

**Application Ref:** 16/01361/FUL

**Proposal:** Residential development comprising 190 dwellings with associated access roads and landscaping

**Site:** Land To The South Of, Lawrence Road, Wittering, Peterborough  
**Applicant:** Larkfleet Ltd And Cecil Estate Family

**Agent:** Mr John Dadge  
 Barker Storey Matthews

**Site visit:** 29.07.2016

**Case officer:** Miss A McSherry  
**Telephone No.** 01733 454416  
**E-Mail:** amanda.mcsherry@peterborough.gov.uk

**Recommendation:** **GRANT** subject to the signing of a **LEGAL AGREEMENT** and relevant conditions

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

Site and surroundings

The site covers an area of 7.72 hectares and is an agricultural field located within the village envelope of Wittering. The site is located on the southern edge of the village. It is currently separated from the village by a 2m high chain linked fence.

The site is bounded to the east by the A1 motorway, to the south and west by other agricultural land and to the north by the existing residential housing of Wittering.

The proposal

Full planning permission is sought for 190 residential dwellings, together with access roads, open space and landscaping. The 190 dwellings proposed comprises 12 x 1 bedroom, 24 x 2 bedroom, 103 x 3 bedroom and 51 x 4 bedroom properties. 57 of the 190 residential properties are proposed to be affordable, to meet the 30% affordable housing requirement of the scheme. Two new vehicle access are proposed to serve the development, one from Lawrence Road and one from St Mary's Avenue. Two areas of open space are proposed within the housing layout, together with a large open space area space on the eastern side of the site adjacent to the A1.

**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 4 - Assessment of Transport Implications**

Development which generates a significant amount of traffic should be supported by a Transport Statement/Transport Assessment. It should be located to minimise the need to travel/to maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel and be supported by a Travel Plan. Large scale developments should include a mix of uses. A safe and suitable access should be provided and the transport network improved to mitigate the impact of the development.

### **Section 6 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**

Paragraph 14 sets out that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay and that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

### **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 10 - Development and Flood Risk**

New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the impacts of climate change. Inappropriate development in areas of flood risk should be avoided by directing it away from areas at higher risk. Where development is necessary it shall be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Applications should be supported as appropriate by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment, a Sequential Test and, if required, the Exception Test.

### **Section 11 - Biodiversity**

Development resulting in significant harm to biodiversity or in the loss of/deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused if the impact cannot be adequately mitigated, or compensated. Proposals to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted and opportunities to incorporate biodiversity into new development encouraged.

Development within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest or other specified sites should not normally be permitted where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely. An exception should only be made where the benefits clearly outweigh the impacts.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring Appropriate Assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered or determined.

### **Section 11 - Noise**

New development giving rise to unacceptable adverse noise impacts should be resisted; development should mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising. Development often creates some noise and existing businesses wanting to expand should not be unreasonably restricted because of changes in nearby land uses.

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

### **CS01 - Settlement Hierarchy and the Countryside**

The location/ scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Development in the countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

### **CS02 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development**

Provision will be made for an additional 25 500 dwellings from April 2009 to March 2026 in strategic areas/allocations.

### **CS08 - Meeting Housing Needs**

Promotes a mix of housing the provision of 30% affordable on sites of 15 or more dwellings (70% social rented and 30% intermediate housing), 20% life time homes and 2% wheelchair housing.

### **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.

### **CS19 - Open Space and Green Infrastructure**

New residential development should make provision for/improve public green space, sports and play facilities. Loss of open space will only be permitted if no deficiency would result.

### **CS20 - Landscape Character**

New development should be sensitive to the open countryside. Within the Landscape Character Areas development will only be permitted where specified criteria are met.

### **CS21 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation**

Development should conserve and enhance biodiversity/ geological interests unless no alternative sites are available and there are demonstrable reasons for the development.

### **CS22 - Flood Risk**

Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 will only be permitted if specific criteria are met. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate.

## **Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012)**

### **SA04 - Village Envelopes**

These are identified on the proposals map. Land outside of the village envelop is defined as open countryside.

### **SA06 - Limited Growth Villages**

Identifies the sites within the Limited Growth Villages which are allocated primarily for residential use.

### **SA14 - Rural Employment Sites**

Identifies rural employment sites for development primarily within use classes B1 and B2. Development should be of an appropriate scale and protect/enhance local amenity.

## **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.

### **PP03 - Impacts of New Development**

Permission will not be granted for development which would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, public and/or private green space or natural daylight; be overbearing or cause noise or other disturbance, odour or other pollution; fail to minimise opportunities for crime and disorder.

### **PP04 - Amenity Provision in New Residential Development**

Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

### **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.

### **PP13 - Parking Standards**

Permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

### **PP14 - Open Space Standards**

Residential development (within Use Classes C3 and C4) will be required to provide open space in accordance with the minimum standards. The type of on-site provision will depend on the nature and location of the development and the needs of the local area.

### **PP16 - The Landscaping and Biodiversity Implications of Development**

Permission will only be granted for development which makes provision for the retention of trees and natural features which contribute significantly to the local landscape or biodiversity.

### **Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Preliminary Draft)**

This document sets out the planning policies against which development will be assessed. It will bring together all the current Development Plan Documents into a single document. Consultation on this document took place between December 2016 and 9 February 2017. The responses are currently being reviewed. At this preliminary stage only limited weight can be attached to the policies set out therein.

## **4 Consultations/Representations**

### **PCC Peterborough Highways Services**

No Objections – subject to conditions and informatives.

### **PCC Pollution Team**

No Objections – The proposed mitigation measures indicated in Section 6 of the Noise Assessment are acceptable.

### **PCC Strategic Housing**

No Objection – 30% affordable housing provision is required in accordance with Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy, this equates to 57 dwellings. This application proposes 57 affordable units as so complies with this policy criteria. The policy sets out a 70% social rented tenure and 30% intermediate tenure mix, but does allow for some flexibility. For this scheme, this would be 40 affordable housing units and 17 intermediate tenure. No extra mix has been specified. The 12 x 1 bed, 24 x 2 bed, 18 x 3 bed and 2 x 4 bed for the affordable units is acceptable. The extra unit needed to make 58 dwellings provision should be a 1 or 2 bed dwelling. 20% of the total units should be of a Lifetime Home standard, this is 38 dwellings, the proposal complies with this requirement. Additionally 2% should meet the Building Regulations Wheelchair housing standard, this is 4 dwellings. There is no mention of wheelchair standard dwellings proposed.

**PCC Tree Officer**

No Objection – There are no arboricultural objections to the proposal as the impact to offsite trees appears to be minimal. However, it would be helpful to understand the exact tree removals and the positioning and specification of any protective fencing, this could be secured by condition. The landscaping scheme is acceptable in principle, however some specific planting details are missing however they can be secured by condition. The native boundary planting details and future management arrangements need to be secured by condition, as does the maintenance and future management of all the soft landscaping areas on site.

**PCC Wildlife Officer**

No Objections – Subject to the imposition of conditions in respect of securing an ecological management plan for the green infrastructure proposed, securing bird boxes, and ensuring means of escape for protected species is provided during construction. In addition, the advice of Natural England's should be sought in respect of the impacts on SSSI's and whether the proposal is required to be considered under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

**PCC Minerals And Waste Officer (Policy)**

No objections - The proposal site is adjacent to, but not within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for limestone (Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy CS26).

**PCC Rights of Way Officer**

No Objection – No comments from a Rights of Way perspective.

**Lead Local Drainage Authority**

No Objection – Subject to the imposition of a condition securing the details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of a sustainable drainage system.

**Archaeological Officer**

No Objection - A detailed magnetic gradiometer survey was undertaken in 2013 in connection with the proposed development. The survey (total area of c. 6.5ha) revealed few positive linear anomalies. These could represent Roman ditches possibly associated with field boundaries or enclosures. Large ferrous responses located in the eastern part of the site may be evidence of iron smelting. The positive anomalies should be further investigated and characterised by means of an evaluation by trial trenches targeted on the magnetic responses, namely the linear features and the ferrous sites.

Targeted area excavation, if required, would follow the evaluation. This archaeological investigation can be secured by condition.

**PCC Waste Management**

There are a number of private driveways that do not have turning areas, therefore they will need a bin collection point. Refuse vehicle tracking details are required to ensure collection vehicles can adequately manoeuvre around the site to collect the waste and recycling. For the 12 x 1 bedroom properties that do not have private gardens details of their bin storage and collection areas should be provided.

**Highways England**

No Objection – Recommend a condition should be attached to any planning permission that may be granted. The recommended condition is in respect of requiring a Framework Travel Plan to be submitted and approved before the development is brought into beneficial use.

**Anglian Water Services Ltd**

No objections – A foul water strategy should be secured by condition. The proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets therefore we offer no comments on this.

### **Environment Agency**

No Objection – Subject to the imposition of a planning condition in respect of the phasing and provision of the mains foul sewage infrastructure both on and off site.

### **Natural England - Consultation Service**

Further information requested in respect of the indirect impacts of the development on hydrology and visitor pressure on the surrounding SSSI's.

### **The Wildlife Trusts (Cambridgeshire)**

We have reviewed the ecological information provided and are disappointed with the standard of this information. We suggest that a desktop search, consulting the local Environmental Records Centre, is carried out, and based on the results of this, further enhancement measures are recommended which are appropriate for the area. At the moment, the plans for the open space show a large area of amenity grassland, which will add very little biodiversity benefit. Although we think the overall conclusion of the ecological scoping survey is probably correct, i.e. that the site currently has little ecological interest, and therefore there is an opportunity for a net gain in biodiversity, more work is needed in order to take full advantage of this opportunity and design good quality ecological enhancement features which will provide real benefits for species and habitats of local importance.

### **Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service**

No Objection – Subject to adequate provision being made for fire hydrants, this could be secured by way of a planning condition. Access and facilities for the Fire Service should also be provided in accordance with the Building Regulations Approved Document B5, Section 16.

### **Health & Safety Executive (HSE)**

No Objections - HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

### **National Grid**

Due to the presence of National Grid apparatus in proximity to the specified area, the contractor should contact National Grid before any works are carried out to ensure our apparatus is not affected by any of the proposed works. A list of requirements and guidance for the developer are provided.

### **GeoPeterborough (Sites Of Interest)**

No comments received

### **Ramblers (Central Office)**

No comments regarding above planning application.

### **Peterborough Civic Society**

Do not object to the principle of this proposal, but feel that adding more traffic to the village junction with the A1 without some physical measures to improve safety to road users would be unwise. It is accepted that the cost of a grade separated junction would be prohibitive but elsewhere on the A1 where safety is an issue speed limits as low as 50mph have long been in force. Permission for residential development should be conditional on providing a practical set of measures to improve safety at the A1 junction.

We have a suggestion to enhance the visual impact of the new housing in views from the south-west of the site. The edge of the site is straight and the layout of houses and their rooflines are largely parallel to this straight boundary, thus resulting in a harsh and inappropriate appearance. Greater variety could be introduced by varying the depth of landscaping tree planting belt on this edge. The feeder road running parallel to southern edge could also be redesigned to include a curved alignment with variations in roofline angles. The applicant's 'Design & Access Statement' sets out the design philosophy would seem to support our approach. Please refer to 'Developing the Detailed Design', page 20, in particularly points 4, 6 and 7.

With regard to 'affordable housing'; the number proposed should be considered as a minimum provision, and as the basis of the approval, although it is accepted that this may be subject to negotiation around the viability of the development.

### **Councillor D Lamb**

Objection – For the following reasons:-

- Size of development – massive impact on Wittering Village
- Poor layout – Traffic and highways
- Inadequate infrastructure
- Major problem with A1 junction at present – 450 more vehicles would add to this significantly
- Increased demand on school places, neighbouring surgeries in Wansford and Stamford etc.

### **Shailesh Vara MP**

Objection –

- The Peterborough Core Strategy identifies that within the Limited Growth Category Villages, of which there are 7 villages. 300 dwellings in total shall be provided between 2009 and 2026, and yet this development accounts for nearly 2/3 of this total.
- This application pays little attention to the challenge faced by Wittering residents in accessing the village from the A1 southbound. At present motorists must cross two lanes of traffic travelling at the national speed limit of 70mph, which is a considerable hazard. The developer would not be required to take the flyover scheme forward due to the scale of the project and the Department for Transport has confirmed that they will not even consider the flyover issue until after 2020.
- Highways England have been consulted on the application and have requested a Framework Travel Plan but this does not appear to have been provided.
- The Wildlife Trust have raised concern at the quality of the applications ecological survey, which does not meet the accepted industry guidelines for developments of this scale. The Council's Wildlife Officer is also disappointed at the lack of ecological enhancements suggested as part of the proposed development.
- Local infrastructure such as water supply and roads are already under pressure with the present number of homes in the village and the additional residents occupying a further 190 dwellings would only exacerbate matters.
- Construction vehicles will access the site via the current road network and their heavy nature will further deteriorate the road surfaces. Wittering also has problems with on-street parking and construction traffic may face difficulties in accessing the site.
- There are no medical or dental facilities in Wittering and existing facilities at Wansford and Stamford are already at capacity. The same applies for certain classes at the village primary school which is an issue that will continue year on year without the addition of children from the proposed homes.
- A further access road is planned from St Mary's Avenue and this will pass through the current A1 sound buffer which is also used by residents for leisure. This will cause much disturbance to villagers.
- There is an existing problems with surface water drainage in the village and these further homes will add unnecessary pressure to the water network.
- Will there be any compensation for residents living next door to this proposed building site.

I therefore strongly express my objection to the application.

## Wittering Parish Council

Objection – The main concerns were:-

- The increased traffic through the village (both the construction traffic and the traffic of the new residents). The existing roads are already inadequate for the current amount of traffic due to their poor condition and cars parking on both sides of the roads, causing highway safety issues.
- Access to the development from the A1 and A47. There are already fears about the number of vehicles turning right across the A1 Southbound, which is a potentially dangerous junction and takes up to 30 minutes to cross in peak times, and the substandard condition of Old Oundle Road from the A47 into the village. There are currently no definite plans/timescales for the much needed A1 Flyover.
- The extra strain on the infrastructure which already struggles to cope with the surface drainage and the sewerage system already.
- The increased demand for places at Wittering Primary school, which currently has some classes at full capacity. If children have to be bussed to other local schools, there will be more traffic crossing the A1. There will also be an increased demand for health services provision at the local GP surgeries in the area.
- The impact on the village and village life. Wittering residents have chosen to benefit from the peace and quiet of living in a small village rather than a busy town. The loss of the natural open countryside views would be lost forever to the detriment of current residents and for future generations.
- There are already sufficient 2 and 3 bedroom properties in the village whilst there is a lack of 4 and 5 bedroom properties. The proposed development does not proposed to include many 4 and 5 bedroom properties.
- No amendments have been made which would alleviate our original objections.
- In addition, we would like to refer to the Further Draft December 2016 to January 2017 of the Peterborough Local Plan, 7.5.5 (page 85) which states: “Any planning application for the development of site WIT001H must be accompanied by a Transport Assessment, including a Residential Travel Plan. Subject to the conclusions of that Assessment, it is likely that the development will require improvements to the existing junction of Townsend Road and the A1 Great North Road, unless improvements or a replacement grade-separated junction in accordance with policy LP15 have already been implemented. Any improvements required to enable to development to proceed will need to be funded by the developer and the works completed before occupation of the first dwelling. It is possible that improvements to the existing junction will not be sufficient to enable all of the development envisaged for this site. In that case a phased development would be necessary, with later phases relying on the prior provision of the grade separated junction”.

## Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 86

Total number of responses: 450

Total number of objections: 432

Total number in support: 18

432 letters of objection have been received raising the following issues:-

- A roundabout or overpass to the A1 is needed to allow safe access to village. This is needed before any new housing is built.
- The Village was promised a flyover the A1 10 years ago. There have been many accidents entering and leaving the village already, this could lead to more.
- The data on traffic flows provided does not show how dangerous it is to cross the traffic on the A1 to access the village. If it is so safe why is a flyover proposed.
- Every week the A1 is at a standstill due to heavy traffic or an accident.
- It takes 45 mins to cross over the A1 into the Village on a Friday night, this will make it worse.



- Highway safety concerns of vehicles having to cross the A1 traffic to get into the village.
- People do 'U' turns which is prohibited.
- The road is a death trap. The extra traffic could lead to more traffic accidents and even fatalities.
- Feel the applicant has mis-represented the problem with access to the village. They have given the minimum accident data on or near the village. However Wansford slip road is an accident hot spot. This has been left out of the submitted information.
- The roads are already busy and unable to cope with more vehicles
- Vehicles would struggle to get through village
- Poor condition of some roads through village, potholes and parked cars make manoeuvring through village difficult
- The extra cars will make it more dangerous for children in the village and could lead to more accidents.
- Parked cars currently make it difficult for buses to get through the Village.
- How are the 40 heavy good vehicles movement during construction going to get through the village roads, when sometimes cars struggle for sufficient width to get through? This could lead to accidents.
- Could a temporary construction access be created from the A1.
- Construction traffic should not use the Old Oundle Road from the A47 into Wittering. This road is currently over used by delivery lorries that are too large for the road conditions. Especially as there are 3 blind bends, More accidents could occur if this road is used.
- The village roads cannot cope with the increased traffic flows from this development.
- Currently the roads are private and maintained by a residents company (Preim) which all the residents pay an annual maintenance fee. The increased traffic will mean increased maintenance and cost to village residents which hasn't been addressed in the submission. Is PCC going to take on liability for all roads in the village? Are new residents going to contribute for the maintenance of the facilities they use?
- The situation with Preim and Anniston Homes with regard to communal areas being properly adopted, this development will add to the problems of who manages what and to what standard.
- Poor access from the village to the A47. It is an unclassified road, narrow in places, badly maintained, with no road markings and leads onto a busy trunk road. It is unsuitable for large amounts of traffic.
- The Old Oundle Rd is a country road that apart from cars and farm vehicles has cyclists, joggers, walkers and horse riders using it. Extra traffic would pose risk to these users.
- The estate roads will not be able to cope with the weight of construction lorries.
- Access for emergency vehicles will be difficult
- Most of the properties on Lawrence Road do not have on plot parking and so they park on the road. This happens also for a small number of properties on St Mary's Avenue.
- Lack of infrastructure to support growth, including lack of school places, no doctors, no dentist, no pharmacy and only 2 small shops.
- The development will put a huge strain on the limited existing village facilities.
- A nursery and secondary school would be welcome. The local senior school is already full with children travelling 30mins or more by coach.
- We have a very limited bus service. No buses in the evening or on a Sunday.
- No police presence
- Roads currently flood due to inadequate drainage, when there is heavy rain
- Noise pollution increase unwanted and unhealthy. Part of the existing sound barrier is to be removed to build access road.
- Traffic noise on two sides of my property
- I am concerned about how I will get access to my property
- Too many houses.
- I have no objection to say 50 houses. Why is Wittering getting more than its fair share of new housing?
- New housing is need but 190 is way too much.

- Wittering is one of 8 Limited Growth Villages and yet is required to take on 42% of the homes required.
- 3 spur roads are in plan and point to neighbouring fields. This makes further construction in neighbouring fields a real possibility. The surrounding fields are part of the rural beauty of the village.
- The formation of the Wittering Action Group is evidence of the strong opposition to these plans, and proof of the community spirit that exists here.
- The comments made by the applicant during public consultation were disrespectful
  - and reckless. They have not addressed any of the concerns we put forward on the day.
- The applicant has bad customer service on estates it has already built.
- We are only a small village of approx. 2500 people with very poor infrastructure.
- We have chosen to live in a semi rural location. This amount of housing will harmfully change this. If we wanted to live in a built up area we would have moved to Stamford.
- We already struggle in this area with water pressure and sewage backing up as the pipes are old. This development could make this worse.
- The majority of the village do not want this new housing estate, and want to keep our village as it is.
- The plan shows a fence along the northern perimeter. I would prefer this to be open, so the new estate feels like it is part of the existing housing rather than forming a separate self contained development.
- The eastern boundary with the A1 needs to be substantial to prevent access by children or dogs on to the A1. Maintenance arrangements need to be in force for subsequent repairs.
- There are houses in the village which are not selling, why build more than will not sell.
- The original plan was for approximately 160 houses, not 190.
- The ecology survey makes no mention of hedgehogs which are present in the village. Construction traffic could increase the risk of these being run over.
- Skylarks nest in the field of the proposed site, this would hamper construction during the bird nesting season.
- Badgers, European Hares, Pipistrel Bats, Roe Deer, Grass Snakes, Hedgehogs and Skylarks all frequent the proposed development site. At least four of these species are named in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.
- The traffic report ignores the St Mary's Avenue entrance.
- There is no report on the effects of the village's sewage system and can it cope or does it need upgrading.
- Detrimental effect on my outlook
- It would affect the light in my front garden, and we will feel overlooked.
- Housing values will be greatly affected.
- How many of the properties will be social housing and where will they be?
- Have this company bought the land needed to create the new vehicle accesses.
- Extra noise, dust and traffic during construction
- What if my children have to go to school in Stamford when they reach school age because the school is full?
- Create more pollution from more cars
- The houses would not be available for the young of the village. They would be available to rent, we would have no control over who lives there, opening the village up to crime.
- This will potentially increase the Wansford Practice by 400-600 patients. 9% of patients are from Wittering, so this percentage could increase to 17%. Additional space and staff will be required. We need financial support to improve health provision and infrastructure.
- The new road from St Mary's will go through a currently grassed area used by families has safety been considered. This area also provides a sound buffer for existing residents, putting a road through it will increase disturbance for residents.
- Air source heating, solar panels and rainwater harvesting should be proposed.
- CPRE have been contacted by a resident about the increased traffic. They live near Old Oundle Road and the post office have stopped delivering their mail because the road is so

dangerous. This development would make this situation worse.

- Article 8 of Human Rights Act 1998 states a right to respect for private and family life.
- The construction routes for vehicles are not suitable
- Refuse collection appears difficult for some plots.
- Lack of applicant assessment on water services
- Lack of response re the high pressure gas apparatus.
- The slip road on the southbound carriageway for vehicles to turn right into Wittering across the A1 is at times insufficient and causes queues blocking the outside fast lane of the A1.
- We have poor telephone and broadband services
- Will there be an environmental study carried out as to the effect on local wildlife
- The Transport and Infrastructure document submitted is dated, it should be updated.
- Inadequate broadband.
- Disagree with Highways Agency's response. No flyover should mean no more houses, unless they want to be responsible for any deaths and serious injuries.
- Concern about the safe movement of refuse collection vehicles.
- This is bad planning.
- The revised plans show no consideration to the issues previously raised.
- I heard money that money that was going to parish council now goes into a big pot and given to the city council, this is unacceptable and needs addressing.

18 letters of support has been received, commenting:-

- I privately rent in Wittering and need a bigger house and don't want to move from the area, so affordable rented properties would be good.
- I'm in military housing and have been waiting 2 years for a house to come up in Wittering. I can't wait to buy one, we need housing here.
- I fully support this development as new houses in this area would be great for forces families looking to buy in the very near future. Although there is a lack of dentists and doctors for families.
- Totally support any community development in a parish which is not progressive in services or community spirit.
- Support this application for development and growth
- As a first time buyer, I am very pleased that there is a possibility to obtain new property in Wittering.
- I support new housing in the Village but I am concerned about access.
- I am looking for a 4 bedroom house in the village, but there is a lack of these. Building these houses would improve my chances of becoming a homeowner.
- Believe this will benefit the village and enhance current services. Bring the possibility of sorting out current water pressure problem, as developers will want the best supply to sell houses.
- New houses are needed across the country and here. I believe the size of development will not adversely impact on the village 'feel'. Whilst there are parking problems in the village, I am sure new development will have to meet current requirements for parking. The village is already taking a co-ordinated approach to the problem of access to the village from the A1.

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

### **a) The Principle of Development**

6.73 hectares of the application site (SA6.10) is allocated for residential use in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2012, for an indicative 160 dwellings. Therefore in accordance with Policy SA6 the principle of residential use on the site is acceptable, and has already been established through its allocation.

An additional 1.0 hectare of the application site (SA14.1) is allocated for B1 and B2 employment use in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2012. This application does not propose any employment development, but instead proposes to use this additional 1 hectare of land for further residential use. Hence the increase in housing numbers by 30 houses to a total of 190, from the indicative 160 in the Site Allocations DPD. Therefore the additional proposed residential development on this land allocated for employment use is contrary to Policy SA14.

All the land of the application site is located within the village envelope, therefore in accordance with Policy SA4, the principle residential development on the site is acceptable.

### **b) 5 Year Housing Land Supply**

The NPPF paragraph 47, requires Local Planning Authorities to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of housing against their housing requirements.

The Council on the 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017 published its 5 Year housing land supply report. This report sets out the five year land supply for Peterborough City Council between the period 1 April 2017 and 31 March 2022.

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) 4 sets out the requirements for five year land supply and guidance on calculating the five year supply. The above Five Year Land Supply report also takes into account the outcomes of a recent appeal decision (Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/16/3153303 Land off Uffington Road, Barnack, March 2017).

The report states that the council has identified land that is estimated, based on evidence, to be capable of delivering 6,516 dwellings between 1 April 2017 and 31 March 2022. The five year requirement during this period is 5,241. The council can therefore demonstrate 1,275 additional dwellings over the five year requirement. Therefore the council can demonstrate a five year supply of housing land of 6.22 years.

The City Council's 5 year housing land supply report dated 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017, demonstrates that the Council has a deliverable 5 year supply of housing. Therefore in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 49, the policies of the adopted development plan are considered up to date and do not need to be set aside as per the NPPF in instances where authorities cannot demonstrate that they have sufficient land supply.

### **c) Loss of employment land**

The applicant considers that there is no demand for employment land in this location, which is why only housing is proposed on both of the allocated sites SA6.10 and SA14.1. They are also of the view that using the land allocated for employment as housing development, would prove a much more compatible land use in amenity terms for the adjacent housing allocation, than employment uses would. The application site is located on the southern edge of Wittering village and the main vehicle accesses to it involves a long route through the residential streets of the village. The applicant is therefore of the view that despite the employment allocation the residential roads of the route through the village to reach the site are probably more suited to residential traffic associated with new housing development rather than larger commercial vans and traffic likely to be associated with any new employment use, and such traffic would have less impacts in terms of residential amenity.

The Site Allocations DPD (2012) identified 3 allocated rural employment sites each of 1 hectare in size, in Wittering, Eye and Thorney. The emerging plan, Peterborough Local Plan (Further Draft) Dec 2016 requires a total of 95.27 hectares of employment land over the 2011 to 2036 period of which only 1 hectare is needed in the rural area. A site in Eye has been identified to meet this need. Therefore whilst this plan is at an early stage and so carries limited weight, it does seem to indicate that the loss of this rural employment land in this location would not be significant or result in a deficit of rural employment land within the district.

Therefore whilst the loss of this rural employment land allocation is regrettable, this has to be balanced against the benefits of providing more housing on site, e.g. the provision of housing and affordable housing; the provision of open space; the provision of CIL monies, new homes bonus and council tax; the support for existing village facilities; and the construction jobs associated with the development. It is agreed that the housing proposed would provide a more compatible land use for the adjacent housing allocation and that the traffic movements through the village roads would be easier for housing rather than employment uses. Therefore on balance Officers are of the view that the loss of employment land allocation can be accepted in this instance and that the housing development proposed instead of employment uses would be acceptable.

#### **d) Design and layout**

The proposed layout has been amended during the course of the application to address the layout issues of ensuring an acceptable level of residential amenity for new residents e.g. sufficient separation distances between dwellings to secure privacy, to provide rear access to all plots for bin storage and manoeuvrability, to ensure adequate layout of car parking etc. The layout now proposed is considered to be acceptable and provides a satisfactory new residential environment in urban design terms with sufficient levels of residential amenity. This is in accordance with Policies CS16 of the Core Strategy and PP2 and PP4 of the Planning Policies DPD.

The open space provision on site is considered to be acceptable. Two smaller areas of open space are proposed within the housing development, and one larger area to the east of the site, which will contain the proposed drainage ponds and provide a noise buffer zone with the traffic on the A1. Exact details of these proposed open space areas will be secured by planning condition.

The highways issues about the road widths and footpaths within the site have now also been resolved and these will be secured by condition.

The housing type designs are considered to be visually acceptable and add to the character and appearance of residential development within Wittering. A soft landscaped buffer zone has been proposed on the southern boundary of the site, to soften the impact of the built development on the countryside edge of the village. This is welcomed and details of the landscaping proposed and its maintenance and management will be secured by condition.

The density of development proposed is considered to be acceptable for this Village location and on this edge of the settlement location. The 160 dwellings on the land allocated for housing works out at a density of 24 dwellings per hectare. The 190 dwellings on this larger site, including the employment land, is 25 dwellings per hectare. Therefore the increase of 30 extra houses over and above the housing allocation, does not significantly affect the proposed housing density on site, due to the increase in land available to accommodate these additional houses.

The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policies CS16 of the Core Strategy and Policies PP2 and PP4 of the Planning Policies DPD.

## **e) Impact on Neighbours**

The proposed application site is positioned to the south of the existing housing of Wittering. There is considered to be sufficient separation between the proposed and existing housing due to the presence of Parker and Lawrence Road and the associated landscaping strips adjacent to the roads. Further towards the east of the site there are existing car parking areas and landscaping areas which also provide a buffer area to the proposed site. It is therefore not considered that any unacceptable overbearing or overshadowing impact will result for existing residents. The privacy for these neighbouring properties will also not be adversely affected.

There will be a loss of countryside views across this existing agricultural field from some of the adjacent residential properties, but this loss of view is not a material planning consideration that can be taken into consideration. In any case this is an allocated site, therefore its loss for new development has already been accepted.

The construction of the new housing will result in some noise, disturbance and dust for nearby residents. However this is the case for all housing construction sites and will not be any more harmful in this instance. A construction management plan will be secured by condition, to control start and finish times, and have noise and dust mitigation measures in place to minimise as far as possible these impacts. This will also agree the exact construction route to and from the site to minimise as far as practicable impacts on residents.

The principle of approximately 160 houses on this site and its compatibility with surrounding residential sites was established through the site allocation. It is considered that the exact layout of these 160 houses plus the additional 30 houses now proposed would not result in any significant harm for the surrounding residential neighbours.

It is therefore considered that this proposed development will not result in any unacceptable impacts on surrounding residents in planning terms in accordance with Policies CS16 of the Core Strategy and Policy PP3 of the Planning Policies DPD.

## **f) Highways**

Highways England have been consulted on this proposed housing development and do not raise any objection on highway safety grounds, subject to a travel plan being secured.

The supporting text in the Site Allocations DPD states '*Any planning application for the development of site SA6.10 must be accompanied by a Transport Assessment, including a Residential Travel Plan. Subject to the conclusions of that Assessment, it is likely that the development will require improvements to the existing junction of Townsend Road and the A1 Great North Road, unless improvements or a replacement grade-separated junction in accordance with policy SA15.4 have already been implemented. Any improvements required to enable the development to proceed will need to be funded by the developer and the works completed before occupation of the first dwelling, in order to comply with Core Strategy policy CS12. It is possible that improvements to the existing junction will not be sufficient to enable all of the development envisaged for this site. In that case a phased development would be necessary, with later phases relying on the prior provision of the grade-separated junction*'.

The Grade separated junction referred to in the text above, policy SA15.4, is the works to the junction of Wittering and the A1 (the proposed flyover), which falls within the remit of Highways England. It is understood that the Government funding to enable these new junction works has not been secured, therefore presently it is not known if or when these works will occur.

A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan have been submitted in support of this application. These documents both state Highways England (HE) have stated that whilst a nil detriment impact at the A1/Townsend Road junction is the *ideal*, it is acknowledged that the proposed development is unlikely to be capable of delivering a scheme such as the A1 grade separated junction (GSJ), and would only therefore look for a reduction in trips via a Travel Plan, rather than a new fly-over.

Currently the A1/Wittering Townsend junction allows vehicles travelling north along the A1 a left hand turn into the Village and a left only turn movement for traffic leaving the Village. Therefore any vehicles leaving the village at this junction and wishing to go south are required to travel approximately 3km northwards along the A1 to the grade separated junction at Carpenter's Lodge at Stamford, and use this to travel over the A1 and re-join the south bound carriageway. Vehicles arriving into Wittering on the southbound approach are provided with a right turning harbourage, approximately 250 metres in length. Traffic turning right are required to give way to the two northbound lanes of traffic travelling at the national speed limit, and cross when there is a gap in the traffic.

It is acknowledged that access to and from Wittering at the Townsend junction on the A1 is not compliant with today's modern road junction standards and as such does presently pose a degree of highway safety danger for its users. It is acknowledged that the further traffic associated with this development will also have to use this sub-standard access. They too will experience the current highway safety risks associated with the junction and any increased risk to due increased traffic flows. However the Transport Assessment has not managed to identify any other possible highway improvements that could be made to improve the junction safety. It is extremely regrettable that Highways England have been unable to secure the funding for the improved grade separated junction previously proposed but have instead had to give priority to using their limited available funding on other parts of their highway network.

Two new vehicle accesses are proposed into the new development from the existing roads in the village to the north of the site. One new access would be formed off Lawrence Road. The other involves the extension of the existing St Mary's Avenue into the site at the north-east of the site. In highways safety terms it is considered that these proposed accesses into the site would be sufficient and would help to spread traffic flows rather than all the development being served off a single access point.

The scheme has been amended during the course of the application altering the proposed access roads throughout the development to meet the highway safety guidelines in terms of road width etc to provide a safe and accessible housing layout. PCC Highway Officers can now support the proposed housing layout in highway safety terms subject to the imposition of planning conditions.

### Walking

There are good footpath provision throughout Wittering to allow residents to access local services, e.g. school, church, shops etc. New footpaths on either side of the roads will be provided within the development. Therefore walking within Wittering will be encouraged for new residents.

### Cycling

There are no formal cycling routes within the vicinity of the development, however cyclists can make use of the local road network. Wittering and some of the surrounding villages are within the 5km cycle catchment zone, however the Travel Plan recognises that likely commuting destinations outside Wittering are likely to exceed the generally accepted cycling distance thresholds. Therefore there are no cycle route improvements proposed as part of this development. Residents will be provided with Residential Travel Packs, secured through the travel plan when they move into the houses which will provide cycle maps and general cycling information. No formal cycle storage shelters are proposed as part of this planning application but residents will be able to store their bikes securely within their rear gardens.

## Bus

Wittering is served by the Centre bus Service No.19 which travels between Peterborough Queensgate bus station and stops at Wittering's Spar shop and Post Office. This offers a Monday to Saturday hourly bus service between approximately 7am and 5pm, but does not operate on a Sunday.

The IHT's '*Guidelines for Planning for Public Transport in Developments*' (IHT 1999) recommends that the maximum walking distance to bus routes should not exceed 400m. The travel plan identifies the closest bus stops to the site are positioned on Parker Road and Legg Road, which require walking distances of approximately 270 and 310 metres respectively from the proposed eastern site access on Lawrence Road. Taken from the furthest point away from the bus stop, a walking distance of approximately 550 metres is required. Therefore majority of the site (two-thirds) however, lies within 400 metres of the bus stop on Parker Road.

Therefore the scheme does not propose any new bus stops or improvement to existing bus services. Details of bus services to encourage residents to use this as an alternative to the car will be provided in the residents travel packs.

## Car Sharing

The travel plan aims to reduce the single occupancy car use by 10% over 5 years. Encouraging car sharing for longer journeys they believe would help to achieve this.

The travel plan recognised the limitations and effectiveness of a travel plan in a village such as Wittering, where most employment opportunities are located elsewhere. Therefore they consider the 10% reduction in single occupancy cars to be a realistic and achievable target.

## Monitoring

The travel plan will be monitored annually for a period of 5 years to help encourage residents to use more sustainable travel modes to the car where possible, and to encourage car sharing and minimise the number of single occupancy car trips. The effectiveness of the travel plan can be monitored and adapted where necessary over this period.

## Conclusion

There will be additional pressure on this existing A1 substandard access, however Highways England do not raise objection to this on highway safety grounds. They seek to secure a travel plan as a way to help minimise additional traffic pressures on the Wittering A1 junction, and A47 junction. The limitations of travel planning in this Village location is acknowledged in the framework travel plan. Highways England do not presently have the funding to commit to the proposed grade separated junction, flyover, at the A1 Wittering Junction, and cannot commit that it will happen in future. Therefore whilst the highway safety dangers associated with the A1 junction are acknowledged, they exist at present and as such Highway England do not feel they could sustain a refusal of planning permission on highway safety grounds.

## **g) Noise**

A noise assessment was submitted in support of the planning application. It identified that the main noise source was the traffic noise from the A1 to the east of the site, whilst acknowledging the presence of RAF Wittering nearby.

The proposed layout of the site maintains an open space buffer zone along the eastern boundary with the A1 which provides separation between the new dwellings and the A1 traffic of at least 95m.



The design of the building envelope of the new dwellings can incorporate suitable sound insulation to satisfy the requirements of BS8233. External noise level criteria can also be achieved by provision of acoustic fencing in key locations.

The dwellings most exposed to noise will be those along the eastern boundary, facing the A1. New dwellings directly facing these A1 will require enhanced sound insulation measures to protect habitable rooms on the exposed facades. The properties positioned further into the site will experience lower ambient noise levels and will also have the benefit from additional acoustic screening and scattering provided by the other surrounding houses. Therefore, these dwellings will not require enhanced sound insulation measures.

All new housing should be of masonry construction, e.g. external cavity walls with 100mm block-work inner leaf and external 103mm brick leaf with cavity insulation. Roof constructions should be tiled, with ceilings to rooms below comprising a minimum of 1 layer of solid gypsum-based board (total minimum mass per unit area 10kg/m<sup>2</sup>), overlaid with minimum 100mm insulation wool. Any proposed rooms in the roof-space should be designed to have suitable internal linings to achieve the required sound insulation, e.g. equivalent to the external masonry wall.

Habitable rooms the first row in of housing, facing the A1, should be provided with suitable passive acoustic ventilators, such as AAC625HM – Rytons 150mm Acoustic AirCore® with Hit & Miss Ventilator (a minimum performance of 37dB Dn,e,w should provide sufficient sound insulation). Alternatively, a ducted ventilation system (e.g. MEV/MVHR or whole house type) could be implemented. It may also be possible to design a continuous running fan system with no requirement for ventilation openings in window frames or external walls into habitable rooms on building elevations directly exposed to noise sources.

All other houses and types of room not specified above may be provided with standard ventilation systems. All rooms may be provided with standard double glazing systems.

Gardens should be provided with acoustic barriers. A suitable acoustic barrier could be formed by installing a minimum 1.8m high close-boarded fence. Close-boarded acoustic fencing should be constructed of solid, weather-treated timber of minimum 18mm thickness. All joints should be tight-butted with timber cover strips or tongue and groove boards to ensure that there are no air gaps in the structure or between the base of the fence and the ground beneath.

Subject to securing the noise mitigation measures it is considered an acceptable level of residential amenity can be secured for future residents.

## **h) Ecology**

An ecological survey was submitted in support of the application. The survey found the arable field to be of low ecological value.

### **Protected Species**

There was no evidence of badgers, reptiles or bats on the site. A small number of birds were recorded during the survey. The recommendations of the ecology report were therefore that bird and bat boxes should be installed on site to enhance biodiversity. Our Wildlife Officer accepts the findings of the report, and recommends that bird and bat boxes should be secured by way of a planning condition. Whilst it is accepted that there was no evidence of badgers on site, as a precaution, all construction trenches should be covered overnight or a means of escape provided for any badgers or mammals that may become trapped. This should be secured by condition.

## Designated Sites

The application site is located within approximately 600m of West, Abbot's and Lound Wood (SSSI), 1.7km of Bonemills Hollow Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Bedford Purlieus SSSI and National Nature Reserve (NNR), 5km of Barnack Hills and Holes SSSI, Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and NNR, and 6km of Collyweston Great Wood and Easton Hornstocks SSSI and NNNR.

Whilst it is accepted that the proposed development is unlikely to have any direct impact on any designated sites, there is the potential for indirect impacts, particularly through changes in hydrology and increased recreational pressure. Therefore these impacts must be fully assessed and any adverse impacts identified appropriately mitigated.

In terms of potential water related impacts. The West, Abbots and Lound Woods SSSI and Bonemills Hollow SSI national important site are water dependent and therefore potentially at risk from changes in water quantity and quality. Therefore further information to demonstrate that foul water disposal and surface water drainage from the site would not have any adverse effect on the water environment and dependent habitats including the SSSI's is required.

In respect of the potential for impacts through recreational pressure. There are evidence based studies that indicate that the majority of regular visitors to areas of publicly accessible strategic open space originate from within 8km driving distance. Therefore an assessment of the effects of increased recreational pressure on designated sites and identify any mitigation (or financial contribution towards these) to address any impacts.

Currently it is considered that there is insufficient information to rule out the likelihood of significant effects on designated sites, therefore further information has been requested and Members will be receive further information of this in the Update report. However it should be noted that this is an allocated housing site, where the principle of approximately 160 residential dwellings and their associated impacts has already been established. In this context therefore it is unlikely that the additional 30 dwellings, now proposed above the already accepted 160 would render the impacts on surrounding SSSI's significant.

### **i) Archaeology**

An archaeological geophysical survey was submitted in support of the application. It identified 7 positive linear anomalies of possible archaeological origin. These could represent Roman ditches possibly associated with field boundaries or enclosures. It also identified 7 ferrous responses and possible ferrous scatters in the eastern half of the site, which may be evidence of iron smelting. Therefore these positive anomalies should be further investigated and characterised by means of an evaluation by trial trenches targeted on the magnetic responses, namely the linear features and the ferrous sites. Therefore a planning condition is recommended to secure this further archaeological investigation.

Subject to the imposition of this archaeological condition, the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with Policies CS17 of the Core Strategy and Policy PP17 of the Planning Policies DPD.

### **j) Drainage/Flood Risk**

A Flood Risk Assessment and preliminary foul and surface water drainage Strategy was submitted in support of the application. The application site is located within Flood Zone 1, where it is considered that there is a low probability of flooding, e.g. having a less than 1 in 100 annual probability of river or sea flooding. All land uses are considered to be appropriate within this zone.

As part of the submitted flood risk assessment, there is a requirement for incorporation of sustainable urban drainage systems to deal with the surface water drainage and run off from the development site. The drainage strategy proposes the use of soakaways, permeable paving and 2 infiltration ponds located in the open space area.

Our Drainage Officer has raised no objection subject to the imposition of a sustainable drainage scheme condition, to agree the exact design, implementation, maintenance and management arrangements.

Anglian Water and the Environment Agency have both also requested the imposition of a condition in respect of foul drainage to prevent any unacceptable risk of flooding downstream.

Therefore the proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy.

### **k) Community Facilities**

No objections have been received from Education Services in respect of school capacity to serve this allocated site for housing. CIL monies received for this development can be used to provide additional education facilities if needed. The primary school website confirms that the school is quite large with 21 classrooms, two halls and pleasant grounds. It was extended in 2000/2001 to cope with the children returning from Germany as the RAF bases there closed. Unfortunately the families were posted elsewhere so they now have a school built for 600 with approximately 300 children in 12 classes. Therefore it is not considered lack of school capacity could be a reason to resist this development.

There are no existing doctor or dentist facilities within Wittering village with residents having to go to nearby settlements e.g. Wansford, Stamford etc for these facilities. The development proposed is not large enough to be able to afford the provision of doctor or dentist facilities, therefore new residents will also have to travel to nearby settlements for their health care.

The services and facilities within the village were considered when allocating this site for housing development and considered acceptable to sustain this level of housing growth. The additional 30 houses proposed now over and above this indicative 160 dwellings would not change this view.

### **l) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)/S106**

The Council has adopted a CIL Charging Schedule. Peterborough City Council are obliged to collect the CIL from liable parties (usually either developers or landowners). All applications identified as CIL liable will incur a CIL charge. This housing development proposed is CIL liable. The site is located within the high CIL charging zone. If planning permission is granted the Council will issue a CIL liability notice which will detail how much CIL is payable. Once commencement of development takes place a CIL demand notice is issued which details how much CIL monies are due and when they are due to be paid.

30% affordable housing provision is required by Policy CS8. This equates to 57 of the 190 dwellings proposed and this is to be secured by way of a legal agreement.

The on-site open space and play provision will be secured by way of a planning condition to ensure it is retained and managed for the benefits of the residents.

The proposed development is therefore considered to be acceptable and in accordance national and local planning policy.

## 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 majority of the application site is allocated for residential development in the adopted Site Allocations DPD. Therefore the principle of residential on the site therefore has already been established in accordance with Policy SA6.
- The loss of the allocated rural employment land is regrettable, however in this instance it is accepted due to the lack of market interest in bringing forward this use, and due to the benefits and more compatible land use housing would provide.
- No highway objections have been received, and travel planning is proposed to encourage where possible the use of more sustainable non car modes of travel.
- The layout, density and design of the proposed housing development is considered to be acceptable, with no adverse visual impacts on the surrounding area.
- There would be no unacceptable adverse impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring sites, in accordance with Policy PP3 of the Planning Policies DPD.
- Sustainable urban drainage methods are proposed to be secured by condition to ensure adequate drainage of the site can be achieved, in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Core Strategy.
- Subject to ensuring there will be no adverse impact on any surrounding SSSI's, there will be no unacceptable ecological impacts, and biodiversity enhancements will be achieved through planting and bat and bird box provision.

## 7 Recommendation

The Director of Growth and Regeneration recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the signing of a **LEGAL AGREEMENT** and the following conditions:

- C1 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 above ground development shall take place until details all external materials e.g. roof, bricks, windows, doors, external rainwater goods etc, 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, 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).

- C 3 No development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation for trial trenching has been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority in writing. No development shall take place unless in complete accordance with the approved scheme. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full including any post development requirements e.g. archiving and submission of final reports.

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). This is a pre-commencement condition because archaeological investigations will be required to be carried out before development begins.

- C4 The development hereby permitted shall not be begun until details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include: a) Information about the design storm period and intensity, discharge rates and volumes (both pre and post development), temporary storage facilities, means of access for maintenance, the methods employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; b) Flood water exceedance routes, both on and off site; c) A timetable for its implementation, and d) A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a Residents' Management Company or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime. e) Demonstration that it meets the governments national standards once approved, the scheme shall be implemented, retained, managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

- C5 No building works which comprise the erection of a building required to be served by water services shall be undertaken in connection with any phase of the development hereby permitted until full details of a scheme including phasing, for the provision of mains foul sewage infrastructure on and off site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No building shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To prevent flooding, pollution and detriment to public amenity through provision of suitable water infrastructure.

- C6 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place until, in line with the Noise Assessment dated 25<sup>th</sup> June 2013, a scheme of noise mitigation to protect the proposed dwellings and their garden from the A1 traffic noise and achieve the noise levels internally and externally in line with the BS8233, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

This will include confirmation of the masonry and roof construction requirements for the new dwellings in accordance with parts 6.6 and 6.7 of the Noise report. It will also include for the first row of housing on the east closest to the A1 noise source, details of the proposed passive acoustic ventilators or ducted ventilation system for habitable rooms, to ensure these properties can achieve suitable internal ventilation, in accordance with 6.8 of the Noise report.

Details of the locations and type of acoustic fences proposed to protect the gardens closest to the road noise in accordance with 6.11 of the noise report shall be submitted for agreement.

All the noise mitigation measures proposed above should be backed up with the necessary acoustic performance data to ensure that the products proposed will achieve the necessary acoustic performance.

Thereafter the development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details, and maintained as such.

Reason: To ensure acceptable noise levels and levels of residential amenity are achieved, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011). This is a pre commencement condition because the use of appropriate noise mitigation windows and ventilation is vital to achieving acceptable noise levels for residents and preventing abortive works should inappropriate materials be used.

- C7 Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling a scheme of bird and bat boxes including details of their location and design shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This shall include a range of nesting features to cater for Swifts, House Sparrow and Starling. The development shall therefore be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity in accordance with policy CS21 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF.

- C8 All construction trenches shall be covered overnight or a means of escape provided for any badgers or other mammals that may have become trapped.

Reason: In order to avoid harm to protected species and in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

- C9 An ecological management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development. The ecological management plan shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable contained therein and as approved unless changes are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Plan shall include the following details:

- Long term design objectives
- Management responsibilities
- Maintenance schedules

Details of the proposed management company to be set up to maintain all the communal areas of landscaping and open space on site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that these areas are suitably maintained and managed for the lifetime of the development.

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

- C10 20% (38) of the houses shall be constructed to meet Building Regulations Part M (Volume 1) Category 2 (the lifetime home standard). These houses shall be built to these standards, and thereafter maintained as such.

Reason: In order to meet housing need in accordance with Policy CS8 of the adopted Core Strategy.

C11 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).

C12 Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure sufficient facilities for firefighting in accordance with policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD. This is a pre commencement condition as suitable fire hydrant need to be identified and designed into the scheme early for safety reasons and to prevent abortive works on site.

C13 Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling the associated car parking and turning area for that dwellings shown on drawing number 1167/003 Rev N shall be provided. Such provision shall thereafter be retained for the car parking and turning of the dwellings on site and not put to any other use.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy PP12 adopted Planning Policies DPD.

C14 The roads and footways linking each dwelling with the public highway shall be constructed to a minimum of base course level prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which they relate. If houses within a phase are occupied with the road at base course level then a timetable to show when the roads will be completed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The roads shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

Reason: Reason: In the interests of the safety of all users of the public highway in accordance with Policy CS14 of the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C15 Within 1 month prior to the first occupation of any dwelling a detailed travel plan based on the Interim Travel Plan dated May 2017 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The detailed travel plan shall include SMART targets and identify 'soft' measures to encourage the use of non-car modes to travel to and from the site. The Travel Plans shall be in place for the life of the development.

Reason: In the interests of promoting sustainable transport and development in accordance with policy CS14 of the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy.

C16 Notwithstanding the approved plans, no development shall take place above slab level until a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
The scheme shall include details of the following:-

- All hard surfacing materials for roads, footways, public spaces etc
- Details of the proposed LAP (including all equipment) and areas of Public Open space
- Proposed finished ground and building slab levels
- External SUDS features, e.g. permeable paving
- Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting
- An implementation programme (phased developments only)
- Details of any boundary treatments

The approved hard landscaping scheme shall be carried out with regard to the houses to which it relates, prior to the occupation of those house and the soft landscaping shall be carried out within the first available planting season following completion of the development or first occupation (whichever is the sooner) or alternatively in accordance with a timetable for landscape implementation which has been approved as part of the submitted landscape scheme.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and then enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policy CS21 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

- C17 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 Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and Policy PP16 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012).

- C18 A landscape management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development. The management plan shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable contained therein and as approved unless changes are first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The Plan shall include the following details:

- Long term design objectives
- Management responsibilities
- Maintenance schedules

Details also of the proposed management company to be set up to maintain all the communal areas of landscaping and open space on site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that these areas are suitably maintained and managed for the lifetime of the development. All areas of Public Open space, Local Area of Play and communal site landscaping as per plan 1167-003 Rev N shall be provided on site within a timetable to be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority and these areas shall thereafter be retained and maintained for recreational purposes.

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



- C19 (a) No development or other operations shall commence on site until a scheme (herein after called the approved protection scheme) which provides for the retention and protection of trees, shrubs and hedges growing on or adjacent to the site, including trees which are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order currently in force, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; no development or other operations shall take place except in complete accordance with the approved protection scheme;
- (b) No operations shall commence on site in connection with the development hereby approved (including any tree felling, tree pruning, demolition work, soil moving, temporary access construction and/or widening or any operations involving the use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) until the protection works required by the approved protection scheme are in place;
- (c) No excavations for services, storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles, deposit or excavation of soil or rubble, lighting of fires or disposal of liquids shall take place within any area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the approved protection scheme;
- (d) Protective fencing shall be retained intact for the full duration of the development hereby approved, and shall not be removed or repositioned without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority;

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 PP14 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012). This is a pre-commencement condition because the protective fencing must be in place and adequate prior to development commencing to ensure the trees are protected.

- C20 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and details:-

- Site Layout Plan – 1167/003 Rev N
- Location Plan
- House Type 2111 – 2111/A00/DS
- House Type 2404 – 2404/L00/DS
- House Type 2224 – L00/2224/DS
- House Type 2401 – 2401/LOO/DS
- House Type 2409 – 2409/01
- House Type – L00/2224/DS Rev A
- House Type – L00/2306/DS Rev A
- House Type L00/2308/DS
- House Type 2318/DS
- House Type L00/2323/DS
- House Type L00/2324/DS
- House Type 2326/L00/DS/01
- House Type 2326/L00/DS/02
- House Type 2409
- House Type 2410/L00/DS
- House Type - 2421
- House Type - 2423
- House Type – 2427/L00/DS
- House Type - 2509/L00/DS
- Garages Double – L00/GAR/02
- Garages Pair – L00/GAR/03
- Garages Single – L00/GAR/01
- Preliminary Foul and surface water drainage – MA9949/200 Rev A

- Topographical Survey Sheet 1 of 1 – S3428/01
- Tree Constraints Plan – 3764/08/D14-2170 (Overview and plans 1-10)
- Affordable housing and Lifetime Homes plan
- Site Appraisal – GRM/P6180/F.1 – Contamination
- Noise Assessment 1798.1/1 – 25<sup>th</sup> June 2013
- Tree Survey – 14-217/3764/08 v1
- Geophysical survey 69/13
- Protected Species Scoping survey
- Ecological Scoping Survey June 2015 (Expanded Nov 2016)
- Flood Risk Assessment Rev B
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
- Residential Travel Plan – Version 6
- Transport Assessment – Version 7

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.