

## PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 12 JUNE 2018 AT 1.30PM

1. Procedure for Speaking
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak
3. Briefing Update

**UPDATE REPORT &  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**



## **PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL**

### **PUBLIC SPEAKING SCHEME - PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

#### **Procedural Notes**

1. Planning Officer to introduce application.
2. Chairman to invite Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives to present their case.
3. Members' questions to Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives.
4. Chairman to invite objector(s) to present their case.
5. Members' questions to objectors.
6. Chairman to invite applicants, agent or any supporters to present their case.
7. Members' questions to applicants, agent or any supporters.
8. Officers to comment, if necessary, on any matters raised during stages 2 to 7 above.
9. Members to debate application and seek advice from Officers where appropriate.
10. Members to reach decision.

**The total time for speeches from Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives shall not exceed ten minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.**

**MPs will be permitted to address Committee when they have been asked to represent their constituents. The total time allowed for speeches for MPs will not be more than five minutes unless the Committee decide on the day of the meeting to extend the time allowed due to unusual or exceptional circumstances.**

**The total time for speeches in respect of each of the following groups of speakers shall not exceed five minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.**

1. Objectors.
2. Applicant or agent or supporters.



**PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 12 JUNE 2018 AT 1.30PM**  
**LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Ward Councillor / Parish Councillor / Objector / Applicant</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>18/00251/R3FUL - Recreation Ground Thorpe Lea Road Peterborough</b>	Alan Dowson  Jill Murdoch, Harry Machin, Joan King (Thorpe Gate Residents Association)	Objector  Objector
<b>5.2</b>	<b>17/00823/FUL - Former Parcel Force Site, Maskew Avenue, New England, Peterborough</b>	Mary Davidson	Agent
<b>5.3</b>	<b>18/00108/OUT - Land To The Rear Of Thorpe Wood House Thorpe Wood Peterborough</b>	David Turnock	Agent
<b>5.5</b>	<b>09/01368/OUT - Land To The North Of Norman Cross London Road Peterborough</b>	Peter Frampton	Applicant/Agent



## BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 12 June 2018

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	18/00251/R3FUL	<b>Recreation Ground Thorpe Lea Road Peterborough .</b> Creation of a sports pitch and running track, a mobile classroom, changing facilities and WCs including perimeter fence and associated soft landscaping

### Additional/revised consultee comments

#### **PCC Wildlife Officer (24.05.18)**

No objections - Further to comments previously made, aware that the Council now intends to utilise the area of open space to the west of the application site (currently managed as an un-mown biodiversity area) as a more formal playing field. Whilst disappointing, this land is currently of limited value to protected species (as per the ecology report). Nevertheless, recommend that the area of land located to the east of the application site is instead managed for biodiversity by the Council, by reducing the frequency of grass cutting at this location to offset the loss of taller vegetation to the west.

***Officer response:** The decision to revert the open space to the west as grassed recreation space does not form part of the current application proposal. A condition may only be imposed whereby it relates directly to the development. As this test is not met, Officers are of the view that the recommendation of the Wildlife Officer cannot be secured by condition as part of this application.*

#### **Sport England (29.05.18)**

No objection to the amendments - Recommendation remains one of support as per the original response dated 29 March 2018 (as set out in the main Committee Report).

#### **PCC Pollution Control Officer (11.06.18)**

No objections - The conclusions and recommendations of the submitted Ground Investigation Report are noted and accepted. It is noted that there is a recommendation that further monitoring is recommended to understand the gas regime. Any buildings on site will require consideration in the context of potential impacts from ground gas.

***Officer response:** As no permanent buildings are being proposed as part of the current proposal, ground gas monitoring is not required at this time.*

### Additional objections

5no. further objections have been received from local residents as follows:

#### **Mr R King**

I do not support the application to create a sport's area at the Recreation Ground above [Thorpe Lea Road]. My reasons are:

1. Peterborough City currently has an increasing population and hence the Council should be seeking to increase the 'open space' area for common use rather than reducing it.
2. The West Town Academy and its predecessor has access to a large playing field and facilities adjacent to Angus Court. There is no need for the public to give up their use of their Recreation Ground elsewhere.

3. Access from school to Angus Court is easier and safer than across the Thorpe main road. There have been deaths in this area in recent years. It is very dangerous.
4. Rough sleepers frequent the trees and bushes surrounding this field and the Council staff and Police do not [have] enough resources to cope with associated problems. This could be detrimental to young children.

### **Dr Jill Murdoch**

This is a statement from the **Thorpe Gate Residents' Association**, representing and summarising the views of those residents who have approached us to express an opinion.

We have to start by saying that a number of our residents approved the use of the Thorpe Lea Road recreation ground by the school.

However we have to also reflect the fact that the great majority of the high number of residents who have approached us is opposed to the loss of the recreation ground amenity as it currently is, as well as opposed to this proposed appropriation of public land for private use.

The grounds for opposition are summarised below in terms of standard Material Planning Considerations.

#### 1. Agreed Council strategies, policies and plans

Under 6.18 of the Proposed Submission for the Local Plan (January 2018), 6.18.2 states 'Planning permission will only be granted for development proposals in the designated LGS in very special circumstances. These circumstances are set out in the NPPF and Align with Green Belt status.' 6.18.1 explains that 'Local Green Space (LGS) is a national designated, as defined in the NPPF, which aims to protect green areas or spaces which are demonstrably special to the local community and hold a particular significance. LGS designation can be used where the green space is:

- In reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; and
- Local in character and not an extensive tract of land; and
- Demonstrably special to a local community and holds particular local significance, for example, because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including playing fields, tranquility or richness of its wildlife.'

Policy LP23 states that

'Existing non-designated open spaces will, in principle, be protected from development. New development that will result in the loss of existing open space will not be supported, unless the criteria in the NPPF are met.

In addition, if the requirements of the NPPF can be satisfied, the proposal must demonstrate that:

- a) The open space does not make an important contribution to the green infrastructure network or connectivity of habitats, and the development would not result in landscape or habitat fragmentation or incremental loss; and
- b) The proposed development can be accommodated on the open space without causing significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, ecology of any heritage assets.'

Many local residents, and the Residents' Association Committee, do not feel that a case of 'very special circumstances' for the development has been established. The land in question is clearly in 'very close proximity to the community it serves' and holds local significance for its recreational value as well as for the expansive open views including of the distant Cathedral.

As an existing non-designated open space, the land should be protected from development. It clearly cannot be 'accommodated on the open space without causing significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area' which any such proposal 'must' be able to demonstrate.



## 2. Size, siting and external appearance of buildings

The siting of the proposed school playing field appears to be selected to create maximum impact on the local residents. It will be alongside the path across the green space, totally cutting off views of the residual space beyond and eliminated the open aspect of the area including the dramatic distant views of the Cathedral. A siting at the very far end of the selected field, or even in the originally planned location (2 years ago?) on the opposite field would, in some ways, be preferable but would not eliminate all the other objections.

The size of the surrounding fence - proposed at 2.4 metres - and sited immediately adjacent to the path will be oppressive and overwhelming to anyone walking past and will emphasis the blocking of views as mentioned above.

It is impossible to comment on the external design of buildings as the current proposal includes only a temporary structure to serve as the pavilion. We can only guess at what any future permanent requirement might be. It is illegitimate for local consent to be sought when it is not known what the final outcome may be. This is a matter of great concern.

## 3. Impact on the neighbourhood and character and amenity of the area

Paragraphs 6.18.4 and 6.18.5 of the Proposed Submission for the Local Plan state:

‘In addition to the open space designations identified on the Policies Map, there are numerous existing open spaces across Peterborough that are valued locally and contribute to the quality of life of communities living in the area.

Although not identified on the Policies Map, these open spaces perform an important role in terms of visual amenity, sport, recreation and play, and community use. Examples include informal parkland and amenity open space...NPPF paragraph 74 clearly states that open space should not be built on unless strict tests are met. The Council will protect all of these open spaces from development unless the particular circumstances set out in the policy apply.’

The impact in terms of loss of open space and of recreational space is as mentioned above. This area very definitely ‘contributes to the quality of life of communities living in the area’ precisely as a ‘visual amenity’ as well as for ‘sport, recreation and play, and community use’.

The character of the area as a relaxed place for families to picnic, footballers and volleyballers etc. to practice or hold competitions, for dog walkers to thor balls, golfers to practice their swing etc. would be irrevocably lost. Despite some comments to the contrary, the field is well used for all of these activities, especially on summer evenings and at weekends. The residual piece of field left at the back of the proposed structures would be invisible to casual passers-by and would be very much less attractive to use.

## 4. Impact on the amenities of adjoining properties

Adjoining properties - largely a set of 2 storey flats - would lose the open view that may well have attracted purchasers and tenants in the first place. The very high fence, however surrounded by bushes it may be, would close off their open aspect. Additionally, there would inevitably be a level of noise intrusion that is concerning many residents.

## 5. Effect on traffic, road access, etc.

While the scholl insists that there will be no traffic or parking issues (in a zone of residential parking only), it is hard to believe that this would be adhered to and this is causing significant concerns. On a school sports day, for example, parents would be unlikely to leave their cars at the school as it has been suggested they would. Other reasons for increased traffic can easily be imagined. This would have a major impact on the quiet, relatively traffic-free neighbourhood and could potentially increase dangers for local children and others, perhaps especially in Thorpe Lea Road.

## 6. Loss of public view

This has been referred to above and includes the loss of the openness of view, the loss of view of the Cathedral and the loss of the view of people playing sports: passers-by often stop for a few minutes to watch if a football match is taking place etc. This is an issue for walkers passing through the field and the loss of the open view from the adjoining properties is noted above (in section 4).

## 7. Appropriateness of proposed land use

It does not seem appropriate to convert a significant part of a public recreation area into a private playing field that would remain unused for a large part of the time, yet would not be available for other schools, clubs or local people to use. Without absolute essential need, it cannot be acceptable to appropriate public land for private use in this way.

Many residents have expressed great concern over the fact that the children have to cross over a very busy main road (Thorpe Road) in order to gain access to the proposed field. For primary children, this is especially worrying. Traffic lights at a crossing point have been installed, but they will not eliminate all dangers. The school will also need a high number of adult supervisors for every trip. The children will then have to navigate Thorpe Lea Road which has cars parked along its length which creates a major potential traffic hazard to even the best disciplined of children.

An especially disquieting aspect of the proposed location, given its use by young children, is the prevalence of drug use and rough sleeping along the river bank and in the general area. A couple of weeks ago a stash of 5 used and exposed needles was found in the edge of the trees just on the corner of the site. It is the fear of many local residents not only that children could come into contact with the detritus of drug use, but also that the fenced site would attract more such behaviour.

All of the above are particularly unacceptable in this case, given that essential need has not been established: the school already has access to an excellent playing field in Angus Grove which has pavilion and toilet facilities attached. The distance from the new school to Angus Grove is 2km on quiet back roads, avoiding the main crossing, and a reasonable distance to expect older children to walk and easily covered by a minibus for the smaller children. The site requires some maintenance as it has not been looked after recently but that would be far cheaper than the taxpayers' money earmarked to be spent on the construction of any new field and serviced pavilion.

This fact is compounded by the fact that the school is built on the corner of a huge site of empty land and an area immediately adjacent to it (that is still empty) could very easily have been allocated in the original plans for a playing field; a pavilion and toilets would not even have been necessary with the school to hand. Poor planning by the COuncil is not a good reason for public land to be lost to the local community and this makes the proposal yet more unacceptable to many local residents.

In this context, the 'strict tests' referred to in paragraph 6.81.5 of the Local PPlan, that might have justified loss of this public open space, have clearly not been met.

### **Mr M Murphy**

Hopefully this will be an improvement on the 'shambles' concerning the Co-Op shop along Thorpe Road which had no support whatsoever from local residents at the meeting but went through anyway... indeed the Co-Op were confident of success they began building it before the meeting even took place!! I wonder why!!

### **Daisy O'Rawe**

On behalf of the children of Thorpe Lea Road, I am writing to you to address the situation of the proposed development on the Thorpe Lea Road recreation grounds.

Parks and recreation grounds are essential to our well-being, there are studies that show parks increase people positivity, they help children learn and promote health, both mental and physical. Many children have spent their whole lives on Thorpe Lea Road and the recreation grounds are a part of our lives, we have spent many hours there throughout the year, from playing football, rounders, cricket and many more games, having picnics and walking dogs in the summer to building snowmen, having snowball fights and going for winter walks in the winter. If the proposed development goes ahead, the recreation ground will lose the magic of the memories that have been made there and will become merely another development site.

The recreation ground has helped us come together as a community and has allowed us to get to know our neighbours and has created a happy, healthy and safe environment for us to grow up in. Studies show that recreational grounds and parks create neighbourhoods with less violence and more support and protection from each other. If you take away our recreational grounds then wouldn't you be taking away our happy, healthy, safe environment. Many children cannot have a park, and therefore a healthy lifestyle, because of where they live - many don't have a safe area to play in, while others don't have room for a park - these children become unhealthy and detached from the outside world, this could lead to mental issues and depression as well as loneliness and physical problems. We are not one of these communities but, without our recreational grounds, we could become one.

If our recreational grounds are developed, not only will it limit our use, it will cause many more problems: it will make our street noisy and messy due to the number of children that would pass through to get to the grounds, it could encourage graffiti on and around the area, including our street, many people would feel less secure also if the recreation ground is used as a school field, many parents may be encouraged to park there on sports days or dropping their kids off at school, this will create unwanted noise, mess and accidents on our usually safe street. The development will cause many more problems for us than just losing our field.

Also, the school also have a field close to them. Why should they need ours if they already have one? There's no reason why they shouldn't develop their existing field that they have had for years and rarely used instead of taking away our recreation grounds, which are in constant use by the local children.

Or perhaps there could be an alternative option, for example; maybe the school could use the area around the building in a more effective way, for instance, staggering breaks between the years, in order to have fewer people on the playground at a time? Or perhaps the recreation ground could be used by the school children but left undeveloped, so that the public may still use it? As I said before, the recreation grounds are an important part of our lives and developing it, and therefore restricting our access to it, would take away that part of our lives.

I hope that you will reconsider the development of our recreation grounds. I have attached a video and a copy of signatures of the children of Thorpe Lea Road that want to keep the fields.

***N.B. This objection was accompanied by a petition from 19no. Children from Thorpe Lea Road and a video from a child who lives within the local area. Owing to safeguarding issues, these cannot be presented to Members.***

### **Mr G Rowley**

My property backs onto the field which is being developed as a sports field for the school and while accepting of this change of use we did request that the trees and shrubs bordering the field be tidied up/trimmed as part of the exercise.

2.	17/00823/FUL	<b>Former Parcel Force Site Maskew Avenue New England Peterborough</b> , Construction of 7 x A1 (non-food bulky goods) retail units (total 16,027 sq m GIA), 2 x A3 (restaurant/cafe) units (total 557 sq m GIA), car parking, servicing, new vehicle access and off-site highway improvements
----	--------------	--

No Further Comments

3.	18/00108/OUT	<b>Land To The Rear Of Thorpe Wood House Thorpe Wood Peterborough</b> , Residential Care Home with access, appearance, layout and scale secured and landscaping reserved
----	--------------	--

The agent has provided more information regarding car parking provision.

At this stage the exact number of staff is unknown, as such it is estimated that there will be approximately 25 full time equivalent staff on site in a day. However, due to staff shift patterns it is estimated that there will be approximately 18 full time equivalent staff on site at any one time. These figures have been used to calculate the car parking provision as outlined in Section 4.4 of the TA, and summarised below:

- 1 space per full time equivalent staff
- 18 full time equivalent staff on site in a day
- 18 car parking spaces provided
- 1 visitor space per 3 beds
- 100 beds
- 33 car parking spaces provided

A total of  $18 + 33 = 51$  car parking spaces (including 3 disabled parking spaces) will be provided as part of the proposed care home, which conforms to the car parking standards for Peterborough as outlined in Table 4.1 of the TA.

Officer response: As stated in the Committee report the parking standards for C2 uses are maximum standards and the provision is considered to be acceptable.

Conditions: The following conditions have been amended for clarity and a contamination condition (C19) has been added.

- C5 The submission of the reserved matter for landscaping shall include a scheme for hard and soft landscaping. The scheme shall include details of the following:-
- Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting. The planting scheme shall include varieties of native, tree, shrub and plant species.
  - An implementation programme
  - Details of the hard surfacing materials
  - Landscape Management Plan
  - Details of the access path and link to the cycle/footway to the south from Thorpe Wood to Nene Park
  - Boundary treatments including the design, height, location and finish.

The approved hard landscaping scheme shall be carried out as part of the development and shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the development 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.

Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme 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 visual amenity and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policy CS21 of the adopted Core Strategy and policy PP16 of the adopted Planning Policies DPD.

C6 No development shall take place on the site until an arboricultural protection scheme has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The arboricultural protection scheme shall be in accordance with BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design demolition and construction - Recommendations methodology standards'. The protection scheme shall include:

- Location and specification of protective tree measures in addition to appropriate ground protection within the Root Protection Areas of all retained trees within the site;
- Details of facilitation pruning;
- Location for access, material storage, site office, mixing of cement, welfare facilities etc.;
- Specification of landscaping prescriptions (including fencing/walls and changes in soil level) within the Root Protection Area of retained trees;
- Details of signage to be erected within the tree protection areas.

The approved scheme shall be implemented in full, strictly in accordance with the agreed details/plans before the development commences and shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the demolition/construction of the development.

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 it is necessary to demonstrate up front that the existing trees on the site can be adequately protected throughout the development phase.

C12 Prior to the commencement of development a scheme for surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the following:

- Full and up to date drainage details such as, but not limited to;
  - An amended sustainable drainage strategy
  - Details of the proposed outfall
  - Amended storage requirements and locations
  - Construction details of all drainage assets
  - Up to date maintenance strategy
  - Exceedance routes
- The discharge rate to be kept at 3 l/s/ha for the whole site.
- Confirmation of;
  - A drainage strategy and landscaping strategy that can both be delivered onsite without conflicts
  - Where swales are to be included on site
  - Information on how surface water runoff from the site will be cleaned/treated
  - Boundary treatment used between the development and adjacent watercourse that allows access for maintenance to be retained.

The approved drainage scheme shall thereafter be implemented on site in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding on and off site, to improve and protect water quality in accordance with Policy CS22 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. This is a pre-commencement condition because it is necessary to demonstrate that the development will not increase the risk of on or off site flooding before works commence.

- C13 No development shall commence on site until details of existing and proposed site levels, including finished floor levels of the building, together with its associated garden area, hereby approved, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall also include the levels of the adjoining land and any building within 15m of the boundary with the application site where access is reasonably possible. The development shall thereafter be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011). This is a pre-commencement condition as these details need to be approved prior to works commencing on site.

- C15 Prior to the commencement of the development a construction management plan (CMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP shall include:
- Haul routes to and from the site.
  - The location of parking, turning, loading and unloading areas for construction vehicles.
  - The location of storage compounds and welfare facilities.
  - Wheel washing facilities capable of cleaning the wheels and underside of the chassis.
  - Location of any temporary access points.
  - Construction delivery times
  - Details for the protection of badger and other small mammals.

The information in the construction plan shall be adhered to throughout the entire construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy PP12 adopted Planning Policies DPD. This is a pre-commencement condition because it is necessary to demonstrate that the development can be constructed without resulting in a detrimental impact on the adjacent highway, Thorpe Wood.

- C16 Prior to the first occupation of the development the area shown for the purposes of parking/turning on drawing number AL0102 Rev F08 shall be provided. Such provision shall thereafter be retained for this purpose and not put to any other use.

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

- C19 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).

C20 The development shall be implemented in accordance with the following approved plans/details:

- Location Plan drg. no. AL0103\_P02
- Site Layout Plan drg. no. AL0102 F08
- Overall Site Layout drg. no. AL0202 F07
- Main building elevations drg. no. AB0801 P01
- East Wing elevations drg. no. AB0802 P01
- West Wing elevations drg. no. AB0803 P01
- Ground Floor Plan drg. no. AB0206 P01
- First Floor Plan drg. no. AB0207 P01
- Second Floor Plan drg. no. AB0208 P01
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

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

4.	18/00503/FUL	<p><b>62 Bamber Street Millfield Peterborough PE1 2HN.</b>            Change of use from public open space to private garden and construction of 2m wall on two sides and creating an opening to rear</p>
----	--------------	---

No Further Comments

5.	09/01368/OUT	<p><b>Land To The North Of Norman Cross London Road Peterborough</b> Development of an urban extension comprising up to 5350 residential dwellings, a district centre (with up to 9200 square metres (99031 sq.ft) retail floor space) and two neighbourhood centres (with up to 2300 square metres (24758 sq.ft) retail floor space) comprising district/neighbourhood retail (A1-A5), community and health (C2, D1), leisure(D2), residential (C3) and commercial (B1) uses. Provision for education facilities (sites for three primary and one secondary school), sports and recreational facilities, a range of strategic open spaces including new landscaping, woodland and allotments, and cemetery provision. Associated highway infrastructure (including pedestrian, bridleway and cycle routes), public transport infrastructure and car parking for all uses. Utilities and renewable energy infrastructure; foul and surface water drainage networks (including SuDS and lakes)</p>
----	--------------	---

No Further Comments

This page is intentionally left blank