go merrily on their own separate ways as they currently do?
- The proposed bus gate would severely affect the existing petrol filling station on London Road as passing trade would be removed. A local service would also be lost;