



Notes of a Meeting of the Local Development Framework Scrutiny Group held on 7 September 2009 in the Forli Room - Town Hall

Members Present: Councillors J R Fox, D Harrington and N Sandford

Officers Present: Peter Heath-Brown, Planning Policy Manager
Steve Winstanley, Team Leader (Policy and Information)
Gemma Wildman, Principal Strategic Planning Officer
Sue Marsh, Principal Planning Officer (Minerals and Waste)
Louise Tyers, Scrutiny Manager

1. Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Ash.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Sandford declared a personal interest as he was an employee of the Woodland Trust who were listed as a consultee.

3. Notes of Meeting held on 15 January 2009

The Group noted the notes of the meeting held on 15 January 2009.

4. Peterborough Core Strategy

Peter Heath-Brown, Planning Policy Manager, gave an update on the purpose of the Peterborough Core Strategy and the next steps in its development.

The Core Strategy included an overall vision and strategic objectives and applied national and regional policy at a local level. The Strategy had to conform to the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Strategy would be for a 15 year period from its adoption, which in Peterborough was expected to be during late 2010/early 2011.

Consultation on the Preferred Options had taken place during May and June 2008 and 878 comments had been received on the Preferred Options. All comments had now been considered and a draft 'Proposed Submission' version was now being recommended.

The key features of the Proposed Submission Version were:

- 25,500 new dwellings (2009 to 2026)
- Emphasis on City Centre, Urban Area, Urban Extension
- 1,100 new dwellings in villages
- Major employment development at Great Haddon and Alwalton Hill (but not Red Brick Farm)
- Regional Freight Interchange at Magna Park
- Affordable housing target reduced to 30%

- A new Environmental Capital policy to replace the draft policy about the resource efficiency of new buildings

The Core Strategy would be considered by the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee on 22 September, Cabinet on 12 October and Council on 2 December. The 'Proposed Submission' version would then be published for 6 weeks during January and February. Adoption by the Council was expected to be in 2011.

The following comments and observations were made:

- Would there be a further opportunity to examine the Planning Policies and Site Allocations documents at a future meeting? *Those two documents had been held back due to the development of the Core Strategy but they would come forward for the Group to consider in the future.*
- It was proposed to reduce the affordable housing target to 30%, what was the regional target for affordable housing? *Across the region it was 35% as a whole and each authority needed to undertake its own needs and viability studies.*
- In the S106 Policy the target was only 25%. *30% was the average target to 2026, however the Council agreed a temporary reduction due to the current economic conditions.*
- Red Brick Farm was not being proposed due to the potential flood risks but the Magna Park site was in a far worse flood area than Red Brick Farm. *A rail freight interchange needed to be next to a rail line and as long as it could be shown that there were no other suitable raiiside sites, then development in the floodrisk area could be justified, however the developer would also have to mitigate the risks.*
- What had happened to the proposed development north of Werrington? *This was not in the Core Strategy.*

Section 4 – Our Objectives

- Objective 19 – adaptation to climate change – should be included in the light of revisions to the Climate Change Strategy. The objective for infrastructure makes no reference to green infrastructure. *The Vision Statement has been changed to include green infrastructure. Officers would look again at possible changes to the wording of the objectives.*

Chapter 5 – The Spatial Strategy, the Scale & Location of Residential Growth

- Were the housing targets unobtainable due to the current economic situation? *That was an argument however the Council was required to show how it would achieve that target. The rate of delivery was dependent on the market and we must have a viable strategy for affordable housing.*

Policy CS10 Renewable Energy

- The guidance from Government was to encourage renewable energy but the changes to CS10 appeared to be adding more qualifications, e.g. aviation operations. *The reference to aviation operations was in relation to wind turbines only. Officers would check the wording to ensure that it is not weakened.*
- Was the protection of RAF operations a planning issue? If it was then it should be included in the planning policies. *Case law was showing that protection of RAF operations was a material consideration but officers thought that this was an issue which may be being dealt with at a national level. It had only been included within the Strategy because of the location of RAF Wittering. Officers would look at how the debate was progressing at a national level.*

Policy CS12 Transport

- It was felt that sustainable transport was not emphasised enough in the Strategy. The use of the Transport User Hierarchy in the Local Transport Plan was not clear within the wording of CS12. *Officers would make reference to the Transport User Hierarchy and would make the link to the LTP more explicit.*

Policy CS18 Open Space and Green Infrastructure

- The Ancient Woodland Policy had been made reference to in objective 20 but why was it not included within policy CS18? *Officers advised that they were encouraged not to repeat policy if it was already national or regional policy.*
- The report is claiming that provision of woodland was not an open space issue but PPG17 defined what open space was. *Officers would look at this again.*

Policy CS20 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

- The Biodiversity Policy was currently being reviewed and looked at landscapes as a whole. *Officers would speak to Brian Armstrong about the review of biodiversity.*
- The third bullet point assumed that all habitats could be compensated for. *If habitats could not be recreated elsewhere we would look to have something else. Officers would speak to Brian Armstrong about the wording.*
- There was no specific reference to agricultural land. Some of the land would not be sustainable in the future and the Council would need to look at whether it wanted to carry on holding this land. *This would be looked at as part of the site allocations and they would also liaise with Property Services about their policy for the agricultural land.*

Policy CS21 Floodrisk

- There was an issue with some householders concreting over drains on their land and this was causing a strain on the drainage systems. *This issue had now been brought under development control.*

5. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents

Steve Winstanley and Sue Marsh gave an update on the production of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals and Waste Documents – Core Strategy DPD, Site Specific Proposals DPD, Location & Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD and RECAP Waste Design Guide SPD.

The Pre-Submission Consultation had taken place during February and March 2009. Submission to the Secretary of State was expected to take place in July 2010 with adoption in June 2011.

There had been a strong response to the consultation with over 13,000 representations throughout Peterborough and Cambridgeshire. The major concerns for the Peterborough area had been the Thornhaugh II proposal but this had not been put forward by the Council and the site proposed for inert waste recycling and inert landfill disposal.

The Development Plan Documents had been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment and each had contributed favourably to shaping the documents.

Minerals

- Sand and Gravel – no change to the proposals as sufficient provision was being made.
- Limestone – the figures had been reviewed and further sites needed to be identified.
- Borrow Pits – there were no borrow pits proposed in Peterborough.
- Mineral Safeguarding Areas – these were now required to be taken into account at the planning stage.

Waste Management

- Importation of Waste from London – the amount of residual waste to be imported from London that we were required to make provision for had not changed since Preferred Options 2.
- New Waste Management Facilities – a number of allocations had been made for built development in Peterborough at Storeys Bar Road, Hampton, Dogsthorpe and West of Peterborough.
- Household Recycling Centres – the Plan identified a need for an additional Household Recycling Centre in Peterborough. It was anticipated that the household recycling centre to serve the southern part of the city might be accommodated at the 'West of Peterborough' site.
- Hazardous Waste – no change from Preferred Options 2.

Habitats Regulation Assessment

As a result of the Habitats Regulation Assessment the site proposal at Dogsthorpe no longer made provision for energy from waste use. The energy from waste proposal at Kings Dyke Brickpits, Whittlesey, would only be acceptable if it could be demonstrated that it led to improvements in air quality and did not lead to an adverse impact on the integrity of the Nene Washes.

The following comments and observations were made:

- Would the Sustainability Appraisal look at the affects on climate change?
- Was there a danger that we would need to continue to import waste to keep the proposed energy from waste facility going? *We were looking to try to introduce something similar to catchment restrictions or tonnage restrictions, as in the current Local Plan, as a way of trying to limit the amount of waste being imported in from other areas.*

6. Any Other Business

There was no other business.

7. Date of Next Meeting

No meeting date was set.

CHAIRMAN
5.30 - 7.15 pm