



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE  
HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH ON 3 MARCH 2015**

**Members Present:** Councillors Harper (Chair), Serluca (Vice-Chair) Casey, Hiller, North, Stokes, Martin, Sylvester, Ash and Harrington

**Officers Present:** Lee Collins, Development Management Manager  
Vicky Hurrell, Principal Development Management Officer  
Bryan Clary, Tree Officer (Item 5.4)  
Theresa Nicholl, Development Manager (Item 5.5)  
Simon Ireland, Principal Engineer (Highway Control)  
Ruth Lea, Planning and Highways Lawyer  
Pippa Turvey, Senior Democratic Services Officer

**1. Apologies for Absence**

No apologies for absence were received.

The Chairman advised that an urgent report had been submitted to the Committee. This report would be heard after agenda item 5.4 '14/02145/FUL – 17 Castor Road, Marholm, Peterborough, PE6 7JA'.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. Members' Declaration of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor**

There were no declarations of intention to make representations as Ward Councillor.

**4. Minutes of the Meetings held on:**

**4.1 20 January 2015**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2015 were approved as a correct record.

**4.2 3 February 2015**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2015 were approved as a correct record.

**5. Development Control and Enforcement Matters**

**5.1 14/01781/FUL and 14/02078/FUL – Guthrie House, Rightwell, East Bretton, Peterborough**

The planning applications were for and extension at Guthrie House, Rightwell, East Bretton, Peterborough to create 13 new flats (14/01791/FUL) and the alterations to elevations of existing two story blocks of flats at Guthrie House, Rightwell, East Bretton, Peterborough, and the creation of a lobby (14/02078/FUL).

The main considerations set out in the reports were:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area

- Landscape implications
- Parking, access and highway implications
- Neighbour amenity
- Amenity provision for future occupants
- Developer contributions
- Environment Capital
- The impact of the proposal on the character of the area
- The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings

It was officer's recommendation that planning permissions be granted subject to, in relation to application 14/01791/FUL, the signing of a legal agreement, and the conditions set out in the respective reports.

The Principal Development Management Officer provided an overview of the applications and raised the following key points:

- The existing blocks were undergoing conversion to residential flats under the Prior Approval process.
- The proposals were not considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the streetscene, even though the proposed materials would be slightly different from those used in the existing buildings.
- It was in line with Council policy to encourage residential development within district centres, as sustainable locations.
- Concern had been raised in relation to the size of the proposal. It was considered by officers that the proposal fitted in with the other buildings in the locality and sufficient separation distances would be in place.
- 16 category A and B trees were to be removed within the development. It was considered that as a gap in the tree cover already existing and there was sufficient number of trees in the surrounding area the landscaping of the proposal was acceptable.
- The car parking provided in the proposal adhered to Council policy. It was believed that as the site was within a district centre, in a sustainable location and with parking available nearby in public car parks, visitor parking was not required.
- Objections had been raised in relation to expected increases in traffic from the site. It was considered that the proposal would not present an unacceptable increase in traffic given the original office use.
- A pedestrian crossing existed further along the road from the development site. As such, no additional crossing point was believed to be necessary.

Councillor David Neville, Bretton Parish Councillor, and Councillor Herdman, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- It was suggested that the height and position of the proposal failed to respect the established character of the area.
- The loss of trees would cause the development to be unduly dominant.
- Pedestrian crossing on the road was already thought to be difficult and dangerous. It was believed that the development would exacerbate this.
- Any residential development should be within the existing building block. Any extension was not necessary.
- The development would front onto the footpath and have a significant impact on its users.
- It was suggested that objection had not been raised by many residents of the area as the full impact of the proposal was not appreciated.
- Several car parks were available for short term use in the area, however these were over 200 yards away from the development site.
- Concern was raised about the safety of the area during the day, if no residents

were at home.

Mr Andrew Winterton, Bretton Green Ltd, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The building had been empty for several years.
- The development site was in a sustainable location, close to public transport and lightly used roads.
- There was a demand for residential housing nationally and locally.
- Safety was not believed to be an issue within the proposal.
- The car parking proposals adhered to Council policy, it was believed that the site would attract less vehicle movements than its previous use. It was considered that sufficient pedestrian crossing points were already in place.
- The trees on the opposite site of the access would be left, as would the trees on the embankment. It was believed that this would maintain the woodland feel of the area.
- The applicant had agreed to make all the relevant Section 106 Agreement contributions.
- It was felt that the proposal was in keeping with the surrounding area and not overbearing. Many of the surrounding buildings of a similar size to the proposed development.
- A waste management plan could be conditioned. It was the preference of the applicant to develop an above ground scheme.

The Committee believed that the building was of an acceptable design and that it fit in well with the character of the surrounding area. It was noted that there was little objection from surrounding residents.

In response to questions the Principal Development Management Officer advised that proposed condition 11 required the submission and approval of bin details, albeit that underground bins couldn't be insisted upon. The development provided one parking space for each one bedroom flat which accorded with policy.

Concerns were raised relating to the proposed parking arrangements and the Principal Engineer (Highway Control) clarified that as the development was situated near a district centre, this was considered sufficient for any visitor parking.

14/01791/FUL

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried nine voting in favour and one abstaining from voting.

**RESOLVED:** (nine in favour, one abstained from voting) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the signing of a **LEGAL AGREEMENT** and the conditions set out in the report.

### **Reasons for the decision**

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

- the application site was located within the Bretton District Centre and the surrounding area of Bretton Green was currently undergoing conversion to residential units accordingly. The proposal would represent further residential development within the District Centre which was considered acceptable in principle, in accordance with paragraph 23 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy CS2 of

- the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011);
- the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- it was considered that on balance, any harm resulting from the loss of trees and landscape features within the application site was outweighed by the benefit arising from additional residential units within the District Centre;
- there was adequate space within the curtilage of the site to provide sufficient parking to meet the needs of the development and no unacceptable impact to the public highway network shall result, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012);
- the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies PDP (2012);
- on balance, the proposal would provide an acceptable level of amenity for further occupants, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (2012); and
- a financial contribution could be secured to meet the infrastructure needs arising from the proposed development, in accordance with Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and the Peterborough Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD (2010).

#### 14/02078/FUL

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried nine voting in favour and one abstaining from voting.

**RESOLVED:** (nine in favour, one abstained from voting) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

#### **Reasons for the decision**

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

- The proposal would not unacceptably harm the character of the area or the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings; in accordance with policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policies PP2 and PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012.

#### **5.2 14/02126/OUT – Rear of 39 Station Road, Thorney, Peterborough**

Councillor Serluca left the meeting.

The planning application was for the erection of up to nine dwellings at the rear of 38 Station Road, Thorney, Peterborough.

The main considerations set out in the report were:

- Principle of development, including flood risk
- Density and layout
- Access and highway implications
- Impact upon the setting of heritage assets and archaeology
- Neighbour amenity
- Amenity provision for future occupants

- Tree and landscape implications
- Drainage
- Developer contributions

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The existing vehicular access to the site was proposed to be maintained, which was bounded by properties owned by the applicant.
- The land to the north of the application site had been granted outline permission for residential dwellings.
- The application site was designated as flood zone 3A, which was the highest risk level. As residential housing was classed as 'vulnerable' use, the sequential test had to be applied. The results of the test undertaken by the agent deemed the location to pass this test. Officers had undertaken their own sequential test, taking into account a wider range of sites, including those that had been previously rejected by the Council in the allocation process. Following this, the application was considered to fail the sequential test.
- It was considered that up to nine dwellings could be constructed on the site, which would fit in with the surrounding area and have no detrimental impact.
- No objections had been raised from the North Level Internal Drainage Board (NLIDB), the Environmental Agency (EA), or the Highway Authority.
- Conditions had been recommended by the by Tree Officers and the Drainage Team.
- Included in the update report was a letter from the applicant's agent, disputing the interpretation by officers of the sequential test. Also included was submission of support for the application from Ward Councillor Sanders.

Councillor Brown, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The Councillor agreed with the comments expressed in the report by the Parish Council and supported the application.
- Significant investment had been made into the flood barriers at Thorney. It was considered unlikely that the site would flood.
- The land adjacent to the proposal site had been approved by the Committee for development. The same flood risks applied to that land as to the application site.
- The site had never been known to flood.

Mr John Dickie, John Dickie Associates, addressed the Committee in support of the application and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- On all other matters the proposal was considered acceptable. The only reason given to refuse the application was flooding.
- No objections had been raised by internal or external consultees.
- A flood risk assessment had been undertaken and approved by the EA and the NLIDB.
- Appropriate measures could be put in place to mitigate the risk of flooding, which would only be presented by River Welland, or significant rainfall.
- There was confusion over how to correctly apply the sequential test. It was suggested that the criteria applied for different applications varied hugely. Mr Dickie was confident that this application passed the sequential test.
- The development had attracted significant local support.
- It was the intention of the applicant to leave the trees at the periphery and the front of the site. The large collection of trees beyond the plot would remain.

- The number of dwellings had been considered appropriate and it was not believed that the proposal would take away the amenity from the existing properties to the front of the site.

Councillor Hiller declared that he was a member of the NLIDB, though he had not been involved in any previous discussion in relation to this application.

The Committee considered the recommendation from officers and the local knowledge presented by the speakers. The Committee took note of the limited history of flooding on the site and the various preventative barriers that were now in place to avoid such issues. It was considered that, on balance, the application was acceptable.

The Development Management Manager advised that officers would meet with the agent to discuss the scope of the sequential test in relation to any future applications.

The Development Management Manager further set out various conditions that would be appropriate, if the Committee were minded to approve the application. These included conditions relating to a noise assessment, access arrangements, tree protection, archaeology, materials and a flood risk assessment.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, contrary to officer recommendation, subject to relevant conditions as set out by officers. The motion was carried seven voting in favour, and two voting against.

**RESOLVED:** (seven voted in favour, two voted against) that planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

- C 1 Approval of details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

Reason: To ensure that the development meets the policy standards required by the development plan and any other material considerations including national and local policy guidance.

- C 2 Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition 1 above, relating to the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority and shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development meets the policy standards required by the development plan and any other material considerations including national and local policy guidance.

- C 3 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

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

- C 4 The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

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

- C 5 The plans and particulars submitted under Condition 2 above shall include a noise assessment (based upon background noise levels) and scheme of noise mitigation (if required) based upon the submitted assessment and the details of the proposal. Any scheme of noise mitigation that is approved shall be carried out prior to first occupation of any dwelling.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable level of amenity is afforded to future occupants, in accordance with Policy PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 6 The plans and particulars submitted under Condition 2 above shall include full details of the proposed Sustainable Drainage Scheme which shall itself include full calculations and the results of any necessary investigations including an assessment of ground conditions. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Sustainable Drainage Scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not result in increased flood risk elsewhere, in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

- C 7 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted document 'Flood Risk Assessment for Residential Development at Station Road, Thorney, Peterborough' (dated November 2014) and the following specific mitigation measures detailed therein:

- a) Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 1.0 metre above Ordnance Datum (AOD);
- b) The dwellings and any ancillary buildings shall include flood resilient/ resistant techniques; and
- c) Future occupants of the dwellings shall be advised to sign up to flood warnings direct.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of each dwellinghouse to which they relate.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants, in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

- C 8 The plans and particulars relating to access submitted under Condition 2 above shall include the following:

- a) Vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays measuring 2 metres x 2 metres on either side of the access;
- b) Vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays measuring 2.4 metres by 47 metres on either side of the access;
- c) An access driveway of no less than 5.5 metres in width; and
- d) Tracking diagrams to demonstrate that a refuse collection vehicle can turn within the site in order to enter and leave the site in a forward gear.

The approved access shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and prior to the commencement of development. Thereafter, the access shall be retained as for the purposes of the access and manoeuvring of vehicles

in connection with the development. The visibility splays shall be maintained clear of any obstruction above a height of 600mm in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C 9 No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall include (but not be limited to):

- a) hours of construction;
- b) routes for all vehicles delivering materials to the site;
- c) materials storage within the site;
- d) the parking of all contractors vehicles clear of the public highway;
- e) wheel washing facilities for all vehicles exiting the site; and
- f) measures to control the emission of dust from the site.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policies CS14 and CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP3 and PP12 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C10 The plans and particulars submitted under Condition 2 above shall include a scheme for the landscaping of the site . The scheme shall include the following details:

- a) Proposed finished ground and building slab levels;
- b) Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting; and
- c) Boundary treatments and areas of hard surfacing.

Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The boundary treatments and hard surfacing shall be provided prior to first occupation of the dwelling to which they relate and the planting shall be carried out no later than the first planting season following completion of the development.

Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme (except those contained in enclosed rear gardens to individual dwellings) that die, are removed or become diseased within five years of the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the developers, or their successors in title with an equivalent size, number and species to those being replaced. Any replacement trees, shrubs or hedgerows dying within five years of planting shall themselves be replaced with an equivalent size, number and species.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity, in accordance with Policies CS16 and CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C11 The plans and particulars submitted under Condition 2 above shall include a concise Site Specific Method Statement and/or Finalised Tree Protection Plan to BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design demolition and construction -



Recommendations methodology. The Statement and/or Plan shall identify (but not exclusively) the following:

- Trees to be retained and those to be removed clearly identified;
- Location and specification of protective tree measures in addition to appropriate ground protection (creating construction corridors where appropriate) within the Root Protection Areas of all retained trees within the application site;
- Details of all Root Protection Area infringement during the construction and landscaping phases with details on how the impact will be reduced;
- Details of facilitation pruning;
- Location of accesses, material storage, site office, mixing of cement, welfare facilities etc;
- Specification of landscaping prescriptions (including fencing/walls and changes in soil level) within the Root Protection Area of retained trees.

The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and/or plans and the tree protection shall be erected according to the specification and locations shown on the agreed Finalised Tree Protection Plan. Signs will be placed on the tree protection emphasising that it is not to be moved, nor the area entered into until the end of development without written permission from the Local Planning Authority's Tree Officer.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenities of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policies PP2 and PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C12 No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work, including a Written Scheme of Investigation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full (including any post development requirements e.g. archiving and submission of final reports) prior to the commencement of any development.

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).

- C13 No development shall take place until details of the following materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- Walling and roofing materials (samples to be provided);
- Windows and doors including garage doors;
- Rainwater goods;
- Canopies, brise-soleil etc (if necessary); and
- Any externally visible sustainable technologies, vents, flues etc.

The details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. 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, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C14 The development hereby approved shall be constructed so that it achieves at least a 10% improvement on the Target Emission Rates set by the Building Regulations at the time of Building Regulations being approved for the development.

Reason: To accord with Policy CS10 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011).

- C15 If, during development, contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure all contamination within the site is dealt with in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 120 and 121 and Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C16 The combined gross floor space of the development hereby permitted shall not exceed 1,000 square metres.

Reason: To ensure that the development accordance with the National Online Planning Guidance in respect of small-scale residential developments and their associated financial contributions towards infrastructure demands.

### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposed outline development was considered acceptable in all matters, with the exception of the flood risks present at the site. It was considered that, on balance, the risk of flooding was not significant and the proposal was acceptable.

### **5.3 14/02145/FUL – 17 Castor Road, Marholm, Peterborough, PE6 7JA**

The planning application was for a proposed three bedroom detached dwelling with associated driveway at 17 Castor Road, Marholm, Peterborough, PE6 7JA.

The main considerations set out in the report were:

- Principle of residential development
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area and heritage assets
- Neighbour amenity
- Access, parking and highway implications
- Tree implications
- Archaeology
- Development contributions

It was officer's recommendation that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Development Management Manager provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The development site was located in a prominent position on the edge of a conservation area.
- The proposed dwelling would be in the same building line as the existing dwellings.
- The proposal would be set at an angle away from the neighbouring property on

Walton Road and would share the existing vehicular access with the host property.

- The neighbouring property on Walton Road would be 5 metres away, with a 1.2 metre boundary fence. The residents of neighbouring property had objected on the grounds that they would lose the use of their kitchen window.
- The host property would be 5.4 metres away and would lose some natural light during the morning time.
- Officers considered that the design of the proposal would positively enhance the immediate environment and fill an existing gap.
- It was considered that the proposed dwelling's siting within the plot would provide sufficient space and avoid any overbearing impact.
- It was not considered that an increase of one dwelling would cause a significant intensification of use of the proposed access point.

The Committee generally approved of the design and access to the proposal. However, the Committee expressed concern regarding the impact the proposal would have on the neighbouring property on Walton Road. It was considered that the impact would be significant and that any privacy afforded to the property would be lost. The Committee believed the level of impact to be unacceptable.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that permission be granted, contrary to officer recommendation, for the reasons of overbearing impact and loss of privacy. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that planning permission is **REFUSED** for the reasons set out below.

#### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposal was considered to have an overbearing impact and resulted in the loss of privacy of neighbouring properties. As such, the proposal was in contravention of policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy (DPD) 2011 and policy PP3 of the Peterborough Planning Policies (DPD) 2012.

#### **5.4 15/00200/CTR – 333 Thorpe Road, Peterborough, PE3 6LU**

Councillor Serluca re-joined the meeting.

The Committee received an urgent report which outlined an application for a notice pursuant to Section 211 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for works to a tree in a conservation area. The work proposed was to reduce the branches of a holly tree at 333 Thorpe Road, Peterborough to provide 0.5 metres clearance on a property.

Section 211 provided that the work would be deemed as authorised and work may be carried out after the expiry of six weeks from the date of the notice, if no decision was made by the Local Planning Authority. The period of six weeks from the submission of the notice would come to an end prior to the next meeting of the Committee. Therefore, the matter required consideration by the Committee as an urgent item.

It was officer's recommendation that no objections be raised to the application. The Tree Officer provided an overview of the application and raised the following key points:

- The application related to minor pruning of a holly tree within a conservation area.
- The tree in question was next to the property window and almost reached the guttering.
- The tree was not considered to be worthy of a Tree Protection Order.

A motion was proposed and seconded to agree that no objections be raised, as per officer recommendation. The motion was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED:** (unanimous) that no objections are raised to the application.

### **Reasons for the decision**

The proposal was in accordance with sound arboricultural practice.

## **5.5 East Coast Main Line Level Crossing Closure**

The Committee received a report which set out the proposals of Network Rail to close a number of level crossings on the East Coast Main Line (ECML) between London and Doncaster as part of a programme to make the line more efficient and reliable. The report sought the Committee's views on the comments made in relation to each proposal and any further comments the Committee wished to make. Planning permission would not be required from Peterborough City Council and, as such, the Council would not be the determining authority. The Council would be a consultee, alongside other organisations such as English Heritage and the Environmental Agency.

Within Peterborough, the closure of the following level crossings was proposed;

- Woodcroft (Woodcroft Road to the southeast of Helpston)
- Helpston (Glinton Road, Helpston)
- Maxey (Maxey Road, Helpston)
- Lolham Bridges and Helpston Footpath (north of B1443 and NE of Bainton)

It was officer's recommendation that Committee note the contents of the report and offer any additional comments it would like to make to Network Rail at this stage.

The Development Manager provided an overview of the report and outlined the comments that officers were able to make at the current time.

The Chairman invited representatives of Network Rail to respond to questions from the Committee. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- National Rail had tried to engage with as many groups as possible in their consultation process. This included cycle forums and walking groups.
- Consultation was still on going.
- The review was not driven by an increase in line speed. The alterations set out in the consultation would be able to facilitate increased speed, however such a proposal would require its own consultation process.
- Traffic modelling was currently being undertaken. It was suggested that mitigation measures may be required to ensure that traffic is diverted away from villages.
- More information would be provided in due course.

The Committee commented that traffic modelling would be vital to ensure that any diverted traffic would not cause congestion in the surrounding villages. It was suggested that consideration should be given to the access Lolham Bridges, to ensure that the site did not become a 'dumping ground'.

**RESOLVED** that the contents of the report and comments of the Committee are noted.

Chairman  
1.30pm – 3:40pm