

Application Ref: 17/02443/REM

Proposal: Reserved matters approval relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the construction of 75 apartments and retail units (A3/A4 restaurant, cafe and public house) with associated parking, manoeuvring and landscaped areas, pursuant to 91/P0556

Site: Tranche TC23, Eagle Way, Hampton Centre, Peterborough

Applicant: O & H Properties Ltd and Hampton Lakeview Ltd

Agent: Mr J S Dadge
Barker Storey Matthews

Referred by: Hampton Parish Council

Reason: The proposal does not provide adequate parking

Site visit: 31.01.2018

Case officer: Mrs J MacLennan

Telephone No. 01733 454438

E-Mail: janet.maclennan@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **Grant** subject to conditions

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

Site and surroundings:

The application site is located within the Hampton Development area, an urban extension which when complete will comprise housing, employment land along with retail, community, education and leisure facilities with associated open space, roads and infrastructure. The majority of the land is brownfield land associated with several former brickworks sites.

The application site is approximately 0.44 ha and is located at the northern end of Serpentine Lake. It is bounded by Braymere Road to the south east, St Edmunds Walk to the north east and Lakeview Way to the north west. The surrounding character is predominantly residential with three storey apartments to the north west and north east, to the south east are four storey apartments in a single block with commercial units on the ground floor. To the west are three storey apartments and three storey houses which are separated by an area of public open space.

The site is approximately 250m from the Hampton District Centre and 60m from a Local Centre to the north east.

The site itself slopes down from St Edmunds Walk to Serpentine Lake and falling approximately 5m from the north east (Braymere Road) to the south west corner next to the Serpentine Lake. The surrounding development also slopes with the topography.

Proposal

The application seeks approval of matters reserved under the outline planning consent ref. 91/P0556 for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. The development comprises the construction of 75 no. apartments, 54 one bed and 21 two bed units in the form of two blocks and an A3/A4 restaurant, café and public house with 712m² of internal floor space. The application is a re-submission of a former approved scheme.

Block A would have 40 units over 5 floors and Block B would have 35 units. The 2 apartment blocks are located at the west and east ends of the site and arranged on a north/south axis. The 2 apartment blocks are both 5 storeys in height with the fifth floor (roof) set in from the building envelope, however the fall in levels across the site means that Block B (west) sits approx. 4m lower than Block A (east).

Block A also has a 2 level restaurant/café below it in the form of a podium block which provides a lower mass in the centre of the site. The café/restaurant would have a glazed lakeside frontage, with a café at the lower/boardwalk level and restaurant on the floor above. This element also includes an external balcony/seating area for customers.

The scheme includes a terraced garden area in the heart of the site providing a seating area with views over the lake.

A boardwalk and pathways that link across the site from east to west.

Car parking for both the apartments and staff parking for the café/restaurant would be located towards the rear of the site and partly below the rear sections of Blocks A and B. A total of 105 parking spaces would be provided; one parking space for the one bed apartments and two spaces for the two bed apartments, including 2 no disabled parking spaces and 9 staff parking spaces for the commercial unit.

The application currently under consideration is a revision to a former approved scheme (ref. 17/00152/FUL) which was determined under delegated powers. The former scheme proposed 62 no. units in the form of 29 one bed and 33 two bed units. There are minor changes to the external appearance of the apartments as a result of the increase in the number of one bed units although the buildings remain the same in relation to their overall form, scale and size.

The car parking has been reconfigured from the original scheme in order to meet the requirements for the increase in one bed units; some of which would be located outside the building along St Edmunds Walk, however still within the demise of the site. One additional parking space has been provided under the revised scheme.

The current scheme also proposes an electricity sub-station to the north east (St Edmunds Walk).

Subsequent to the approval of the original scheme a non-material amendment application was approved (ref. 17/01777/NONMAT). The changes approved were minor including the reduction to the number of balconies and alteration in their design and the use of alternative materials.

Revisions have also been made to this application following receipt of amended plans; these changes are very minor and include the addition of a fire exit for the commercial unit, addition of ventilation grills to the car park and commercial unit, the addition of an access and lobby to the commercial unit (south- east elevation), pairing of the parking spaces for the 2-bed units, change in layout to the cycle/bin store. The most noticeable change is the re-orientation of the roof, however this would not result in an increase to the roof height. Due to the non-material nature of the changes a further re-consultation has not been undertaken.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
17/00152/REM	Reserved matters approval relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the construction of 62 apartments and retail units (A3/A4 restaurant, cafe and public house) with associated parking, manoeuvring and landscaped areas, pursuant to 91/P0556	Permitted	30/06/2017
17/01777/NONMAT	Non-Material Amendment (Design Change and Materials) of planning permission 17/00152/REM	Determined	06/10/2017

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 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 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.

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.

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 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.

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.

PP19 - Habitats and Species of Principal Importance

Permission will not be granted for development which would cause demonstrable harm to a habitat or species unless the need for, and benefits of it, outweigh the harm. Development likely to have an impact should include measures to maintain and, if possible, enhance the status of the habitat or species.

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (Submission)

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 Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan took place in January and February 2018. The Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State on 26 March 2018 who will appoint a Planning Inspector to examine the Local Plan to establish whether it is 'sound', taking all the representations into consideration.

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in an emerging plan according to:-

- the stage of the Plan (the more advanced the plan, the more weight which can be given)
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the policies
- the degree of consistency between emerging policies and the framework.

The policies can be used alongside adopted policies in the decision making process, especially where the plan contains new policies. The amount of weight to be given to the emerging plan policies is a matter for the decision maker. At this final stage the weight to be given to the emerging plan is more substantial than at the earlier stages although the 'starting point' for decision making remains the adopted Local Plan.

LP02 - The Settle Hierarchy and the Countryside

The location/scale of new development should accord with the settlement hierarchy. Proposals within village envelopes will be supported in principle, subject to them being of an appropriate scale. Development in the open countryside will be permitted only where key criteria are met.

LP03 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

Provision will be made for an additional 21,315 dwellings from April 2016 to March 2036 in the urban area, strategic areas/allocations.

LP13 - Transport

LP13a) New development should ensure that appropriate provision is made for the transport needs that it will create including reducing the need to travel by car, prioritisation of bus use, improved walking and cycling routes and facilities.

LP13b) The Transport Implications of Development- Permission will only be granted where appropriate provision has been made for safe access for all user groups and subject to appropriate mitigation.

LP13c) Parking Standards- permission will only be granted if appropriate parking provision for all modes of transport is made in accordance with standards.

LP13d) City Centre- All proposal must demonstrate that careful consideration has been given to prioritising pedestrian access, to improving access for those with mobility issues, to encouraging cyclists and to reducing the need for vehicles to access the area.

LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm

Development proposals would contribute positively to the character and distinctiveness of the area. They should make effective and efficient use of land and buildings, be durable and flexible, use appropriate high quality materials, maximise pedestrian permeability and legibility, improve the public realm, address vulnerability to crime, and be accessible to all.

LP28 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Part 1: Designated Site

International Sites- The highest level of protection will be afforded to these sites. Proposals which would have an adverse impact on the integrity of such areas and which cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where there are no suitable alternatives, overriding public interest and subject to appropriate compensation.

National Sites- Proposals within or outside a SSSI likely to have an adverse effect will not normally be permitted unless the benefits outweigh the adverse impacts.

Local Sites- Development likely to have an adverse effect will only be permitted where the need and benefits outweigh the loss.

Habitats and Species of Principal Importance- Development proposals will be considered in the context of the duty to promote and protect species and habitats. Development which would have an adverse impact will only be permitted where the need and benefit clearly outweigh the impact. Appropriate mitigation or compensation will be required.

Part 2: Habitats and Geodiversity in Development

All proposals should conserve and enhance avoiding a negative impact on biodiversity and geodiversity.

Part 3: Mitigation of Potential Adverse Impacts of Development

Development should avoid adverse impact as the first principle. Where such impacts are unavoidable they must be adequately and appropriately mitigated. Compensation will be required as a last resort.

LP17 - Amenity Provision

LP17a) Part A Amenity of Existing Occupiers- 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.

LP17b) Part B Amenity of Future Occupiers- Proposals for new residential development should be designed and located to ensure that they provide for the needs of the future residents.

LP28 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Part 1: Designated Site

International Sites- The highest level of protection will be afforded to these sites. Proposals which would have an adverse impact on the integrity of such areas and which cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where there are no suitable alternatives, overriding public interest and subject to appropriate compensation.

National Sites- Proposals within or outside a SSSI likely to have an adverse effect will not normally be permitted unless the benefits outweigh the adverse impacts.

Local Sites- Development likely to have an adverse effect will only be permitted where the need and benefits outweigh the loss.

Habitats and Species of Principal Importance- Development proposals will be considered in the context of the duty to promote and protect species and habitats. Development which would have an adverse impact will only be permitted where the need and benefit clearly outweigh the impact. Appropriate mitigation or compensation will be required.

Part 2: Habitats and Geodiversity in Development

All proposals should conserve and enhance avoiding a negative impact on biodiversity and geodiversity.

Part 3: Mitigation of Potential Adverse Impacts of Development

Development should avoid adverse impact as the first principle. Where such impacts are unavoidable they must be adequately and appropriately mitigated. Compensation will be required as a last resort.

LP29 - Trees and Woodland

Proposals should be prepared based upon the overriding principle that existing tree and woodland cover is maintained. Opportunities for expanding woodland should be actively considered.

Proposals which would result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland and or the loss of veteran trees will be refused unless there are exceptional benefits which outweigh the loss. Where a proposal would result in the loss or deterioration of a tree covered by a Tree Preservation Order permission will be refused unless there is no net loss of amenity value or the need for and benefits of the development outweigh the loss. Where appropriate mitigation planting will be required.

LP32 - Flood and Water Management

Proposals should adopt a sequential approach to flood risk management in line with the NPPF and council's Flood and Water Management SPD.. Sustainable drainage systems should be used where appropriate. Development proposals should also protect the water environment.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010

Paragraphs 203-205 of the National Planning Policy Framework: Planning Conditions and Obligations:

Requests for planning obligations whether CIL is in place or not, are only lawful where they meet the following tests:-

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In addition obligations should be:

- (i) relevant to planning;
- (ii) reasonable in all other respects.

Planning permissions may not be bought or sold. Unacceptable development cannot be permitted because of benefits/inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Neither can obligations be used purely as a means of securing for the local community a share in the profits of development.

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC S106 Planning Obligations Officer - The proposal is not CIL Liabe and the S106 requirements were determined in relation to 91/P0556 with subsequent variations and modifications to the original Agreement.

Archaeological Officer - No objections. The proposed reserved matters have no archaeological implications.

Building Control Manager - Building regulations approval is required.

PCC Pollution Team - No objections. All ventilation of steam and cooking fumes to the atmosphere should be suitably filtered to avoid nuisance from smell, grease or smoke to persons in neighbouring or nearby properties. Details of the nature and location of such filtration equipment shall be secured by condition.

The section recommends that before the development commences a scheme should be agreed which specifies the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from the site. These provisions could include physical and/or administrative measures. In the absence of Sound Power Levels and frequency spectrum information for plant, background noise levels and operating hours the following noise limits are recommended.

In addition a scheme should be agreed for protecting the proposed residential development from noise from the A3/A4 use has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority; all works which form part of the scheme should be completed before any part of the noise sensitive development is occupied.

The potential for disturbance upon local residents during unsociable hours requires consideration. Restriction of access to external areas by clientele after 23:00 is recommended. It is suggested that any application for extended hours is given temporary permission to be able to establish that operations can be conducted without unacceptable impact.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services - Previous discussions and principles have been agreed by the LHA with regard to the Transport Statement through the application 17/00152/REM and through the revised submitted Transport Statement for this application the LHA are content that they have been modified to form an acceptable application.

The proposed parking layout has been modified from the previous application to include a new parking area in a basement area adjacent to the commercial unit. Track was requested to demonstrate that cars can park in these parking spaces. Tracking has been provided and this is acceptable.

Residential parking bays 1-13 are accessed off St Edmunds Walk, which would not be suitable for the residents as they would have to park their vehicle in its allocated space and then walk nearly 70m around the secure enclosed car park just to get in the residential block. This in turn may encourage on street parking nearer to the entrance to the buildings. These 13 spaces should be in groups of no more than 4 parking bays with a 2.7m gap between the groups of 4 parking bays.

Although the LHA would have preferred the residents parking bays 1 – 13 not to be accessed directly off St Edmunds Walk this is not of sufficient merit for the Local Highways Authority to object to this application. The spacing between the blocks of 4 parking spaces has been amended.

A suitable amount of residential and commercial allocated parking has been provided by the applicant to accord with Peterborough City Council DPD PP13. The applicant through surveys of the surrounding 'on street unallocated parking provision' has demonstrated an amount of parking availability that could be used by users of the commercial units.

Although the applicant has not complied with the cycle parking provision as detailed within with DPD PP13 the LHA appreciate that the applicant has provided a significant amount of secure residential and public cycle parking and therefore is content that the amount of parking is acceptable.

PCC Strategic Housing - Affordable housing element has been secured elsewhere. No further comments.

PCC Wildlife Officer – No objection - No ecological assessment appears to have been submitted as part of this application, however the Officer is aware that adequate surveys were carried out in relation to planning ref. 17/00152/REM.

The Officer is satisfied that there was no evidence of water voles found during the recent survey and that no further action is required in this respect.

The water body and surrounding habitats are likely to be used by bats for foraging purposes. The Officer raises concern that the proposed lighting scheme described as "feature lighting" designed to illuminate the lake may negatively impact bats. The lighting scheme should be revised to achieve a reduction/ minimise light spillage over the lake. Full lighting details including LUX levels should be provided by the applicant which would be acceptable via a suitably worded condition.

The lake edge vegetation was found to support nesting birds. A standard bird nesting information is recommended. To mitigate for the loss of nesting habitat, a range of nesting boxes should be installed. The details could be secured by condition.

Lead Local Drainage Authority – No objection – Recommends a condition requiring the details of the surface water management system.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) – No objections. Crime in the area over the last 6 months are moderate to high. The proposed layout and design should mitigate against crime and disorder. The Officer would welcome discussion regarding vulnerable areas i.e. car park, access control, post, delivery, cycle storage etc. Would welcome a secured by design application.

Anglian Water Services Ltd – No objections. The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Flag Fen Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse.

The planning application includes employment/commercial use. To discharge trade effluent from trade premises to a public sewer vested in Anglian Water requires our consent.

The Wildlife Trusts (Cambridgeshire) - No comments received

Hampton Parish Council – Objects to the proposal. At the Full Council meeting, all members of Hampton Parish Council voted unanimously to object to this planning application and ask that this be called in under the premise that this application does not offer adequate parking.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 572
Total number of responses: 18
Total number of objections: 16
Total number in support: 2

16 no letters of objection have been received raising the following issues:

Accessibility

- The designers are still totally ignoring disability accessibility - briefly mentioned in the new revised document
- None of the apartments seem to be to at least BS Part M4 (2) standard, there is a national shortage of wheelchair accessible accommodation
- Wheelchair Access to ALL of the site has not been designed in, lots of steps without access, that does not involve long detours.

Highway implications

- The level of parking is completely inadequate.
- Concern regarding increase in apartments with no extra parking
- The new parking spaces created on St Edmunds walk are quite often full up and along Lakeview Way....where are all visitors to the retail/restaurant going to park
- I have allocated parking at the rear of my house and my neighbours and I have had to put signage up because people use our spaces.
- Parking is already an issue in Hampton from previous poor planning so don't compound the situation.
- There is a large care home opposite the site where there are ambulances almost daily outside. If parking becomes like the flats at Hampton Vale shops there will be problems for emergency vehicles.
- There are already plans for restaurants and expansion to the rear of Tescos on Silver Hill so again parking MUST take into account those plans that are already going ahead.
- St Edmunds Walk has opened up as a thorough road and is barely wide enough for one car let alone another 75
- The road is used by hundreds of children and families going to school and the extra traffic will cause concern to safety
- The extra traffic will have an adverse effect on air quality
- The roads are already unable to cope with the amount of traffic

Residential Amenity

- St Edmunds Court is misnamed as St Edmunds House, just exemplifies the contempt this developer holds for the elderly residents of its neighbouring development.
- When will we find out whether the restricted hours of construction will be accepted as per document submitted previously.
- Concern about the rise in noise levels the café/restaurant/pub will bring to the area
- The disruption to the elderly surely must be taken into account with any licensed establishment that is built on the site.
- The shops and public house will be right next to a sheltered scheme for the elderly
- There is already a new pub/restaurant not far from Tesco and the lake and they have already had numerous issues however lakeside development would be right amongst residents and the elderly.
- The area is quiet and peaceful and ideal for residents many who are disabled
- The development will block out light
- There will be an increase in anti-social behaviour and littering.
- The pub is inappropriate for this location
- The height of the building blocking the houses on St Edmunds Walk, Braymere and Silver Hill.
- Overlooking our gardens.
- The view Residents on St Edmunds Walk and Lakeside will suffer the largest impact but Braymere and Silver Hill will also lose out.
- The building works will cause disruption, noise etc,
- A public house surrounded by residents with young families is not acceptable
- The new plans seem to be higher opposite my house than on the original plans
- Disturbance of late opening hours and early morning deliveries

Visual Amenity

- The proposed 7 storey buildings are total out of keeping with the current attractive look of the lake.
- There are other places to build these blocks of flats instead of spoiling the end of the lake.
- I am very surprised that the Council intends to approve this building.
- The main objection is the scale of the development
- The size of the development will dwarf surrounding development
- Over development of the site
- It will have a detrimental effect on the beautiful environment
- I'm not opposed to any development opposite the lake but they should be in keeping with the lake and not ruining it. Single storey buildings at most, landscaping, something that will benefit the elderly.
- Why are we trying to cram everything into this small space that is already established when there are vast tracts of land and possibilities to get planning and parking right at Hampton Gardens/Leys?
- The lake is a very peaceful area and this will be totally spoilt by the development suggested.
- I would only support purely housing with enough car parking spaces.
- Where would landscaping come into this project
- The site would make an ideal park
- O&H have made the rest of the Serpentine Lake very attractive with landscaped gardens, trees, benches etc. It is one the nicest spots in Hampton.

Wildlife

- There is no mention of the pair of red kites that are in the area and the many geese which continue to use the area
- Newts, swans and ducks will be pushed out of their natural habitat creating issues for local residents
- This development will have a detrimental effect on our wonderful wildlife and the extra pollution from more vehicles, more people, more rubbish will also not help.
- There is no mention to protected species and there are Great Crested Newts in the lake

- Due to the gradient of the land the lake could become contaminated due to spillages
- I would like to see a comprehensive plan to prevent spillages

Misc

- The scale of the building will cause subsidence to the surrounding development
- I am opposed to the building of an electrical substation opposite the front of my home.
- My mother has had cancer and I do not believe this would be good for her health – could increase the risk of medical problems
- The plans could devalue our house
- Despite the level of objection to the former scheme it was approved
- where on earth is the extra supporting structure for an accessible health centre to sustain the already over stretched population....hundreds of houses have been added since I moved here in 2007 and not one expansion in the medical centre
- There are retail units in Braymere and the surrounding roads and none have been let
- We do not need anymore coffee shops
- The infrastructure for this type of development is not possible
- There is a large shopping development within 2 minute walk and 4 pubs and numerous eating facilities
- Money grabbing idea with no thought for people living nearby
- Not clear at all what has been amended in this update to the application. Applicant and council needs to be more open and honest re changes to this application as it is going to detrimentally affect the lives of its neighbours many of whom are already sick and elderly.

2 letters have been received supporting the application

- I am a Hampton resident and approve of the plan.
- The retail units will provide more jobs to residents and more housing for young people.
- Hampton residents have never been supported with pubs and restaurants
- The land has been an eyesore for 15 years
- More development is needed including the area behind the Rotunda and area to the north of Hampton Avenue, hotel, cinema etc.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The Principle of Development

The site is located within the Hampton Urban Extension area, which is an allocated site. Outline planning permission was granted in 1993 for the development of a township to include approximately 5,200 houses together with community, education, social, industrial and commercial areas and associated open spaces, roads and service infrastructure (ref. 91/P0556 and 91/0815).

Conditions 1 and 3 of the outline permission require the submission of a development brief covering the respective areas of development. A Development Brief covering the site and surrounding area, known as the Hampton Centre (TC23) was approved by the Local Planning Authority in 2013. The Development Brief therefore provides guidance against which the proposal is assessed.

The Development Brief identifies Hampton Centre as the civic and commercial heart of Hampton where the delivery of a suitable mix of local land uses that animate the built form and generate a sense of vitality and activity within the public realm are to be encouraged and supported.

Residential development forms a significant proportion of the land use within the Hampton Centre. The development brief identified allowable land uses for TC23. An indicative quantum of development for the site was for residential development of 60 dph (22 dwellings) and an opportunity for A3/A4 uses. It was envisaged that these uses would provide a landmark development consistent with the surrounding character of Hampton Centre.

A scheme has recently been approved for 62 apartments (17/00152/FUL) and therefore the principle of development has been established. As with the former approved scheme the number of residential units proposed is significantly higher than the indicative number given in the development brief however the principle of the mixed use residential and commercial development is consistent with the development brief and is acceptable subject to meeting the requirements of other relevant planning policies and material considerations. The only issue for consideration therefore is whether the amendments/alterations made to this scheme are acceptable.

A number of comments have been made regarding the provision of more commercial units. The scheme would provide a restaurant, café and public house and it is considered this will complement the nearby Local Centre as well as enhancing the experience of the lakeside edge. This type of development was envisaged for the site.

The site is not currently accessible to the public and the proposal would provide a permeable and accessible development which would be available to the local community. The boardwalk and seating areas will encourage activity around the lakeside.

In terms of housing, whilst it is accepted that the number of units would increase to that of the former scheme providing more one bed units, the proposal would meet existing housing demand and would go some way to meeting the housing delivery targets for the city.

Design and Visual Amenity

The Development Brief envisaged a development that would address and enclose the street and one which would have active frontages. The development on the eastern side of Braymere Road is also a mixed development with commercial units at ground floor and the development would complement this adding to the existing townscape.

The height of Block A would be 19m however this is comparable to the development in Braymere Road. The buildings follow the topography of the site providing varied building heights that step down in height from east to west. The 2 apartment blocks are both 5 storeys in height with the fifth floor set back on the roof of both blocks, but the fall in levels across the site means that Block B (west) sits approx. 4m lower than Block A (east). There is no change to the roof height to that approved under the original application. Block A also has the 2 level restaurant/café below it in the form of a podium block which provides a lower mass in the centre of the site. A roof garden over the restaurant serving Block A was proposed under the former scheme; however this has been removed under the current application and would now be a Sedum roof.

The buildings would be in two blocks to the west and east of the site which would retain views of the lake from properties in St Edmunds walk, also reducing the bulk and mass of the development.

The development would have a contemporary design and would provide a landmark development providing a focal point and is of a scale and design which complement the nearby local centre as well as the existing surrounding development within the Hampton Centre area.

The café/restaurant/public house unit would have substantial glazing to the lakeside and the restaurant includes an external balcony/seating area for customers and there is a terraced garden at the heart of the site. This scheme does not fundamentally change the external appearance of the development and therefore remains acceptable.

The proposal would provide a modern attractive development which would respect the surrounding character. The proposal therefore accords with policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy and Policy PP2 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Neighbouring Amenity

The site is situated between existing residential development to the west, north and east and as with the former scheme, there have been a number of objections from neighbouring properties.

Block A would provide a corner turn building to the east of the site and would enclose the street. The separation distances to the development on Braymere Road would be at least 22m and the separation distances to properties in St Edmunds Walk would be 23m. The relationship between the proposed development and the existing development would be 'street to street' where the level of amenity afforded to occupiers is less compared with a 'back to back' relationship where the level of amenity in term is overlooking and loss of privacy is given greater consideration. It is considered that given the context of the location and the density for the Hampton Centre the relationship with existing residential properties is considered to be acceptable. The separation distances have not changed from the original approval and therefore remains acceptable.

Block B would be positioned to the west to the site. The west elevation would overlook Lakeview Way and an area of open space. There would be no direct views towards dwellings in Lakeview Way.

A number of concerns have been raised regarding the noise implications during the construction period and in particular the impact on the occupiers of the nearby St Edmunds Court extra care facility. It has been stated that the noise from piling has a significant impact on people suffering from, for example, dementia. Construction work is a noisy activity however the impact on neighbouring properties would be managed as far as is practically possible. A Construction Management Plan would be secured by condition and this will include hours of operation (piling), hours of deliveries and temporary facilities for the parking of vehicles etc. to prevent lorries, cars idling near residential properties.

The above concerns were raised under the original scheme and it is acknowledged that there has been significant construction taking place within the area and the disturbance this activity causes to existing residential development. However, Hampton is a new Township where development has been ongoing and therefore residents should expect a certain degree of disturbance when moving to development areas.

There is also concerns regarding the A3/A4 use in terms of noise and disturbance. As with the previously approved scheme the opening hours will be agreed prior to the occupation of this unit along with measures that would be put in place to ensure noise is kept to a reasonable level.

It is not considered that the proposal would unduly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and hence the proposal accords with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD and policy CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Residential Amenity

The development would provide a good level of amenity for the future occupiers. Many of the apartments would have balcony. It is unfortunate that the roof garden for Block A has been removed from this scheme, however, this change is not considered to make the proposal unacceptable.

All rooms would be served by natural lighting. Access to the apartments would also be provided by a lift.

As with the original scheme there is at least 21m separation distance between block A and block B which is acceptable in terms of amenity.

As this is a mixed use development a scheme shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority indicating how the residents of the development would be protected from noise emanating from the A3/A4 use.

Each apartment would have car parking provision; most would be located within the footprint of the building and entrance to these parking areas would be gated.

Secure cycle parking for 80 cycles would be provided within the building. In order to comply with policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, 96 secure parking spaces would be required however it is considered that the applicant has provided a significant amount of secure residential and public cycle parking and therefore is content that the amount of parking is acceptable.

Refuse bins will also be provided close to the respective Blocks.

As with the original scheme it is considered that the development would provide a good level of amenity for the future occupiers and hence the proposal accords with policy PP4 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Highway Implications

Under the former approved scheme it was acknowledged that the site did not benefit by being in a particularly sustainable location which would justify a reduced amount of residential parking, due to the frequency of passenger transport services every 20 minutes.

The location of this site is not any more sustainable in terms of trips from residences to work than any other part of Hampton. It is acknowledged that there are existing problems where car parking has been provided at a ratio of 1.5 spaces per dwelling. Therefore the issues would be the same if this development were to provide insufficient parking.

Parking has been provided in accordance with the parking standards under policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. 54 no spaces for one bed apartments and 42 no for the two bed apartments, as proposed. In order to accommodate the parking a reconfiguration is proposed. The parking has been provided by using the topography of the site and the use of basement parking. The additional number of one bed apartments has required some of the parking to be outside the footprint of the building; still within the site area. The parking for the 2 bed flats can be accommodated by providing tandem parking bays however, this layout is not possible for one bed flats, where each parking space needs to be accessible. There is insufficient space under the buildings to provide for all the one bed flats, hence the 13 no. spaces along St Edmunds Walk which would be accessed from the street.

The scheme originally proposed did not provide the required spacing between the blocks of four bay parking spaces; this has now been amended and is acceptable to the Highways Officer.

It is noted that a number of objections have been received regarding the parking provision particularly as there are now more units with only one extra parking space provided. However the one bed units only required one parking space whereas the two bed units required two parking spaces. Therefore the parking can be accommodated in accordance with policy PP13. As such the application could not be resisted on this basis.

As with the former approved scheme, it is proposed that visitor and customer parking would be provided by the on street parking bays. In accordance with the parking standards under policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD the commercial element would require 47 parking spaces to be provided. However in acknowledging the local context and the site proximity to the District and Local Centre and the immediate residential character it is considered that the location is sustainable in that the likely customer base would primarily be local to the site. Therefore it is considered that there would be capacity on the street for customer and visitor parking. There are a number of on-street parking spaces. The spaces are to be available for use by the development on each block as visitor parking and are not allocated parking spaces and therefore will be capable of being shared by different uses throughout the day.

The scheme provides 9 on site parking spaces for staff. This has not changed from the former approved scheme, as such the application could not be resisted on this basis.

A condition was appended to the original scheme requiring the A3/A4 unit to be occupied by one operator due to the lack of parking provision for the commercial use. This condition would be appended to the decision notice, if approved.

80 secure cycle parking spaces would be provided for the residents and staff for the commercial unit. In addition 11 cycle stands would be provided for visitors around the external areas. The cycle parking provision is slightly lower than the former approved scheme, however an adequate amount of covered parking spaces would be provided.

The applicant has demonstrated on drg. no. 104 through Track Plot that various car park spaces are accessible by cars. A delivery bay has been provided along St Edmonds Walk to service the commercial units.

Separate commercial and residential refuse bins are provided.

A footway is provided to the east of the site adjacent to Braymere Road. This will provide pedestrian access to Block A apartments and to the ground floor commercial unit.

The boundary treatment fronting St. Edmunds Walk will be a mixture of fencing/trelliswork to allow climbing plants to screen the parking area while maintaining security of the car park areas. The vehicle access to both car park areas is from Lakeview Way on the western side of the site.

It is considered that the proposal would provide appropriate levels of parking and would not result in any adverse impact on the adjacent public highway. Hence the proposal accords with policies PP12 and PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Accessibility

Disabled access to the commercial unit is provided off the footway to the east of the site and also to the Boardwalk from the west of the site from Lakeview Way.

Accessibility to the apartments is provided by a lift. A lift will also be provided within the commercial unit to ensure disability access is available from the restaurant to the boardwalk.

Building regulations approval would be required which will cover part M – accessibility. In terms of ‘lifetime’ homes and ‘wheelchair housing’ this provision is met within other areas of the Hampton township development

The proposal would be accessible for people with disabilities and therefore accords with policies CS14 and CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Wildlife implications

The original scheme was supported with an Ecology Survey. The Wildlife Officer is content that adequate surveys were carried out and these do not need to be repeated for this application.

The survey concluded that there was no evidence of water voles using the lake and that no assessment is required.

There was evidence of breeding birds with Coot *Fulica atra* with a family and Reed Warbler *Acrocephalus scirpaceus* probable breeding. Mute Swan *Cygnus olor* was also recorded using the lake, but no evidence of breeding was recorded.

The report proposed recommendations to minimise the impact on breeding birds including any works should be carried out outside of the bird nesting season unless a qualified ecologists has inspected the site.

The Wildlife Officer agrees with the conclusion of the report, however, the officer considers that the water body and surrounding habitats are likely to be used by bats for foraging purposes, there is concern regarding the “feature lighting” designed to illuminate the lake and lighting should be reduced to minimise light spillage over the lake. This is considered to be a reasonable concern. A lighting scheme shall be secured by condition.

In addition and to mitigate for the loss of nesting habitat, the officer requests that a range of nesting boxes are installed that cater for a number of different species such as House Sparrow, Starling & Swift, as well as bat roosting features. These details shall be secured by condition.

As with the original scheme it is considered that the amended proposal would not adversely impact on the biodiversity of the lake and surrounding area and the proposal accords with policies PP16 and PP19 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Landscaping

A landscaping plan supports the application. The main landscaped area would be the terrace. The proposed plants include a mixture of grasses and bamboo which will link the outside space to the Lake with its grassy banks.

It is considered that the landscaping detail would enhance the visual quality of the development as well as providing for the biodiversity of the site and nearby lake and accords with CS21 of Peterborough Core Strategy and Policy PP16 of Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

Flood Risk and Drainage

A Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Strategy supports the application. The site lies within flood risk zone 1 as defined on the Environment Agency Flood Risk Maps.

The main attenuation feature to be used for surface water from the site is the adjacent Serpentine Lake which has been designed to serve both the site and wider Hampton development area.

A Sustainable Urban Drainage system will be used within the site for surface water drainage. Permeable paving will be used on all vehicular access and parking areas along with pedestrian access areas through the development and the promenade area. Permeable paving is a SuDS technique that is appropriate for the development as it provides for flood reduction due to attenuation in the base as well as a pollution reduction benefit due to the filtration of water as it passes through the permeable surfacing.

There are also other options for the site including the Sedum roof, utilisation of grassed areas and grey water harvesting. The final drainage strategy for the site would be secured by condition.

Foul drainage from the development will be to manhole 6706 in St Edmunds Walk by gravity connection, which Anglian Water have confirmed has capacity to accept gravity flows from the proposed development.

As with the original scheme, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in flood risk outside of the site or for the future occupants of the development. Hence the proposal accords with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

Miscellaneous issues not covered above raised through representations

- The scale of the building will cause subsidence to the surrounding development – *Officer Response: The development is not dissimilar to surrounding development and the suitability of the foundations would be covered under the building regulations.*
- I am opposed to the building of an electrical substation opposite the front of my home. My mother has had cancer and I do not believe this would be good for her health – could increase the risk of medical problems. *Officer Response: This is not a material planning consideration. Sub-stations are a common feature of residential development.*

- The plans could devalue our house. *Officer Response: This is not a material planning consideration.*
- Despite the level of objection to the former scheme it was approved. *Officer Response: Despite the level of objection the application was approved because in planning terms it was acceptable.*
- Where on earth is the extra supporting structure for an accessible health centre to sustain the already over stretched population....hundreds of houses have been added since I moved here in 2007 and not one expansion in the medical centre. *Officer Response: It is accepted that more dwellings put pressure on services including medical services, however this has to be balanced with the need for additional housing development. The lack of medical services and the numbers of patients is a national problem.*
- The infrastructure for this type of development is not possible. *Officer Response: The scheme is supported with a Transport Statement which has demonstrated that the proposal would not result in any adverse highway implications. The site is located on an estate road which has been built to adoptable standards and capable serving the development.*
- Money grabbing idea with no thought for people living nearby. *Officer Response: The amenity of neighbouring occupiers is a material planning consideration and has been assessed as part the process of determining the application.*

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 site lies within the Hampton Development area where outline planning permission has been granted for the township development and a Development Brief has been approved
- This is a revised scheme to that previously approved. The principle of development is therefore acceptable
- The proposal would provide a modern, attractive landmark development which would respect the surrounding character
- The proposal would not unduly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and measures will be agreed with the developer to minimise any noise implications resulting from the construction
- The proposal would provide a satisfactory level of accommodation for the further occupiers of the development
- The proposal would provide appropriate parking provision for residents and staff and it is not considered that the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the adjacent highway
- The development would be assessable
- The proposal would not impact on the biodiversity of the lake and the landscaping would enhance the visual amenity of the area
- The proposal would not result in flood risk outside of the site or for the future occupants of the development.

Hence the proposal accords with policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12, PP13, PP16 and PP19 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, policies CS1 CS2, CS14, CS16, CS21 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD, policy SA1 of the Adopted Peterborough Site Allocations DPD and sections 6, 7 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7 Recommendation

The case officer recommends that Reserved Matters is approved subject to the following conditions:

- C 1 No development other than groundwork's and foundations shall take place until details of the materials 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. Samples of the materials shall be made available on site for inspection. 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 2 Before the building is occupied, visibility splays shall be provided on both sides of the vehicle access(es) from the car park and shall be maintained thereafter free from any obstruction over a height of 600mm within an area of 2.0m x 2.0m measured from and along respectively the back edge of the edge of the highway boundary; and before the building is occupied, visibility splays shall be provided on both sides of the staff parking bays shall be maintained thereafter free from any obstruction over a height of 600mm within an area of 1.5m x 1.5m measured from and along respectively the back edge of the edge of the highway boundary.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policies CS14 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and PP12 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C 3 The parking spaces detailed on the approved plans shall be provided prior to the development being brought into use and shall thereafter be retained for the purpose of parking in association with the approved development.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policies CS14 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and PP12 and PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C 4 Notwithstanding the approved plans details of the proposed cycle stands shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site for bicycles to be parked in accordance with the approved details, and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of cycles.

Reason: In order to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, Policies CS14 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and PP12 and PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C 5 Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include amongst other matters:

- a noise management plan including a scheme for the monitoring of construction noise;
- a scheme for the control of dust arising from building and site works;
- a scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for construction vehicles including contingency
- measures should these facilities become in-operative and a scheme for the cleaning of affected public highways;
- a scheme of working hours for construction and other site works including piling;
- a scheme for construction access from the Parkway system, including measures to ensure that all construction vehicles can enter the site immediately upon arrival, adequate space within the site to enable vehicles to load and unload clear of the public highway and details of any haul routes across the site;
- a scheme for parking of contractors vehicles;

- a scheme for access and deliveries including hours.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies CS14 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and PP12 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition as these details will need to be agreed prior to works commencing.

- C 6 No development shall take place until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan for the surface water drainage of the site using sustainable drainage methods has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved drainage design prior to any of the development being brought into use.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into the development in accordance with policy CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition as the details will need to be agreed prior to works commencing.

- C7 All ventilation of steam and cooking fumes to the atmosphere should be suitably filtered to avoid nuisance from smell, grease or smoke to persons in neighbouring or nearby properties. Details of the nature and location of such filtration equipment should be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before installation and should be installed before the use of the premises commences.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C8 Prior to the first occupation of the A3/A4 use hereby permitted a scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which specifies the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from the A3/A4 use. The provisions could include physical and/or administrative measures. The development thereafter, shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and any physical measures implemented prior to the A3/A4 unit being brought in to use.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

- C9 Prior to the first occupancy of the apartments a scheme for protecting the proposed residential development from noise from the A3/A4 use shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. All works which form part of the scheme should be completed before any part of the residential element is occupied and thereafter retained.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policy DPD.

- C10 Prior to any installation of lighting, full lighting details including LUX levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of protecting biodiversity as the surrounding habitats are likely to be used by bats; and in accordance with policy CS21 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD and policy PP19 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C11 No development other than groundworks or foundations shall take place until a scheme of nesting boxes to cater for a number of different species such as House Sparrow, Starling & Swift, as well as bat roosting features shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details such as numbers, designs and locations. The approved boxes shall be installed prior to the occupation of any part of the development.

Reason: To enhance the biodiversity of the site and in accordance with policies PP16 and of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C12 Notwithstanding the approved plans the A3/A4 commercial unit hereby approved shall be occupied by one operator and the unit shall not be subdivided.

Reason: To ensure adequate parking can be provided in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy PP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C13 Prior to the A3/A4 unit being brought into use details of the opening hours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be thereafter be operated in accordance with the approved opening times.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with policy PP3 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD.

C14 Notwithstanding the plans hereby approved details of the means of accessibility from the commercial unit, by lift or other means, shall be provided prior to the commercial unit being brought into use and thereafter retained.

Reason: To ensure the site is accessible for all users and in accordance with policies CS14 and CS16 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD.

C15 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Location Plan drg. no. AL0101 Rev P01
- Proposed site plan drg. no. AL0501 Rev P12
- Proposed site plan basement level drg. no. AL0500 P11
- Block A elevation 01 SE drg. no. AB0801 Rev P05
- Block A elevation 02 SW drg. no. AB0802 P05
- Block A elevation 03 NW drg. no. AB0803 Rev P05
- Block A elevation 04 NE drg. no. AB0804 Rev P05
- Block A basement plan drg. no. AB0201 Rev P04
- Block A ground floor plan drg. no. AB0202 Rev P04
- Block A 1st floor drg. no. AB0203 Rev P04
- Block A 2nd floor drg. no. AB0204 Rev P03
- Block A 3rd floor drg. no. AB0205 Rev P03
- Block A 4th floor drg. no. AB0206 Rev P03
- Block A 5th floor drg. no. AB0207 Rev P04
- Block A roof plan drg. no. AB0601 Rev P03
- Block B elevation 01 SE drg. no. AB0851 Rev P04
- Block B elevation 02 SW drg. No. AB0852 Rev P04
- Block B elevation 03 NW drg. no. AB0853 P04
- Block B elevation 04 NE drg. no. AB0854 Rev P05
- Block B basement plan drg. no. AB0251 Rev P04
- Block B ground floor drg. no. AB0252 Rev P04
- Block B 1st floor drg. no. AB0253 Rev P03
- Block B 2nd floor drg. no. AB0254 Rev P03
- Block B 3rd floor drg. no. AB0255 Rev P03
- Block B 4th floor plan drg. no. AB0256 Rev P03

- Block B roof plan drg. no. AB0651 Rev P03
- Proposed street scene drg. no. AB0875 Rev P04
- Site Sections A & B drg. no. AL0701 Rev P02
- Site Sections C & D drg. no. AL0702 Rev P02
- Site Sections E & F drg. no. AL0703 Rev P02
- Site Sections G & H drg. no. AL0704 Rev P02
- Vehicle tracking drg. no. 104
- Landscaping plan sheet 1 of 2 drg. no. 001D
- Landscape Sheet 2 of 2 drg. no. 002

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

Copies to: Cllrs: Howard Fuller, Janet Goodwin and Irene Walsh

This page is intentionally left blank