

Application Ref: 19/01244/OUT

Proposal: Outline application for the erection of up to 100 dwellings, following demolition of existing buildings, with all matters reserved except for access, together with associated public open space, highways and drainage infrastructure works

Site: Gloucester Centre, Morpeth Close, Orton Longueville, Peterborough

Applicant: C/O Agent
Homes England

Agent: Mr Paul Rowland
Savills (UK) Ltd

Site visit: 13th September 2019 and 4th November 2020

Case officer: Mrs J MacLennan

Telephone No. 01733 4501733 454438

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

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

Site and surroundings:

The site is approximately 3.23 hectares, is relatively flat and rectangular in shape and contains the Gloucester Centre; a site comprising a number of former health/hospital buildings and associated parking areas. There are existing trees scattered throughout the site.

The site is predominantly surrounded by residential land use, to the north-west is Edenfield, to the north Caldervale, to the north east is Thornleigh Drive comprising mainly two storey dwellings. To the east is Basil Green and Morpeth Close which are mainly bungalow/chalet bungalow developments. Wainmain Road industrial estate lies to the south-east. To the west there is existing hedgerow and trees which bound the Nene Parkway/A1260, beyond which are estates of detached and semi-detached residential properties.

The site is accessed off Morpeth Close, a residential estate road leading from a residential development to the north east of the site. There is also a further access to the south east through Wainman Road industrial development. The Wellingtonia Cycleway runs adjacent to the south-eastern and western boundary, passing below Nene parkway and leading to residential development beyond. Pedestrian access is possible off the Caldervale residential estate.

There is a red brick substation located in the south-eastern corner of site, adjacent to Morpeth Close.

Proposal

The application seeks outline consent for the erection of up to 100 dwellings with details of access to be approved and all other matters relating to the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved to a later stage.

30% of the dwellings would be affordable.

The indicative plan submitted indicates the following house types:

Private	No. of units	Affordable	No. of units
Detached units	20		
Semi detached/terraced	43	Semi detached/terraced	9
Coach House	1	Coach House	3
Apartments	6	Apartments	18

It is stated that the development would provide a mix of house sizes from 1 bed to 4 bed dwellings, which would be predominately 2 storey.

Access would be provided by an existing access to the Gloucester Centre from Morpeth Close. The access to Wainman Road would be closed.

The development would provide an area of 0.77 hectares of on-site Public Open Space.

The existing buildings within the site are to be demolished.

An amended layout plan and updated information on Trees, Flood Risk/Drainage and Bat Report have been received since the original application was submitted. A re-consultation has been undertaken on these revised details.

In summary, the indicative mix of house types has changed increasing the number of detached dwellings, the introduction of coach houses and apartments provided in 4 smaller blocks.

In addition, one drainage attenuation basin is now proposed to the south west of the site.

It is acknowledged that there was a problem with the City Council Portal system during the second consultation period. This resulted in a duplication of representations which have now been deleted. A few comments were initially not published on the portal however, this has now been rectified.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
20/00282/FUL	Proposed construction of Bat Barn and erection of bat boxes on telegraph poles	Permitted	01/05/2020
20/00411/PRIOR	Phased demolition of all buildings within the site	Prior Approval Permitted	16/06/2020

3 Planning Policy

Decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan policies below, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Paragraph 47 - Determination of Applications

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Paragraph 108 - Transport Impacts

Any significant impacts from development on the transport network (capacity and congestion) or on highway safety should be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. Development should only be prevented or refused on highway safety grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impact on the road network would be severe.

Paragraph 117 - Making Effective Use of Land

Exception to Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. The presumption does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment because of its potential impact on a habitat site is being planned or determined.

Paragraph 175 - Habitats and Biodiversity

Permission should be refused if significant harm to biodiversity would result which cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or as a last resort compensated for. Development on land within or outside of a Site of Special Scientific Interest and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it should not normally be permitted. The only exception is if the benefits clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features for which it is designated and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Development resulting in the loss of or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional circumstances and suitable compensation strategy exists.

Paragraph 175 - Biodiversity Enhancement

Development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported. Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged.

Paragraph 180 - Pollution

New development should be appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment. In doing so they should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life, identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and limit the impact of light pollution from artificial lighting on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019)

LP01 - Sustainable Development and Creation of the UK's Environment Capital

The council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework. It will seek to approve development wherever possible and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area and in turn helps Peterborough create the UK's Environment Capital.

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.

LP08 - Meeting Housing Needs

LP8a) Housing Mix/Affordable Housing - Promotes a mix of housing, the provision of 30% affordable on sites of 15 or more dwellings, housing for older people, the provision of housing to meet the needs of the most vulnerable, and dwellings with higher access standards

LP8b) Rural Exception Sites- Development for affordable housing outside of but adjacent to village envelopes maybe accepted provided that it needs an identified need which cannot be met in the village, is supported locally and there are no fundamental constraints to delivery or harm arising.

LP8c) Homes for Permanent Caravan Dwellers/Park Homes- Permission will be granted for permanent residential caravans (mobile homes) on sites which would be acceptable for permanent dwellings.

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.

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.

LP19 - The Historic Environment

Development should protect, conserve and enhance where appropriate the local character and distinctiveness of the area particularly in areas of high heritage value.

Unless it is explicitly demonstrated that a proposal meets the tests of the NPPF permission will only be granted for development affecting a designated heritage asset where the impact would not lead to substantial loss or harm. Where a proposal would result in less than substantial harm this harm will be weighed against the public benefit.

Proposals which fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a designated heritage asset will not be supported.

LP21 - New Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

LP12 Part A New Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Facilities- Residential schemes of 15 or more dwellings will be required to make appropriate provision for new or enhanced open space, sports and recreation facilities in accordance with the standards. The council's first preference is for on site provision.

LP21 Part B: Indoor Sports and Recreation Facilities- All residential development below 500 dwellings will contribute to the provision of 'off site' strategic indoor sports and recreation facilities by way of CIL. For sites of 500 dwellings more a S106 Planning Obligation will be sort.

LP21 Part C Designated Sites- Mitigation of Recreational Impacts of Development- Where development has the potential to have a significant adverse effect on the integrity of a designated international or national site for nature conservation as a result of recreation pressure, the development maybe require to provide open space of sufficient size, type and quality over and above the standards to mitigate that pressure.

LP23 - Local Green Space, Protected Green Space and Existing Open Space

Local Green Space will be protected in line with the NPPF. Development will only be permitted if in addition to the requirements of the NPPF there would be no significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding areas, ecology and heritage assets.

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, over riding 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.

LP31 - Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

Development proposals will be considered more favourably where they include measures to reduce energy demand and consumption, incorporate sustainable materials, incorporate decentralised or renewable energy or carbon off setting. Proposals for non wind renewable energy will be considered taking account of the impact of the landscape including heritage assets, amenity, highways and aviation. Wind proposals will also only be considered if in additional to

these factors the site is in an adoptable Neighbourhood Plan and the proposal has local support.

LP37 - Urban Area Allocation

Identifies sites within the Urban Area that are allocated primarily for residential use.

4 Consultations/Representations

Archaeological Officer – No objection. The proposed development site and surrounding area (500m radius) contain no scheduled monuments and only sparse archaeological assets, probably as the result of limited archaeological investigations rather than being a true reflection of lack of archaeological remains. However, the available evidence would point to activity dating from the prehistoric period, with finds of Neolithic implements having been reported from the general area.

To the south of the subject site aerial photographs show cropmarked remains of undated, possibly prehistoric, ring ditches, and traces of a number of conjoined small enclosures and other ditched features possibly representing a Romano-British settlement site.

Aerial photographs also show extensive patterns of medieval/post-medieval ridge-furrow and headlands which would have been associated with the open fields of the parish. Cartographic evidence shows that after Enclosure the site was still used as arable, witnessing no major development until the recent construction of the Gloucester Centre.

To the east of the site at least two Anglo-Saxon sunken-floored buildings were recorded during gravel working in the 1930s (no further information). Residual Saxon pottery was also found during archaeological investigations off Oundle Road, suggesting activity nearby.

On the basis of the available evidence, remains dating from the prehistoric period may be present within the proposed development site. If present, these are expected to have been truncated and/or disturbed during the construction of the Gloucester Centre with associated services and landscaping, as indicated by the geotechnical survey undertaken on the site. However, remains may survive in undisturbed pockets of land or in deeply stratified contexts. Given the anticipated extent of ground disturbance, the implementation of a pre-determination programme of non-intrusive techniques of investigations would be largely ineffective. I would therefore recommend that an evaluation by trial trenching is secured by condition, together with monitoring of preliminary groundwork for site preparation and, subjects to the results of the evaluation, monitoring of all other groundwork, including excavations for foundations, drainage features, service trenches, landscaping, etc.

PCC Pollution Team – No objection. Demolition and construction should be carried out in such a manner so as not to cause nuisance to neighbouring dwellings. Noise: A noise assessment considering the effects of the local noise climate on the proposed use of the site has been provided, this is noted and accepted. It demonstrates that compliance with the national standards for acceptable noise levels in both internal and external amenity area can be achieved with some mitigation measures i.e. buffering, screening, orientation and façade mitigation and the use of noise barriers where necessary. Further work is therefore at design stage.

Contamination: The submitted phase 1 and 2 reports are noted and accepted, the investigations to date have shown the site to be largely free from contamination. A conservative ground gas designation of CIRIA CS2 (or NHBC Amber) has been applied because of the elevated concentrations of carbon dioxide reported in two locations. The conclusions of the report are that either "further ground gas monitoring visits should be undertaken to further assess the elevated carbon dioxide concentrations identified during monitoring" or "to install ground gas protection measures designed in compliance with the CS2 classification provided herein, and supervised and verified by a competent engineer". A condition is required that ensures that either further works are undertaken and / or a remedial plan (and verification report) is produced by the applicants and agreed by the LPA. As the site is still currently in use the investigation has not included areas currently

covered by buildings. As such it would also be prudent to apply the unsuspected contamination condition if this application is approved.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services Initial comments: – No objection. The road within the site should be 5.5m rather than 6.0m. The 2 x 2.0m footways are acceptable. Given the agreement to close off Wainman Road to vehicular traffic, following PCC's recommendations during the pre-app process, it would be sensible to widen Morpeth Close to 5.5m. The square kerblines on the entrance may be an issue so consideration of a radius outer kerblines should be provided. The LHA expects proposals to amend the Wainman Road access at this stage with the cycle track shown as a continuous path without interruption from the current link through. Currently Wainman Road has priority with dropped kerbs for the cycle track entrances. A design showing the proposals in advance of a section 278 submission would be my preferred solution with details of the changes to the kerbing, surfacing, signs and lines etc. being provided. The refuse vehicle used for the tracking of the access road is incorrect. Please see the attached specs for the PCC RCV.

Second comments: Further to the LHA's previous comments. As stated previously, a maximum road width of 5.5m wide will be required, but could even be reduced to 5m wide as discussed recently with the developer's consultant. Widening on bends is likely to be necessary, and will be determined by tracking of a refuse truck and car passing one another.

The trip rates, traffic generation and trip distributions are appropriate and due to the proposed development creating less trips than the existing usage of the site, it would be agreed that the proposed development would have no detrimental impact on the highway network.

Whilst there are inconsistencies and incorrect statements made about the current situation in the Transport Assessment, as the proposed trips are expected to be less than the current use of the site, the development is considered acceptable in terms of traffic generation. As mentioned previously and above, the geometric layout must be revised to address road widths, etc. and we still require details for the off-site highway improvements including severing the connection to Wainman Road and footway/cycleway improvements. Widening of Morpeth Way to match the new access road is required, but the LHA are currently seeking clarification as to the status of the land to the south (currently verge). An update on this point will be sent as soon as possible. Revised tracking as previously requested is still outstanding. In the event you intend to determine this application, as it currently stands, please re-consult for final comments, but ideally the LHA seeks revised plans before making final comments/recommendations.

It has since been confirmed by the Local Highways that Morpeth Close is 5.4m wide along the whole length up to the turning head, therefore does not need widening.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services final comments on revised scheme: No objection subject to conditions.

Proposed Access: The access location will be acceptable subject to it meeting the width requirements for both footway and carriageway as detailed by the previous case officer in 2019, but as the access will be subject to a Section 278 agreement and the appropriate technical vetting the LHA have no objection to the access arrangements.

Wainman Road: This cannot be left as it is or just severed so additional section 278 works will be required at this location but the LHA is content that this can be conditioned or agreed at a later stage should outline consent be granted.

Footway Cycleway Eastbound from the Underpass: The width of the cycleway should be 3m throughout and a connecting route should be provided from the south end of the development through to the route that runs parallel to Morpeth Close, this would provide a new route for existing and future residents and avoid unofficial routes being used to cross the grassed areas.

Landscape Technical Officer – Initial comments: Areas on the plan have been identified as POS. These areas will be highway and the plan should be amended. The POS needs to be “usable” for recreational purposes, one of the main issues here is that it is proposed that the main two areas of POS is to be for SUDS. These would need to be dry green basins that would not “hold water” and can be used for informal recreational use.

The following required offsite commuted sums are required.

Children's Play: PCC expect an offsite contribution of £13,218.65 + 5 years maintenance costs for Oakleigh Drive Play Area. (Note: Land cost not applied).

Allotments: PCC expect an offsite contribution for Belzise Avenue Allotment site of £5,313.93 + 5 years Maintenance costs (Note: Land cost not applied)

Second comments: The proposed POS/NGS quantities would be within tolerance for the units outlined. Again the POS needs to be usable for Recreational purposes. A low flow channel will be installed in the base of the basin to convey more frequent rainfall events and limit the waterlogging of soils” this does not confirm on the point directly which is “can the POS/SUDS Green Basin be usable for Recreational activities (outside of a 1 in a 100 year storm event). Furthermore I also note while other PCC Officers/Departments comments have been reflected upon/clarified PCC’s Open Space Management Team’s comments have not been addressed within this document.

Parking Bays should be removed from POS Areas. Smaller Area of POS needs to be enlarged to make it a “usable area for Recreational activities”. The stone wall within the SuDs basin will provide an area for ASB, in particular graffiti, this needs to be looked into and confirmed by the Applicant.

PCC Travel Choice - Having reviewed the document I can confirm that the framework travel plan is satisfactory.

PCC Strategic Housing – No objection. In accordance with our housing needs policy, we would expect a contribution of 30% on this site of up to 100 dwellings – 30 affordable dwellings. No information is provided on bedroom sizes.

The current tenure split we would expect to see delivered for affordable housing in Peterborough is 70% affordable rented tenure and 30% intermediate tenure. This would equate to the delivery of 21 affordable rented homes and 9 intermediate tenure in this instance. I note from the Design & Access Statement that the applicant acknowledges this higher need for affordable rented dwellings. I am happy to discuss the details of the tenure mix at a later date, if required. In terms of intermediate tenures, the provision of shared ownership tenure remains the council's priority for meeting the need for affordable home ownership products in Peterborough. This is because of its capacity to cater for a wider range of household incomes by varying the initial share required to enable access to home ownership.

In accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan, all dwellings should meet Building Regulations Part M4(2), unless they are exceptional design reasons for not being able to do so (e.g. Listed Building constrains or site specific factors such as vulnerability to flooding or site topography). On all development proposals of 50 dwellings or more, 5% of homes should meet Building Regulations Part M4(3)(2)(a). Policy LP8 also says that all new rented tenure affordable housing will be required to be built to meet minimum National Space Standards (as defined by Building Regulations).

Second comments: As above. In addition, we would like to see at least 1 of the M4(3)(2)(a) units to come forward as a rented tenure affordable home and in the event that this is one of the apartments proposed, we would anticipate that this would be a ground floor dwelling.

Lead Local Drainage Authority – No objection. As it stands, we have no concerns with the

proposals of the development. Recommends the details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme, in accordance with the Gloucester Centre Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (FRA001 - dated July 2019) be secured by condition.

Second comments: No objection. Recommends the details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme, in accordance with the Gloucester Centre Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (FRA001 –dated September 2020), be secured by condition.

Waste Management - I can confirm we have no immediate objection in terms of waste services and provisions. Upon submission of the FULL application then the developer must refer and adhere to advice in the RECAP Waste Management SPD, but from the offset we have no objections.

PCC Wildlife Officer – No objection. The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment (July 2018) and subsequent Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Nov 2018). Further information submitted - Bat Survey Report (Oct 2019).

Protected Species - Bats: The bat roost survey recorded confirmed evidence of five bat roosts in four of the buildings proposed for demolition, which includes two maternity (summer) roosts of soprano pipistrelle and common pipistrelle bats. Because the roost survey was carried out during the late autumn, it wasn't possible to establish the exact numbers of bats using the roosts and therefore what the impacts of the proposed development would be on bat species. All bats and their roosts are fully protected by the Habitat Regulations. Therefore prior to any demolition works commencing, a European Protected Species licence will be required from Natural England (NE). NE will not issue a licence until planning permission has been obtained. Therefore the LPA must be satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to be able to assess whether a NE licence could be issued.

Ideally the three bat activity surveys recommended in the bat report should be carried out (between May and August) to inform mitigation measures prior to determination of this planning application. However I note that the applicant has instead proposed a detailed precautionary "worst case scenario" bat mitigation strategy.

Subsequent to the submission of the application a Bat Survey Report has been submitted. The additional bat activity surveys have now provided adequate details regarding the impacts the proposed development on bat species.

I am satisfied that the submitted mitigation measures set out in the 2019 Bat Survey Report are likely to ensure that the favourable conservation status of bat species. It is essential that all avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures set out in section 5 of the 2019 Bat Survey Report are fully implemented, including: construction of a permanent compensatory bat roost structure, installation of minimum of ten tree mounted bat boxes plus integral boxes on 10% of all new dwellings; pre-demolition mitigation works; Restrictions on timings of demolition works to avoid summer breeding and winter hibernation period; and lighting design to avoid disturbance to bats.

I would request that full details of all bat avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures (including locations and specifications of the bat building and bat boxes) are submitted for approval prior to commencement of any site clearance or demolition works. I would also request that a minimum five year monitoring of the bat roost structure is carried out to demonstrate its successful use by bats. The strategy including monitoring requirements may be secured by condition.

Nesting Birds: The proposal involves the removal of both vegetation and demolition of buildings which may support nesting birds. I would therefore recommend that a standard bird nesting Informative be attached to the planning decision.

To mitigate for the loss of nesting habitat, I would request that a range of nesting boxes are

installed that cater for a number of different species such as House Sparrow, Starling & Swift. Full details regarding numbers, designs and locations of nest features should be provided by the applicant which may be secured by condition.

Hedgehogs: Suitable habitat is present within the application site to support hedgehogs which are a UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority species and listed as a Species of Principle Importance under s41 of the NERC Act 2006. I would therefore recommend that impenetrable barriers are avoided by allowing adequate gaps to be retained under all new sections of fencing. Full details such measures may be secured via a suitably worded condition.

Site Layout & Landscaping: The Masterplan Layout Drawing appears broadly acceptable, noting that the site layout will need to incorporate a permanent compensatory bat roost structure which is indicated to be located in the south west of the site at an acceptable location adjacent to the tree belt and SuDS features.

I would advise that the existing trees and shrubs which form the western site boundary are retained and strengthened with additional native species planting. The use of native planting is recommended throughout the development, including the use of marginal aquatic plants around the SuDS features. Full landscape planting details may be secured by condition.

External Lighting: It is essential that the lighting scheme is carefully designed to ensure bat species are not negatively impacted, particularly in relation to the western area of the site where the bat roost structure is proposed to be constructed, along with bat foraging/ commuting areas around the tree belt and SuDS features. Full lighting details may be secured by condition.

I can advise that subject to my recommendations being fully incorporated into the approved scheme the development will in my opinion result in no net loss in biodiversity.

Ecologist (Northamptonshire – acting for PCC) comments: The proposal does not require a reconsideration of the advice provided by PCC Wildlife Officer given in November 2019. I note that he'd asked for the bat mitigation to be conditioned, and with regard to the compensation roost and its design. I agree with his advice. I would also recommend the standard BS42020 protected species licence condition in this case, as that will ensure that the licence has been obtained and all mitigation agreed with Natural England. Nothing further to add.

PCC Tree Officer – Objects. Initial comments: The above Arboricultural Report by WSP dated July 2019 includes the standard information expected within an arboricultural impact/implication assessment (AIA), as recommended within the British Standard BS 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'. The Report includes a 'walkover survey of all arboricultural features within the study area' which includes the above application site.

I do not agree with many of the assessments/categories of the trees as assessed, especially within the Category C trees and some Category B trees and I consider these should be reviewed with some of the supporting text, as many of the Category C trees have a greater 'estimated retention span of 10 years' and have a far greater public amenity value than that expressed, especially as the current site is a 'public' site and a large part of the proposed development site will retain its public accessibility. The same can be said for at least six of the Category B trees in as far as they have a greater 'estimated retention span of 20 years' and have no significant arboricultural defects.

Please note also that the number of trees quoted in the Report are misleading, as a number of the 'arboricultural features' are not actually on the development site but within the greater 'study area' covered by the Report, beyond the site boundary.

There does not appear to be a tree survey plan with trees identified on an existing site plan or on a Tree Constraints Plan however, there is a Tree Protection Plan, showing tree positions. Unfortunately, T.20 does not appear to be on the plan but is recommended for removal? There are two T.27's and two G.107's on the plan, one of which is recommended for removal? G.99 & G.100 do not appear to be on the plan but are also recommended for removal?

The AIA has been completed on the basis of an outline - preliminary design which is obviously reflected in that 10 of the 12 Category B trees are recommended for removal on the proposed outline development site with 55 of the 56 Category C trees being removed, 3 out of the 5 tree groups being removed and 2 of the 3 hedges removed. This leaves only 3 trees on or adjacent to the boundaries of the site T.33, 51 & 72 and two groups, again on the boundaries G.103 & 106 and 1 hedge H.111 therefore, there will be no existing trees retained across the entire central parts of the site.

I consider this to be unacceptable and demonstrates a clear disregard for the value and importance of existing and established tree/canopy cover on a development site and I believe, is contrary to the Council's Local Plan Policy, LP 29 Trees & Woodland, therefore I consider this should be reviewed and amended in light of a new layout to be considered as a part of a full detailed design stage.

Access - I have no objection to the proposed access, except to point out that the above Report and its Tree Protection Plan (TPP) & Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) in Appendix B does not cover this part of the development site and appears to stop at the site boundary, whereas there are proposed works to re-instate the turning head in close proximity to T.19.

Drainage - I do object to the proposed design of the 'Attenuation Basins' if works to form the basins as shown on the submitted plans include the removal of trees T.2 Sycamore, T.5 Oak & T.90 Ash all Category B, T.15 Cherry & T.91-94 Purple Leaved Plums all Category C and Group G.98, a tight group of 10 Silver Birch Category C. I believe, the attenuation basins can be formed/shaped to incorporate/retain the above trees/group given the existing topography of the site.

Public Open Space (POS) - With regard to the POS, I've no objection in principle however, how accessible and how user friendly will all the areas of POS be?

I object to the proposed layout due to the excessive tree removals, I believe, a redesign of the layout could retain a greater number of trees across the site.

PCC Tree Officer comments on revised indicative layout: Objection: Comments on detailed Arboricultural Report October 2020. I'm not prepared to accept or agree to the detail within this document, on three grounds. One, because it does not acknowledge the true value of a number of the trees, with reference to the BS5837 Categories, as referenced in my original comments; two, because I do not consider it to be relevant to the current Proposed Scheme, as discussed within the report, because the entire layout except for the access, is subject to change in the future; and thirdly, because there are too many inaccuracies and contradictions in several parts of the report.

The only part of the report, I'm prepared to accept, at this time, is Sub-Section 5.2.2 which identifies the individual trees to be removed to facilitate the pre-development demolition on site. The reason, I say individual trees, is because, all the individual trees are included, but not Group G.107. This has been agreed by way of the planning permission, for the prior approval application 20/00411/PRIOR, that the trees can be removed to facilitate the demolition.

The report highlights in Sub-Section 5.2.3 that trees T.6 and T.9 are to be removed 'as a matter of good practice' but T.9 is off site?

Sub-Section 5.2.4 says 'Implementation of the Proposed Scheme will require the removal of one moderate quality tree T.86'? T.86 is a Category B tree which I consider, could easily be incorporated into the Proposed Scheme or a similar revised Scheme, simple by deviating a footpath.

The Sub-Section goes on to reference the removal of tree T.47 (a Category C tree, which should be a Category B tree) which is shown to be retained within the Proposed Scheme, tree T.76 which is highlighted for Translocation with Sub-Section 5.2.5 of the report, is shown for removal.

Trees T.78 & T.79 are both mature Crab Apples with 20+yrs of safe, useful, life expectancy remaining but have a Category C rating, instead of a Category B and are shown for removal. However, I

consider both of these trees are worthy of retention and can be accommodated within a revised Scheme. The same can be said for the four trees. T.91-94. However, it appears that T.91 is missing from the report?

Again, Group G.98, a group of 12 Silver Birch has been identified for removal and wrongly Categorized, as above, but is shown on the Proposed Scheme as being retained?
Groups G.99, G.100 & G.101 are shown for removal but G.99 & G.100 are off site and G.101 does not appear to be marked on a plan?

Please note within Appendix B, Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS), there are further contradictions, including under the heading REMOVAL OF ARBORICULTURAL FEATURES AND PRUNING, Table B-1 Current schedule of identified tree work, within the Table various trees are referenced by number for recommended works - Fell to ground level.

The first; is T.5 a mature, Category B Oak, clearly shown for retention within the Proposed Scheme; T.20 is a mature, Category B London Plane, clearly off site; trees T.39, T.41, T.44, T.45, T.55, T.59 & T.76 are all shown for Translocation in Sub-Section 5.2.5, mentioned previously; tree T.47 a mature, ornamental Pear, a Category C tree, which should be a Category B tree, is again clearly shown for retention within the Proposed Scheme; and trees T.78, T.79, T.86, T.91, T.92, T.93, T.94, G.98, G.99, G.100 & G.101 are all mentioned previously and considered for retention or off site?

PCC Property Services - No comments received

Childcare Market Facilitation Manager - No comments received

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) – No objection. This is an area of low vulnerability to the risk of crime at this time. This appears to be an appropriate layout in relation to crime prevention and the fear of crime providing reasonable levels of natural surveillance from neighbour's properties with many of the homes facing each other and some overlooking the public open space. Pedestrian and vehicle routes are aligned together, well overlooked and pedestrian safety has been considered. Permeability on the whole has been limited to essential areas/routes only, which should provide some level of territoriality amongst residents. Vehicle parking is mostly in-curtilage between and to the sides of properties. Most homes have back to back protected rear gardens which reduces the risk and vulnerability to crime and have been provided with the potential for some defensible space where possible to their front. Recommend that all adopted and un-adopted roads, private roads, shared drives and parking areas including the flat parking area, should be lit with columns to BS5489:1 2013. I would like to see an external lighting plan when available. No details are provided on boundary treatments – will the car park to the flats be gated? Footpaths to the side/rear of the terraced houses need to be gated - communal gates should be fitted with closers and the private gates fitted with closers and be lockable from both sides. What access control will there be to the flats - including cycle and bin stores?

Second comments following reconsultation: No further comments to add.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service – No objection. Adequate provision should be made for Fire Hydrants to be secured by condition of a S106 agreement.

Anglian Water Services Ltd – No objection subject to appending a surface water management condition.

Environment Agency – No objection. Recommend condition regarding unsuspected contamination.

Natural England - Consultation Service - Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

Orton Longueville Parish Council – Objects. Orton Longueville Parish Council wholeheartedly back the residents in their objections to this outline application and we would be grateful if, under the

Council's adopted scheme of delegation, you would 'call in' this application by Members if officers are minded to accept the scheme. We believe this to be in the public interest and the interest of the proper planning of the area. We have summarised the main objections and material considerations as:

- Detrimental impact upon residential amenities and the visual impact of the redevelopment (i.e. what it will be like to look at, NOT the loss of a view). This includes the impact on the character of an area, availability of infrastructure, density, over-development, layout, design and external appearance of buildings and landscaping.
- Noise pollution.
- Adverse impact on protected species such as bats and rare butterflies.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking due to 2 and 3 storey properties proposed within the redevelopment.
- Overshadowing/loss of light (NOT loss of acquired rights to light)
- Highway safety is compromised: traffic generation, road capacity, means of access, visibility, car parking and effects on pedestrians/cyclists.
- Development is contrary to latest government national planning policy framework in terms of making the viability assessment publicly available - especially around education and local amenities; promoting healthy and safe communities; promoting sustainable transport; meeting the challenge of climate change; conserving and enhancing the natural environment; conserving & enhancing the historic environment (existing builds are predominantly single storey); plus open space & recreation.
- We have also reattached the outstanding questions that Savills have asked us to refer to you as the case officer.

Second comments following re-consultation on revised layout: Objection

Residents are aghast to find that this is the second time that PCC has issued an application to redevelop the Gloucester Centre during a national lockdown! The demographics for this locale are available to PCC planners - yet they have had no regard to this. Some residents are still shielding from lockdown 1. We remain concerned over the impact of those who do not have electronic access who are therefore being disadvantaged and not able to comment fully on the devil in the detail, as the plans are not visible/available to them, and they have no way of requesting them by post -due to the lockdown plus tight deadline for comments being 17 November .

Specifically, we are appalled at the proposed increased density – with several blocks of flats now proposed with additional detached properties which is akin to erecting up to 100 toothpaste homes -so tightly squeezed together. We also note that the natural green space is 0.77ha in a site development of 3.23ha.

Whilst the number of flats and scale of a single block has been mitigated to x4 smaller blocks distributed throughout the development – we note that 6 will be private and 18 affordable. The housing mix is 70 private and 30 affordable. The latter x 24 flats sits out with the existing surrounding built environment.

The Highway layout still only has access and egress via Morpeth Road which remains contentious as far as we and our residents are concerned. We would respectfully request a traffic survey be conducted on feeder roads (like Royston Avenue) onto arterial roads like Shrewsbury Avenue and Oundle Road when traffic is back to normal.

We raised concerns regarding surface water disposal and note that any known historical floods on site is unanswered, as the Gloucester Centre estate roads are all private, and as such WSP engineers have stated in reports that they are not aware of the extent of their drainage network and suitability.

The proposed development site area is said to contain sparse archaeological assets, but this is more to do with limited archaeological investigations rather than being a true reflection of archaeological

remains. We know that activity dating from the prehistoric period, with finds of Neolithic implements have been reported from the general area. The site may well have assets which have yet to be uncovered.

We note the mitigation on existing residents' gardens with more of the site's trees and shrubs being retained for privacy as well as combating noise pollution. Thus, reducing the felling of mature trees. That said, the removal of some mature trees and shrubs which are habitats for varied wildlife remains a significant concern – even taking account of the mitigation to leave some in the new build gardens. The mitigation of planting saplings which will take decades to mature is of no recompense.

We remain concerned about the car parking provision with the potential of 200 – 300 cars flooding the already congested highway by roadside parking. It was acknowledged that 'rat running' does occur through the estate and the addition of 200-300 more cars can only add to this problem. The assertion that the Transport Assessment contains evidence to show that the traffic flows through Morpeth Close will not increase as a result of the development remains incongruous to us and our residents.

As regards the ecology, particularly bats – we are adamant that no demolition should take place without ecological consent with particularly reference to bat licencing.

We are unsure about the asbestos risk to neighbouring properties once demolition starts and what mitigation is planned.

The Design and Access Statement from 'Building for Life' for this application has not been accessible and we have not had sight of their checklist as promised by Savills and Homes England.

Residents and ourselves feel that the site would be best redesigned to accommodate sheltered housing with warden/special supervision for the elderly population of this area, or given the shortage of bungalows of "Lifetime Homes" be utilised for the disabled or aged population of this area. Even providing multiple occupancy properties for students at Peterborough's new Technical University.

Shailesh Vara – MP – Objects to the application and shares a number of concerns raised by local residents. The application site is in a residential area and the addition of up to 100 dwellings would be over development of the area, putting additional pressures on local services including GP surgeries and schools. Consideration should be given to reducing the number of dwellings to ease pressures on local services.

The height of the proposed apartment block is not in keeping with the local area and it should be kept at a level that is similar to existing neighbouring housing. Additionally the apartment block as currently envisaged would overlook many of the new housing units which would cause loss of privacy.

Concern regarding the increase in vehicular traffic and vehicular access from the site on to local roads. The proposal is to close the Wainman Road access and all traffic would be directed solely on to Morpeth Close. This would put additional pressure onto already congested local roads leading on to Oundle Road. Keeping Wainman Road access open would alleviate any further congestion problems.

The traffic assessment undertaken is inaccurate and inconsistent and should not be relied upon.

Cllr Graham Casey – Objection. Requests application is called in to planning committee. The proposed development will adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring residents in Orton Longueville Ward. I am particularly concerned about the reallocation/re-signposting of the access to the Gloucester Centre site which has been, for over 25 years, via Wainman Road, off Shrewsbury Avenue. Indeed, this route is even signposted opposite the entrance near Big Sky. Why has PCC requested that Wainman Road be closed off? Have Highways carried out an assessment of the

traffic impact on the access/exits of the estate (via Royston Ave, Newcastle Drive, Oakleigh Drive) at peak times? Has an assessment been made on the increased wear and tear on the current road surfaces which are already having to be regularly repaired due to heavy over use at peak times (e.g. Thornleigh Drive, Sheringham Way).

Cllr Farooq Mohammed – Objection – Requests the application is called in. I have been inundated with the requests from residents (from Orton Longueville) to 'call-in' the planning application for the Gloucester Centre Development. The increase in traffic (particularly in Oakleigh Drive, Morpeth, Newcastle Drive etc). Ideally a separate access to the new development is required. This will have a severe impact on the lives of the current residents. The impact on local amenities. Such as transport, schools, medical services and other public services. The density and property type is not in keeping with the existing estate. Wildlife habitat issues, especially relating to bats. Adequacy of parking within the proposed development.

Cllr Irene Walsh – Objection. The amount of housing. 100 houses crammed into an area that size doesn't seem in keeping with the area. The proposal to close of Wainman road industrial estate access and use Morpeth close only as the access is a terrible idea. It will turn a lovely quiet area into a constant stream of traffic. The surrounding roads like Oundle road are at bursting point as it is every day as it is.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

It should be noted that following a public exhibition prior to this application being submitted a petition containing 506 signatures was submitted to the City Council.

Initial consultations: 115
Total number of responses: 204
Total number of objections: 198
Total number in support: 2

Summary of Objections received – first round

Principle of development

- Strongly object to the amount of proposed homes being up to 100.
- Peterborough, is already over populated, over built.
- There is ample space around Peterborough for houses to be built
- There is significant building going on around Peterborough. I therefore do not see any justification in developing 'low costing / need to buy' housing on the 'Gloucester' site.
- More houses in the area of Orton Longueville is not necessary or wanted.
- It will ruin our community
- Over-population of the area
- The desire is purely to make as much profit as possible.
- The outlying areas of Peterborough are more than enough to handle the demand of new homes – the planned development of the Gloucester Centre as pure greed from the developer.
- Location not suitable for proposed development.

- The site could be better used for Independent Living/Retirement apartments for the over 60s but on a smaller scale than what is proposed.
- Housing for the elderly residents which would not only be in high demand but also blend with the existing development and are less likely to be multiple car owners or need access to the road network each day at peak times.
- The plans do not take account that Orton Longueville is a 'village'
- The land behind the Co-op was also allocated for the building of new homes several years ago - surely sites such as this should be finished first before more land is allocated off for consideration of a new estate.
- Perhaps a new doctors surgery could be built in place of some of the homes.
- The site would be better used for a small development of offices no higher than two storeys to reflect the current areas architecture. This would increase opportunities for small business to locate to Peterborough and increase revenue to the Council in the form of business rates.
- Why do we need to crowd more homes into the city area when Hampton has plenty of capacity to cope with these housing requirements.

Character

- The proposed dwellings are not in keeping with the surrounding area.
- 30, 3 storey apartments or flats does not fit in with this established estate. There are no flats or modern 3 storey town houses on the estate.
- This proposed plan features mainly terraced houses and apartments, the apartments making up 30% of the total houses. This will destroy the peaceful, tranquillity atmosphere of this area and turn it into another area of condensed housing.
- Dramatic change in the style of housing within the area of Orton Longueville
- A large block of 29 flats would not respect the street plots, spaces between buildings, building form, size, scale or massing of the surrounding area and would certainly not positively contribute to the character and local distinctiveness of the area. Contrary to policy LP16
- There should NOT be any flats. These (flats) buildings will lie parallel to my home.
- Building should be detached properties of high value.

Overdevelopment

- The statement of community involvement 2.19 admits that "Following receipt of the initial written pre-application response" it was "difficult to accommodate the number of dwellings expected by the local plan". It seems therefore that the decision to change the originally planned layout to include 29 flats was not based adhering to planning policy but just trying to reach the maximum number of dwellings allocated in the local plan.
- A layout in keeping with the surrounding area should be of higher importance than squashing in the maximum number allowed.
- The plans do not take the existing environment, buildings or purpose into consideration and is designed to make as much profit as possible by building as many houses as possible.
- A reduction in the number of houses by building more executive style homes, more detached units and generally more expensive properties can easily bring the developers the same profits.
- 100 houses crammed into an area that size doesn't seem in keeping with the area.
- The density is much greater than the rest of the estate

Highways

Transport Assessment

- A new traffic survey is required with accurate recordings of all roads on the estate.
- The traffic survey undertaken is unreliable, it does not include Royston Avenue which suffers from long queues – cars back up with cars through to Sherringham during morning rush hour.
- The comment that there are no queues on the Nene Parkway does not match my experience, in particular the queues on and approaching the slip road to the Gordon Arms.

- The documents do not contain risk assessments directly relating to the increased traffic flow.
- The flawed approach to the transport study area is evidenced further by the over simplistic traffic assignment methodology which only considers direct journey to work trips. This fails to assign the significant number of diverted link vehicle trips within the neighbourhood from parents dropping their children off at St. Botolph Primary School/Nene Park Academy prior to continuing their journey to work.
- The junction capacity assessments could also be accused of being over simplistic, focusing entirely on capacity 'flags' and failing to consider the significant delays that could be experienced by motorists on minor arms wishing to enter Shrewsbury Avenue. This could lead to poor gap acceptance and resultant collisions.
- The TA fails to establish valid baseline traffic patterns, has major flaws in the trip assignments/capacity assessment and therefore the conclusions of the no significant impacts cannot be relied on.
- The TA should address the omissions and flaws prior to the application being determined.
- The traffic and accident data for the transport assessment was carried out at the end of June and beginning of July and so not reflective of all seasons.
- More and more cars are cutting through Oakleigh Drive / Royston avenue to avoid the traffic in Oundle road; the addition of 150 to 200 cars will only add significant congestion.
- It is bumper to bumper in peak hours and most of the day, especially the off ramp to Oundle Road with traffic backing up past the on ramp from Thorpe Road. An additional 150 / 200 cars is only going to make this even worse. Only today was there a serious accident on the corner of Shrewsbury and Newcastle roads.
- The Travel Plan (pages 8-9) provides the widths of all the nearby residential roads with the exception of Morpeth Close - Why has this measurement been omitted?
- The DCLG guidance published in 2014 states that 'Travel Plans can positively contribute to lessening traffic generation and improving road safety. It suggests that ideally plans should reduce the need for new developments to increase existing road capacity or they should provide new roads. - Where do current plans address these issues?
- No new access road, just a statement that they will persuade everyone to reduce car usage.
- In the WSP Framework Residential Travel Plan (1.5.1), they say that they aim to provide better air quality and reduced congestion. No mention of how 100 extra homes will avoid producing vehicle exhaust gases nor how adding extra vehicles and closing Wainman Road will reduce congestion onto Oakleigh Drive.
- Is there evidence on other developments that such measure as listed in the Table 7.1 - Action Plan actually work.
- The WSP Framework Residential Travel Plan states that currently 76% of all journeys in the Ortons are made by road transport and that up to 80% of residents of Orton Longueville journey to work using a car or van. They go on to state that they can reduce this to 50% by educating the car drivers on the benefits of alternative travel arrangements. This does not deliver robust control measures for the unavoidable sharp increase in road traffic along our streets.

Existing situation

- The development would have a massive impact on the amount of traffic in the neighbourhood.
- 100 hundred homes will surely bring more cars onto the local roads.
- Traffic is already gridlocked mornings and night.
- 100 houses likely equates to 200 cars or more.
- People use the estate as 'rat runs'.
- The local roads are not suitable.
- The estate was not designed with the additional vehicular access in mind
- The current state of the tarmac is testament to the already overburdening – this will be made worse
- Vehicles already parking on the roads it will not be long until an accident involving a cyclist or pedestrian occurs.
- All of the roads on this estate are narrow and by definition of 'Drive' and 'Way' in the road

names.

- The majority of residents' driveways are on a bend, some on blind bends. Local residents are aware of this and drive more carefully.
- Those who race along our roads to cut through and so avoid the Shrewsbury Avenue traffic lights, tend to drive in the centre of the road and too fast.
- Traffic calming measures need to be put in place along roads such as Thornleigh Drive. However, speed humps etc would also be a disaster for people with disabilities using adapted bikes, scooters and mobility vehicles.
- There are other planned developments in the surrounding areas with impact on the roads.
- Over the years there have been various traffic calming measures proposed for Oakleigh Drive & Newcastle Drive because of "too much traffic"; all of which suggested because the roads were too dangerous.
- As a resident near the junction of Newcastle drive and Shrewsbury Avenue I have seen 2 accidents in 6 months caused by the volume of traffic using the estate as a rat run.
- There will be more parking outside of our houses. It's too much already with the industrial estate let alone with a further 100 dwellings!!
- At peak times, cars queue to join the Oundle Road up and past my property all the way to Sheringham Way.
- The increase in cars will make leaving my home by car even more of a problem.
- Local shops in this area near the Post Office regularly overflow with parked cars making the road congested and the pavement blocked. This is a danger road users, children and other pedestrians in and around the entrance to the playing field.
- Home owners in Botolph Lane would have more people walking past their property; more people using it will add pressure on them to maintain it more often.
- Existing roads such as Oakleigh Drive, Thornleigh Drive, Sheringham Way and Royston Avenue will struggle to handle the volume of traffic from the new development. Accesses directly to Shrewsbury Avenue and Oundle road must be looked into.
- I already have problems with people blocking driveways
- Are the highways department going to paint yellow lines to ensure the smooth flow of traffic, inconveniencing local residents even more?
- Emergency vehicles trying to access the new development could result in potentially fatal consequences.
- A high volume of large modern vehicles are just not compatible with roads that are short, narrow and with sweeping bends.
- There are several other projects that will also feed traffic and pollution into the area (Sugar Way / Showground)
- It's an accident waiting to happen with a lot of children walking to school and back.
- Safety concerns on roads - elderly people and very young children
- Traffic should be prevented from using Royston Avenue, Sheringham Way & Thornleigh Drive as thoroughfares.
- Morpeth Close is effectively a single lane road due to the frequent parking down one side, possibly by people who park there for the Wainman industry area. More so now that the large carpark in Wainman industry has recently been closed.
- Concern for the safety of children who cycle/walk through the estate with such an increase in cars.
- The Nene parkway is illegally and dangerously jammed with traffic that is unable to exit onto Oundle Road.
- Further traffic under that parkway will increase the traffic unable to exit the parkway and endanger lives. The police do not deal with this and those unable to exit will exit at the next junction and then cut through the estate making the rat run worse.

Access

- Morpeth Close is a narrow road with only seven properties who have to park on the road as they haven't sufficient driveways making it essentially a one way street.
- Even if this road is marginally widened it is still making well over 200 cars leaving & returning

24/7 an absolutely ridiculous prospect.

- Basil Green is mostly elderly residents who will be directly affected and the chance of an accident far higher.
- Access to the site should only be from Wainman Road which should be improved to cope with the additional traffic.
- The developer should also be required to assess and improve the cycle access along the proposed vehicular access, at least as far as Oundle Road.
- At a time when it is universally agreed that airborne pollution must be reduced, your proposed access will have the opposite effect.
- There is only one entrance to the development – there would be a problem with emergency services getting in and out.
- Access could be created around the industrial area, perhaps consideration to opening the public footpath parallel to Morpeth Close leading to the proposed site.
- I strongly recommend improving the access from Morpeth Close to Wainman Rd. and its exit on to Shrewsbury Avenue (perhaps a mini roundabout, as this junction already suffers from traffic build up) to help alleviate traffic throughout the estate.
- Concern with two way traffic for the safety of cyclists using Morpeth Close.
- I work at the Gloucester Centre and see how busy Morpeth Road can get.

Closure of Wainman Road access

- With the Wainman Road access closed off, all traffic will be funnelled through Morpeth Close to gain access to Oundle Road or Shrewsbury Avenue.
- The closure of Wainman Road access will turn a lovely quiet area into a constant stream of traffic.
- Why is the access to the industrial site being closed off?
- I can confirm that every car using the parking facilities at the Gloucester Centre enters and exits through the Wainman Road Trading Estate.
- Industrial unit staff at Wainman road are expected to load and unload using fork lifts and power trucks in the middle of the road on a regular basis.
- On the basis of road safety alone the access should be closed as a matter of urgency.
- We have already lost a large car park of approx. 100 spaces, leaving us with no choice but to park on the roadside, causing obvious Health and Safety issues. The car park appears to be going to be turned into a car lot, which if access is granted to the proposed dwelling area is going to cause absolute mayhem.
- Wainman Road businesses are suffering enough due to not being able to load/unload deliveries etc and I am sure if this access remains open it will only be a matter of time before there is a serious accident.
- This is a major point of contention, the existing use is non-domestic use, its management instructed its staff to enter and leave via the industrial estate.
- The proposal is all domestic and all of the vehicles will be prevented from using the industrial estate by removing the vehicular connecting road.

Cycleway

- Concern regarding the removal of cycle path used by schoolchildren who use this to avoid congested Oundle Road.
- It looks as if the pathway between Caldervale road and the subway under the A1260 is going to be turned into a road servicing houses and all 30 apartments.
- By turning the pathway into a road you significantly increase the possibility of there being accidents especially with young children and elderly who might have used the pathway for years.
- Peterborough is well known for its many safe walkways and cycle paths, this plan totally ignores this by building the apartment block which could house up to 60 cars.
- It is important that the east-west cycle route (part of the National Cycle Network) be given high quality treatment and width. It is welcome that the awkward crossing at Wainman Road will be

eliminated.

- The walkway behind my house is very much used as a walkway for school children as its one path to the underpass and no roads to cross which is safe environment , with the proposed plans this would mean another road that the children have to walk by and not good for the wildlife that has the greenery space.
- This shared footway / cycleway runs parallel to the south of Morpeth Close, from Shrewsbury Avenue to Wainman Road". This takes residents away from the local shops and post office. Currently local cyclists use Oakleigh Drive. Surely new residents will do the same. This puts all of them at increased risk from the increased road traffic yet no suitable risk control measures are contained in the plans.
- There is an existing footpath / cycleway running around the site, how will this be affected?
- Children who attend Nene Park Academy are advised by the school to use this back cycle path (right next to the Gloucester centre) , as its safer than children using the path along Oundle Road, yet your planning of putting a extra 200+ cars into a area used twice daily by young children aged from 11 years old up .
- The loss of a valuable safe cycle path is not acceptable as school kids use this for access to school.

Parking

- There is insufficient parking space allowed for the 30 apartments - residents and visitors to the apartments will park on the road/road verges making it extremely unsafe for walking and cycling on.
- There doesn't even seem to be adequate parking space on the plan.
- The area of Orton Longueville is well established and the current properties all have generous proportions and land, including plenty of frontage for parking. I fear that new builds and especially the proposed flats will not be allocated enough accessible parking.
- In view of the prospect of excellent cycle access for the proposed dwellings it is important that the City's levels of cycle parking be equalled or exceeded. This is especially important for the apartments, for which secure, covered resident cycle parking, preferably within the building itself, and very convenient to the building entrance be provided, as well as visitor cycle parking adjacent to the building entrance.
- The dimensions on the illustrative master plan for the apartment car park are roughly 21 by 24 metres – it has not been demonstrated that the car park can accommodate the required parking spaces.
- Construction Traffic
 - The traffic generated by the building work will also be extremely heavy and noisy.
 - The roads in this area are not wide enough to accommodate large vehicles and are already in a bad state of repair.
 - The building work is set to last for 2 years, hence we are going to be subjected to much noise, dust and a general building site environment.
 - Concern regarding access for construction vehicles - Morpeth Close is a narrow Close
 - If cars are parked in Morpeth Close it will be extremely difficult for these trucks to pass by without damaging any parked cars let alone the safety of all pedestrians.
 - The light industrial area is bursting at the seams with cars and traffic so any additional heavy vehicles going through the industrial area is going to very dangerous to all.
 - There is no detail how the construction is going to be carried out but assume it will be 1 building site, if so what happens to the path while building work is going on, will it be closed if not how are you going to ensure the safety of cyclists and walkers of all ages?

Noise and Pollution

- Noise pollution is also a concern to a peaceful neighbourhood.
- Has any consideration been given to preventing noise from the adjacent Parkway?

- This is an unsuitable place for residential development due to the lack of sound baffling from cars and motorbikes, the continued increase in traffic from the excessive Hampton development, repeated overnight road works that endanger all residents and other road users due to the tiredness of responsible residents who went home to sleep and were kept awake all night by an irresponsible and dangerous council policy.
- Existing home close to the parkway are blighted and difficult to sell due to the road noise.
- Current residents are unable to enjoy their gardens due to road noise.
- Pollution from diesel cars is known to impact on youngsters intellect and is a hazard to those with conditions such as Asthma and other breathing issues
- The quality of life would be appalling for any residents of this proposed development due to the unsuitable location.

Facilities/amenities

- Has the impact of 200 to 400 additional people on local facilities been undertaken, if so please can they be publicised?
- Facilities in the area are not coping
- Local doctors surgeries are few and far between.
- Already there is a limited number of medical practices in the area, the closest medical practises are, Nene Valley Medical Practice, Orton Bushfield Medical Practice, Botolph Bridge Community Health Centre all of which are not in the immediate vicinity and all overloaded.
- Local schools have already expanded their buildings and intake to accommodate the already burgeoning population in Peterborough. All local schools have waiting lists as they are full.
- There are no shops within walking distance apart from a small parade in Oakleigh Drive which does not have a food shop.
- In terms of Dental services once again there is a limited amount and also fairly full.
- By building this development as proposed will place a huge additional strain on all these facilities.
- There are going to be no extra NHS provisions put in place for GP surgeries that are already over stretched (I know this for a fact as work for the NHS) in fact you are taking away vital mental health provisions within the community, and NHS staff will be potentially out of pocket having to be relocated and possibly pay their own parking fees!

Biodiversity

- There are a number of bat colonies roosting in the current buildings poised for demolition, that have established flight paths and hunting grounds within the site.
- To suggest that the introduction of a few bat boxes will preserve the biodiversity of the area is ludicrous. The bats won't find temporary accommodation whilst their land is being overhauled and then return, they will simply leave.
- How can one bat building and boxes placed in the far corner near the 'flats', parkway and industrial estate be considered as the best and only place to provide alternative roosts.
- If a member of the public were to remove the species, they would be subject to legal action, but paying money for a certificate seems to warrant action carte blanche.
- The development will result in a net loss in biodiversity.
- The garden spaces have remained undisturbed for many years and there is a wealth of wildlife - foxes, squirrels, deer, many species of birds and hedgehogs are all present on this site.
- As a protected species, I understand that a very large fine exists for each bat that is destroyed in any development, especially as their existence is known and has been documented. It is not enough to simply obtain a license to move them, it rarely works.
- With the inevitable erection of wooden fences around each plot, will the developers follow guidelines to leave gaps or hedgehog thoroughfares so that they may continue to remain in this area?
- What strategies will be employed to save and rescue wildlife when the bulldozers move in?
- The pack mentions Ecology in a very brief paragraph with no detail and appears to brush off any impact. Has a study being undertaken and if so can this be made public, if not why not? Is

the proposed moving of bats in line with the law and has application been made for a Bat migration license?

- Peterborough labels itself as an environment city, this plan completely contradicts this ideology.
- Doubling Biodiversity is not achieved by cutting down 67 mature trees and destroying their supported wildlife.
- Getting a licence first to destroy bat roots, might be legal but it's still wrong'
- Understand 67 trees are to be destroyed. This will be a huge loss to the area at a time when trees are recognised to have a positive affect absorbing traffic fumes etc. The trees provide habitats for wildlife including bats. The offer of new roosts for them will not work. There is an endangered butterfly too. These pockets of wildlife need protecting.
- Also there are bats currently nesting in and around the Gloucester Centre, how can this be seen as feasible when the ozone is depleting.
- The local thriving and protected bat population will also be directly affected not only due to loss of habitat but also the inevitable long term disruption that building in the area will cause.

Trees

- There are a good many mature trees on this site, which need to be retained and ideally more planted.
- At the recent meeting, it was said that none of the trees are of 'good quality'. Yet, none are diseased, mostly mature and are all beautiful specimens.
- How can Peterborough call itself the Environmental Capital, when it intends on allowing wanton destruction of an eco system that requires preserving, not destroying.
- The planning application now states that out of 97 counted trees and several tree groups, that 66 trees will be DESTROYED and several groups of trees.
- The extensive planned removal of mature trees and shrubbery will reduce the current amenity value of the area for walkers and those like me backing onto the proposed development area.
- The mature trees also provide a sound barrier from the nearby parkway as well as hiding it from view.
- Trees and hedges are a vital part of vital part of any built up area for humans and wildlife
- What is being done to replace the trees? Note that these trees have taken 30 / 40 years to establish. Mature trees do not grow overnight !!
- The plans should be reworked leaving all the trees in place and planting at least on new tree per house
- We are reminded daily about our environment & climate change and how we need to look after it, yet they want to chop 64 trees down. where is the sense in that.
- Peterborough should be trying to improve and lead the way with Climate change, yet your allowing money to take over and have these trees destroyed to have a have homes built that we don't need, shame on you Peterborough council if you allow these trees to be cut down.
- Although the developers claim these are not grade A trees, it will take 20-30 years to grow new trees to this size.
- This will increase the local carbon pollution in the area.
- God made the trees, birds and animals long before we as human beings were made and now we are destroying by increasing pollution and limiting the wild life for animals and birds, you should be ashamed of yourselves as you don't care about it.
- This nature life is not only for birds and animals, for us as we can enjoy walking with or without dogs that we need to go somewhere to do our wellbeing daily exercises by what the GPs tell us to do! Where else can we go for a walk locally if some of us can't walk very far?
- In addition, having trees at the back of my garden does make me feel safety and secure living where I am.

Public open space

- Lack of public open space within the new development plan also a great concern.
- With the exception of the attenuation basins it looks as if the public open space has been an after thought and is on the whole fragments of land where it would be difficult to put houses,

rather than high quality usable open space.

- What is the purpose of the 'Pond'? This could be a danger to children etc.
- Lack of recreation areas for children on proposed plan.

Amenity

- The proposed houses are to be built right up to our boundary fences, it was stated by Savills that houses will not be built above two floors, no plan shows this.
- Many existing properties are lower down than Gloucester Site, this will cause issues with new properties over looking residents bedrooms, bathrooms etc.
- A high concentration of families living closely, inevitably brings its own problems. T
- This is a quiet estate with very few problems, the population being mostly middle age to older residents. The majority of residents having moved here to escape more problematic areas in Peterborough.
- There is no reference in the proposed plan of how the developers plan to limit air pollution, general pollution and noise pollution that comes standard with any large development. The amount of dust generated during construction will have an impact on all who live in the area whether it is dust in their houses or health impact especially on the many elderly people who live in the area.
- Proposed plan not in keeping with local area as site has many boundaries with bungalows
- We have a park in the area where lots of children play this will have an impact on that as parents won't want to bring the children here, being a grandparent I won't blame them
- How much consideration has been given to the folk who live peacefully on this very narrow road- Morpeth Close?
- The construction traffic and commuter traffic thereafter will make life intolerable; surely they deserve better than this.
- Also being over looked with houses where when I brought the property this was not the case and was one of the reasons for doing so.
- We already have enough dog poo / litter left at the back of my house and apparently the bushes at the back of my fence belong to us which we have to cut down every year.
- The building works will effect me directly ...my husband works night shifts so sleeps in the day.
- Having houses built near my back garden will make me uncomfortable, insecure and edgy which isn't good for my mental wellbeing, especially men who could spying on any children
- Home life within the community should be happy, comfortable, safe, secure and friendly environment to live for many years ahead, not over crowded houses and limited nature wild life.
- The plans put forward, will alter the areas housing dramatically and affect all existing residents quality of life on a daily basis
- What about the residents of Basil Green, the Bungalows were built in the 1960's they have not been overlooked for more than 50 years, what about our privacy.
- Concern regarding the quality of life that the residents who have lived on this estate for many years will have, many of these are elderly and changes of this scale can have an effect on people's mental health.
- Increase antisocial behaviour in our very quiet and friendly neighbourhood.
- Work on a compromise to keep our development to a sensible size and ensure the peacefulness of it, which many of us have moved to for that very reason.
- Also there is potential for noise pollution to my property with extra persons using the play area on the corner of Thornleigh Drive and Newcastle Drive.

Affordable Housing

- If policy makers insist of 30% social housing to be incorporated into all developments, how is it that the new Fletton Quays development, (several hundred apartments) do not or intend to have any social housing built within that development?

- Affordable housing does not need to be provided by way of flats. It should be done with house types that are in keeping with the surroundings.
- You can only get so much in to a pint pot, build your new affordable house else where
- I'm concerned about the potential increase of the 30 social housing planned to be dumped on our doorsteps and the value of our property dropping. We bought into this area as its more private homes not social, why should we be expected to put up with it.
- Social housing and flats are the worst scenario because it would ruin our sense of community that could turn our neighbourhood into crime and drugs

Misc

- The application should be called in for Determination by Members if officers are minded to accept the scheme. I believe this to be in the public interest of the proper planning of the area.
- Are the traffic plan, transport plan and associated risk assessments available for review
- I feel that the housing values will decrease unless properties are built to a similar standard as those already there.
- My previous objections have been ignored
- It would appear that the developer's mentality is " See a space - build houses - make a profit - then vanish," leaving existing residents to cope with the problems.
- Environment Capital - Greenwash?
- You have a duty of care in your role in Development Control. Hold yourself personally accountable for your actions.
- The application has been supported by some very dubious reports, which have been exposed by PCC own Officers. For example, the WSP Arboricultural Report has been shown to be "misleading". Similarly, the Wildlife Report is an over-simplification of the complex issue of re-homing displaced animals. No one has mentioned any rare fauna. Natural England has no comments to make on this application, which shows their support for political solutions.
- Similarly, the Pollution Team appears to know nothing about the subject and do not see any pollution by the very presence of up to 100 new houses, each generating tons of waste every day.
- The number of objections to this proposal has been unprecedented and nearly all of the supporting reports supplied by the developers have been flawed. Yet, I have serious concerns that political needs will over-ride residents' concerns
- Impact on public transport
- Our properties will lose value for a considerable while and some, such as Morpeth Close, will certainly depreciate.

Building for life – resident critique

- So far the public presentation, resident feedback and joint discussions, show no signs of following the spirit of BfL12
- We think that at the point of planning permission is too soon, if the decanting of bats from their numerous existing long term roots to an inappropriate shape for the species, inadequately sized for the colony, modern construction probably incompatible materials, poorly chosen and remotely located, over-lit and disturbed by pedestrians and cyclist, dedicated roost, is unsuccessful this should not be a given as a premature credit when the long term success of this (licensed but otherwise illegal action) is not assured success

1b Should there be pedestrian and cycle only routes into and through the development? If so, where should they go?

- Original scheme eroded this existing amenity towards the north-west of the site, the new scheme has not resolved this. - The site plan currently shows no connection through to Caldervale.
- The dedicated and stand alone footpath/cycleway from the underpass to Caldervale has been turned into a road with footpaths putting cyclists at higher risk and pedestrians at risk of HOHO

(half on half off car parking).

- The route of this footpath and cycleway on the road is now contorted and no longer visible; without inter-visibility the users may be discouraged from exploring to determine if there is a way through.
- If the existing route is maintained, a corner of one plot's back garden is lost to maintain the route.
- Secured By Design principles related to landscape and site layout principles need to be considered with the only three small scraps of public open space on the site, these may encourage anti-social behaviour, intimidation or worse and discourage or prevent the use of this important public route used by school children and residents on foot and bike.
- The proposed changes to the south west route is an improvement by providing a highway with footpath both sides, near to the rerouted cycleway/footpath, and adding a new route to Morley way inside the site boundary running parallel to the existing cycleway/footpath outside of the boundary, improving on the publicly displayed site plan.
- It will be important to consider the risk of over-lighting this route near the proposed bat roost putting them at risk of predation; consideration of reclaiming the existing photovoltaic cats-eyes and reusing them or installing new with Photovoltaic and retro-reflective cats-eyes (still work when the rechargeable batteries flatten or die).

1c Where should new streets be placed, could they be used to cross the development site and help create linkages across the scheme and into the existing neighbourhood and surrounding places? Thinking carefully before blocking or redirecting existing routes, particularly where these are well used.

- An existing exit from the proposed estate via the industrial estate is to be closed and reconnection prevented by the close proximity of the proposed social housing
- The existing Morpeth Close narrow residential street is being proposed as the only option for connections from proposed residential development into and through existing estate streets
- Emergency services will no longer get access from the existing link via the industrial estate
- There is only one other option for vehicular traffic access and egress from this site is at the existing North west cycle path route through the existing estates. This option will be most unwelcome by the residents of Caldervale drive as it is too narrow for this purpose, whilst it could be seen as a desirable exit direction.

1d How should the new development relate to existing development? What should happen at the edges of the development site?

- The current proposals shows a combination of house back gardens and road verges up against the site boundary and a road dead end up to a brick wall on the boundary

1e Does the development provide No (or is it close to) community facilities, such as shops, schools, workplaces, parks, play areas, pubs or cafes?

- The development makes no non-residential provisions
- Some community facilities are close but all are full; shops will always welcome more business
- Proposed new retail store by others at Sugarbeet Office site north-east, if it happens,
- Tesco and Coop are in the area along Oundle road to the North and East of the site.
- Public Houses are on Oundle road and in the adjacent villages

2 Facilities and Services

2a Are there enough facilities and services in the local area to support the development?

- No they are already overcrowded or oversubscribed

If not, what is needed?

- - Schools, Doctors, Dentists, Cafes

Where new facilities are proposed:

- None are proposed

2b Are these facilities what the area needs?

2c Are these new facilities located in the right place? If not, where should they go?

2d Does the layout encourage walking, cycling or using public transport to reach them?

3 Public Transport

Does the scheme have good access to public transport to help reduce car dependency?

- Footpaths to bus stops, but the bus routes are hidden from roads so there is little visibility to encourage switching.

3a What can the development do to encourage more people (both existing and new residents) to use public transport more often?

- Bring bus route through adjacent residential estate again?

3b Where should new public transport stops be located?

- No change needed

BfL12 We recommend that you avoid

- For example, bus only routes (or bus plugs) can be used to connect a new development to an existing development and create a more viable bus service without creating a 'rat run' for cars.
- We have 6 rush-hour rat-runs already, we do not need anymore
- One rat-run will be closed off by this development

4. Meeting local housing requirements

Does the development have a mix of housing types and tenures that suit local requirements?

4a What types of homes, tenure and price range are needed in the area (for example, starter homes, family homes or homes for those downsizing)?

- There is a national and local need for more bungalows for elderly, downsizing and disabled
If bungalows were built here existing elderly residents could move to this site and stay local to their friends and families, freeing up more homes for families
Bungalows for the elderly would potentially reduce the overall numbers of cars in the development and reduce the number of journeys through the surrounding estate
1-2 bedroom homes are required apparently, so that is what is proposed for the Social housing

4b Is there a need for different types of home ownership (such as part buy and part rent) or rented properties to help people on lower incomes?

- 15% of the site is intended for 29% rented social housing (objected to by residents)
No opportunities are being offered to Self-builders

4c Are the different types and tenures spatially integrated to create a cohesive community?

- No the original scheme put the social housing on the west side of the site was inadequately planned
- The later version keeps all the social housing in one u shaped block of terraces turning its back on the remainder of the site, not blended in
- The other 69% of properties are a mixture of sizes and formats: terraced (objected to by residents), semi- and detached.
- A mixture of 5 Detached, 30 Semi-detached, 34 terraced

5 Character

Does the scheme create a place with a locally inspired or otherwise distinctive character?

5a How can the development be designed to have a local or distinctive identity?

- A mixture of 5 Detached, 30 Semi-detached, 34 terraced
- Predominantly flat site
- Site is surrounded by tall mature trees give an impression of surrounding countryside

- Dense tree and hedge row to site perimeter against views of dual carriageway Parkways and slip roads and its street lighting
- Scattered and 67 mature trees throughout the site, plus hedgerows, bushes and shrubs
- Predominantly single storey buildings with shallow monopitch roofs

5b Are there any distinctive characteristics within the area, such as building shapes, styles, colours and materials or the character of streets and spaces that the development should draw inspiration from?

- The existing site is predominantly single storey, but includes a two storey building despite assurances to residents at the time of construction that all would be single storey
- The surrounding estate buildings include: Bungalows, Chalet Bungalows and 2 Storey Homes
Yellow and pale pink, red, brown, coloured bricks and dark grey roof tiles
No Terraces and no blocks of 3 storey buildings.

6 Working with the site and its context

Does the scheme take advantage of existing topography, landscape features (including water courses), trees and plants, wildlife habitats, existing buildings, site orientation and microclimate?

- Trees and Plants: No advantage to be taken of the over 40 years old trees, the whole site is to be clear felled of trees (only 1 of 67 is shown to be retained) and plants and put back tarmac roads and pavements, houses and gardens
- Topography: The site is predominantly flat with 3 raised banks and under pass ramps, to the west.
- The site of a raised bank with silver birch tree coppice is proposed to become a SuDS settlement pond requiring felling, leveling and excavating
- Landscape features: Trees: 67 mature >40 year old trees, the intention is that the 'trees are unlikely to stay'
- Many trees with hedgerows or bushes are dense and continuous or in clusters
Foxes, Muntjac deer, Hedgehogs all frequent the area, but we do not know where there habitats are
- We do know that bats occupy parts of the site and occupy numerous exiting buildings
- A survey has revealed the existing buildings that have been empty for over 20 years, do have bat colonies, the intention is to demolish them and provide compensatory, accommodation and bat roost in a risky location on the site adjacent to an illuminated footpath and cycleway.
- All of this is presumptuous and risky for the bat colonies.
- All the buildings are intended for demolition rather than refurbishment to make sheltered housing using the existing bungalows
- The site runs North-South and it lends itself to easterly, southerly and westerly solar access.
- The current layout ignores solar orientation and only some properties benefit from easterly and westerly rear elevations and with potential for summer evening overheating of bedrooms

6a Are there any views into or from the site that need to be carefully considered?

- One conical tree forms the focal point and makes a great view north onto the site from the industrial estate link road from the south and can continue to do so.
- It should be retained weather there is a link road or not.
- There are two more of the same species trees in close proximity
- 4 Cherry trees demarcate a pedestrian route and vista into the site from the north
- Numerous Silver Birch form a coppice on the western side of the site on a raised bank, it is a popular site for picnics and wedding photographs
- One Lime tree is known to support a bat population foraging for food at the north end of the site, we suspect there may be more of the same species near the site entrance.

6b Are there any existing trees, hedgerows or other features, such as streams that need to be carefully designed into the development?

- 67 existing mature trees, could be saved and designed into the scheme adding dispersed public open spaces

- Site perimeter trees and hedgerows
- "The tree lines that currently provide a barrier between the site and the Parkway and the industrial estate are likely to be retained"
- 'Likely' is not strong enough, we want assurances.
- The hedge rows along the A1260 Parkway will be completely removed in the scheme shown in the Public exhibition.
- The site plan included in the Outline Planning Application avoids the problem outlined above.
- However the trees and shrubs may be deemed to be incompatible with SuDS settlement ponds and may still be removed.
- The suggested, in words only, Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SuDS) has two proposed settlement pond where a raised back and much loved trees exist, there are no evident swales or other components to the SuDS show in the plans.

6c Should the development keep any existing building(s) on the site?

- Yes many of the special supported housing could be saved refurbished and reused
- All the buildings containing bat colonies should be retained and refurbished

If so, how could they be used?

Bungalows or Sheltered housing for the elderly from the exiting local community

7. Creating well defined streets and spaces

Are buildings designed and positioned with landscaping to define and enhance streets and spaces and are buildings designed to turn street corners well?

- No, the scheme proposed in the public exhibition was just a number crunching exercise to see how many plots can be crammed in without any enhancement, place making or safe neighbourhood children play areas, or retaining existing trees
- The revised scheme submitted for outline planning application makes little difference, but removes one block of public open space fills it with social housing and car parking and the remaining open space is dedicated to SuDS settlement ponds.
- The Social Housing in the second scheme creates a 3 sided quadrangle enclosing potentially shared communal space potentially with a westerly orientation, it could be the best place in the development bathed in summer evening sun.
- However it appears to be used entirely for car parking which will become a noisy courtyard with much disruptive activity at night time
- The car parking could have been relocated around the perimeter of the block, leaving the smaller courtyard for social housing health and wellbeing and a focus for communal activity

7a Are buildings and landscaping schemes used to create enclosed streets and spaces?

- Plots with obligation-minimum car-parking provision, but for larger older families insufficient car parking spaces will force considerable on street parking
- Half on half off (HOHO) parking on pavements is inevitable eroding the provision of footpaths for pedestrians, children on bikes, prams and wheelchairs
- Endless roads with on-street parking does not conger up a 'sense of place'

7b Do buildings turn corners well?

- No, many corners are planned as car parking drives at the side of houses in terraces, up to corners
- Cars on those drives will block the views at the corners, potentially making them more dangerous

7c Do all fronts of buildings, including front doors and habitable rooms, face the street?

- A question for Reserved Matters or Full Application rather than Outline Application?

8. Easy to find your way around -Is the development designed to make it easy to find your way around?

8a Will the development be easy to find your way around?

- The original scheme had 3 loop roads, 9 tee junctions, 3 dead end at site boundaries, 1 dead end facing open space, making it difficult to find your way around
- The revised scheme has 3 loop roads, 6 tee junctions, 1 dead end at site boundary is a small

improvement.

- One single road the full length of the site could be something of a drag strip with speeding cars between on-street or HOHO parking

If not, what could be done to make it easier to find your way around?

- Retaining mature trees will provide landmarks to navigate by?

8b Are there any obvious landmarks?

- The undeveloped side of the site with 2 settlement ponds, footpath and cycleway, distinguish themselves from the car lined street on the other
- 1 mature tree retained in a back garden will not help navigate round the site
- Mature trees would be preferred to a 3 storey bulky block of flats may make it easy to find your way around.

8c Are the routes between places clear and direct?

- In the second scheme; one long straight road from one end of the site to the other
- Routes linking these two sides will be simple

Three lengths of road joined by chicanes should not be too difficult to navigate

9. Streets for all - Are streets designed in a way that encourage low vehicle speeds and allow them to function as social spaces?

- The 3 loop roads potentially create a loop road race track
- Loop roads and many off set junctions prevent highest speeds, but may encourage accelerating and breaking between junctions
- Tee junctions are generally considered safer than cross roads which this scheme avoids.
- 6 Tee junctions will mean much breaking and accelerating around the streets

9a Are streets pedestrian friendly and are they designed to encourage cars to drive slower and more carefully?

- Nothing about the original scheme or the submitted scheme suggests this is a consideration
- These are car and other vehicle friendly so that does not make them pedestrian or cycling friendly
- Demarcation of vehicle and pedestrian lines is part of the national requirements standards
- The public exhibition described a scheme free from safety-focused raised crossing tables
- Its is not clear if any are included in the submitted scheme
- The use of dropped curbs makes crossings easier with prams, wheelchairs and bikes

9b Are streets designed in a way that they can be used as social spaces, such as places for children to play safely or for neighbours to converse?

- In the submitted scheme one long straight road from one end of the site to the other may encourage speeding
- Inevitable on-street parking will make the streets unsuitable for street play
- There is no public open space left for play and socialising, just slitters of left over strips, this site is overdeveloped
- Front garden to footpath conversations can occur anyway.
- The social housing block inner courtyard could have been a good place for socializing but it will be completely covered in 60 car parking spaces, making no room for children's play, health and wellbeing or socializing.

10. Car parking - Is resident and visitor parking sufficient and well integrated so that it does not dominate the street?

10a Is there enough parking for residents and visitors?

- 2 parking spaces for homes is standard requirement, on-street parking will be inevitable with larger older families
- No dedicated space for visitors parking anywhere, other than on-street parking in east-west link roads
- The social housing layout is void of any details indicating numbers of car parking paces, motor

bike or cycle parking, there is insufficient room for 30 let alone 60 car parking spaces.

- The social housing is an insufficiently developed part of the proposals and is probably inadequate to put 30% of the housing into 15% of the site

10b Is parking positioned close to people's homes?

- 2 frontage car parking spaces, could be permeable pavement for SuDS
- 2 side drives at road junctions making corner visibility bad, could be permeable for SuDS
- Additional spaces could be in the east west link roads on-street parking or HoHo parking (Half on Half off pavements)
- Insufficient car parking for Social Housing may push parking further away, possibly into surrounding streets

10c Are any parking courtyards small in size (generally no more than five properties should use a parking courtyard) and are they well overlooked by neighbouring properties?

- Social Housing car parking need is far greater than is provided for and will push some parking on street and remote from the block and possible off site into neighbouring roads.
- 30 social housing units will share the car parking, all will be overlooked and have the potential to disturb people's sleep evening and morning.

10d Are garages well positioned so that they do not dominate the street scene?

- No garages are indicated all provision is frontages, side drives, and courtyard
- A question for Reserved Matters or Full Application rather than Outline Application?

11. Public & private spaces - Will public and private spaces be clearly defined and designed to have appropriate access and be able to be well managed and safe in use?

11a What types of open space should be provided within this development?

- All public open space on the site is now occupied by buildings or SuDS settlement ponds suggesting overdevelopment
- Make the settlement ponds safe for children's play with places for parents to observe
- Cycle routes and footpaths ran along grass verges, raised banks and coppices, these will now be turned into SuDS settlement ponds
- Retain the existing coppice on the mound, it is a popular spot for local residents
- Design the building layout to fit between the trees and create public open space around them
- Retain all the mature trees and make something of them, make them places in their own right
- Make the most of the shade and cooling provided by mature trees and hedgerows as we progress towards Climate Emergency conditions
 - SuDS settlement Pond might provide foraging for bats and other wildlife if the right plants and trees are provided in their vicinity.
- Retaining the existing mature trees (lime trees in particular) may well provide the necessary foraging sources for bats and birds

11b Is there a need for play facilities for children and teenagers?

- Yes but nothing indicated so far and no open space is left for them
- Consider exercise equipment for children and oldies along the footpath/cycleways if there is any room left
- If so, is this the right place or should the developer contribute towards an existing facility in the area that could be made better?
- There is no room on this overdeveloped site, under-develop this site and make space of health and wellbeing, or spread it further afield

11c How will they be looked after?

- SuDS should need little maintenance
- Settlement ponds will need some maintenance or margin planting
- PCC landscape maintenance department, unless they want to pay the community to do the job for them

12. External storage and amenity space -Is there adequate external storage space for bins and recycling, as well as vehicles and cycles?

- A question for Reserved Matters or Full Application rather than Outline Application?
- Probably more important an issue for Social Housing layout
- The social housing layout is void of any details indicating numbers of segregation bins for recycling, spaces for cars, motor bike or cycle parking, there is insufficient room for 30 let alone 60 car parking spaces.
- The social housing is a insufficiently developed part of the proposals and is probably inadequate to put 30% of the housing into 15% of the site

12a Is storage for bins and recycling items fully integrated, so that these items are less likely to be left on the street?

- The social housing is a insufficiently developed part of the proposals and is probably inadequate to put 30% of the segregation bins into 15% of the site
- To contain segregation bins for recycling and encourage reuse by others

12b Is access to cycle and other vehicle storage convenient and secure?

- The social housing is a insufficiently developed part of the proposals and is probably inadequate for convenient and secure storage for cycle and other vehicles
- But with car parking on front garden/drive there may not be enough provision for bike storage

A reconsultation was undertaken on 3rd November 2020. The representations received are summarised below.

Summary of Objections received – second round

Principle

- Despite public comments, little has changed from the first planning application.
- Why not a village hall, a community centre? Leaving the area green and not another concrete jungle.
- This is a quiet, desirable estate on which to live that he going to be spoilt for the greed of the developers and fulfilling the quota of housing for PCC.
- Why can we not do something for the children update the parks or build something that will encourage our children.
- There is plenty of room for new development sites on the outskirts of Peterborough
- You are ruining a beautiful place. Peterborough has become a joke!
- The land can be used for better purposes.
- The site itself lends to the construction of high quality family homes.
- Is it needed - thousands of homes are being built on the outskirts of Peterborough(Hampton)
- Another council decision - cramming in more housing while not developing in parts of the city where there is adequate space.

Character

- The revised plan is still not in-keeping with the local area.
- The layout has changed to accommodate several blocks of flats, rather than just one eyesore.
- Flats are not in keeping with the surrounding properties, especially if they exceed two storeys.
- This whole estate was built in the 1960's and is of low density housing.
- The plan now has 20 detached houses, with garages – will these be 3-4 storeys high?
- Do we have any assurance that houses will be limited to 2 storey not 3
- The area has a quiet village feel which is why most of us live here, why change that?
- Botolph Green/Gretton Close, less houses, but bigger houses, this is something that would work much better in this quiet and attractive residential location.

- The homes would be of much lower value than the surrounding area potentially changing the makeup of the community.

Overdevelopment

- The housing density is different from the estate it is joining.
- The developers acknowledge the constraints and challenges – because they are trying to cram in too many houses on a small site.
- The number of houses is way too many for such a small site.
- Why do we have to have so many houses built on little nooks and cranny that become empty?
- 50 or 60 would make me a lot happier than 100.
- A limited build of 50 homes sensitively designed around the existing environment would be a reasonable compromise for this site.
- The area is predominantly pre 70's housing, spaced out housing with front gardens. In contrast the development would have banks of car parking, 1m deep front gardens.
- It is evident that the proposal is overdevelopment and too dense for the context.
- It seems this is a stack them high profit grab by the builders with no concern for safety.
- I support the building of houses but the number of houses seems to be a great concern.
- The high density will impact on the neighbourhood character.
- Lockdown has shown the importance of gardens, not postage stamp yards.
- Despite objections there is no reduction in dwellings.

Highway implications

Transport Assessment

- The revised plan does not address traffic impact concerns and the TA cannot be relied upon.
- No traffic survey was ever conducted on Royston Avenue and to do so now, in these unusual times, would not truly reflect the normal amount of traffic.
- Royston Avenue/Oundle Road junction is subject to significant congestion during am peak with queues being regularly observed backing up past Dry Leys.
- The proposed development would exacerbate queuing and delays – both junctions should be assessed.
- Flawed traffic distribution which only considers direct journey to work trips. This fails to assign the significant number of diverted link vehicle trips within the neighbourhood accessing Oundle Rd via Royston Avenue for St. Botolph Primary School/Nene Park Academy, Nene Park Way and Orton Southgate Business Park.
There will be an increase in traffic resulting from large housing developments/Lidl at Sugar Way and the Showground.
- MP Shailesh Vara objected to the previous plan and said the traffic assessment is inaccurate and should not be relied upon.
- Stationary traffic on Oundle Road cause tail backs on the Nene Parkway (A1260) at junction 32 all the way to junction 33 effectively creating 3 lanes of traffic - this is just a recipe for a serious accident – the police and emergency services should comment on this known blackspot.
- There needs to be an investigation into the root cause of the traffic problem down Oundle road and a commitment to rectify it.
- The TA fails to establish valid baseline traffic patterns, has major flaws in the trip assignments/capacity assessment and therefore the conclusions of the no significant impacts cannot be relied on.
- The TA should address the omissions and flaws prior to the application being determined.
- There is still no clear description of the impact of increased traffic.
- Given the Covid situation, another traffic survey will not be representative.

Existing Situation

- The area will not cope with the extra traffic and the damage to the area will never recover.
- 100 houses with at least 2 cars a property - nearly 200 cars to adding to the existing problematic Oundle road at peak times.
- The previous use is likely to attract vehicle traffic less so at peak times, as well as a different type of visitor, who are more likely to approach on the parkway highway network from across the city.
- Residential use of the site is likely to result in more local traffic at peak times.
- The traffic in Royston Avenue will be queuing past Sheringham Way making it difficult to get out of my driveway.
- It will also affect traffic turning right onto Shrewsbury Avenue from Oakleigh Drive and Thornleigh Drive.
- There is always a lot of traffic through Newcastle Drive and Shrewsbury Avenue. This development will add to this.
- Drivers take a shortcut via Tollhouse Road speed down Latham Avenue and then use Hillward close to join the rat run on Royston Avenue.
- We are now at a point where anybody living in the Orton Longueville estate has no easy way out of the estate during the rush hour.
- It takes over half an hour to travel less than the one mile.
- Oundle Road is at a standstill in the mornings.
- In the mornings, cars are queuing on the parkway back to the holiday Inn roundabout.
- There is a lot of congestion between 07:30 and 09:00.
- To get from my house to the slip road onto the A1260 Nene Parkway, can take 20-30 mins to complete.
- Cars speed down Newcastle Drive as it is to cut through when the traffic is built up from Shrewsbury Ave and Oundle Road.
- Even now during this covid pandemic the levels of traffic can be quite high.
- The local authorities should focus on improving the traffic flow not adding another development.
- Thornleigh drive, Sheringham and Royston are too narrow for heavy traffic, makes passing other cars difficult. It's a miracle there isn't more accidents.
- The existing roads are extremely narrow which makes passing other cars difficult, pushing cars closer to and impacting on the pavements.
- The problematic rat runs are throughout the estate on every road that links the two main roads of Shrewsbury Avenue and the Oundle Road.
- The crossing on Shrewsbury Ave causes queues in the rush hour making leaving the estate very hard.
- Not enough room on our small estate to cope with extra traffic!
- We have enough problems with people using the cycle path and back streets as a rat run - nothing has been done about it.
- Oakleigh drive will become a rat run for the site.
- The quality of the road surfaces in the area is already poor with the added vehicular this would be made worse.
- I have asked in the past if new road markings could be put down be to no avail and perhaps speed bumps but again to no avail.
- It is a wonder that we do not experience accidents daily on our narrow and tight cornered roads around the estate, with drivers that do not live locally, flying along at full speed in their haste to avoid the traffic lights.
- There will be accidents with the additional 200+ cars and delivery vehicles from the new development.
- During the school run in the mornings the traffic queues all the way up Royston Avenue and I have great difficulty exiting my drive to get to work.

- There are a number of blind spots i.e. junction of Newcastle Drive/Oakleigh Road/Caldervale/Thornleigh Drive and Sheringham Road due number of cars parked on the left.
- Roads leading from the Oundle Road to Oakleigh Drive (Royston Ave, Sherringham Way, Thornleigh Drive) are incredibly narrow, with some sharp/blind bends, and are precarious enough, particularly at busy times, when traffic is queuing around parked cars
- Parking is at a premium already in this area and with the increase of traffic, this would make the situation intolerable.
- There is no suitable access road for this application without clogging narrow roads with cars parked on each side.
- Local roads which will feed into this estate were never designed for this amount of traffic.
- Increase the danger of crossing the roads, especially for the elderly & children.
- The pavements are also frequently used by children walking to the nearby schools – the development would increase risk of harm to them by way of road traffic accidents.
- The extra traffic will also place a greater risk on school children who use the adjoining streets to avoid the main Oundle Rd.
- As a local resident and local business owner I will be affected both personally and professionally, my business entry/exit is onto Shrewsbury Avenue which can be challenging already!
- Who will take responsibility for the injury or god forbid death of a child as not all drivers abide by the speed restrictions?
- Within the last 12 months there has been at least 5 minor/major accidents where Shrewsbury avenue turns into Newcastle drive. One of a few reasons is that residents and work-vans (from businesses and home improvements happening) park on both sides of the street and always up on the kerbs.
- People and commercial vehicles park on these roads and access for emergency vehicles is already hazardous.
- Are all the existing footpaths/cycle ways being retained
- If this development does go ahead then Traffic calming needs to be implemented on the roads and the narrow roads/pavements should be made safer for pedestrians.
- It puzzles me how the planners expect an already busy thoroughfare, to cope with additional traffic.
- The layby at the shops on Oakleigh Drive is already inadequate. This causes more congestion, both in the daytimes and evenings as there are 2 takeaways.
- Has anyone making these decision even visited these areas and at peak times.
- I suggest the planning committee take to their cars and see for themselves the dangers this size of development would bring to the area traffic wise.

Access

- Without broader amendments to the highway access, there will be significant impact on local residents for such a dense development.
- The size and nature of the development is not suitable for the relatively difficult access.
- The access is inadequate and would involve all traffic to the new development using the existing housing estate roads.
- The existing housing areas which are not suitable and to increase traffic flow would be more dangerous for users of vehicles cyclists and pedestrians.
- Morpeth Road is less suitable, narrow and congested with parking associated with the existing house frontages.
- You need to block off the end of Morpeth close to ensure the safety of children and current residents.
- There needs to be separate road access created.
- A new access road could also be constructed along the alignment of the existing cycleway foot path which runs between the housing area and the Wainman Road estate.

- Morpeth Close is supposed to be a close, not a road.
- It is unbelievable that the Highways Department and the Planning Department think that one exit/entrance to the new development is sufficient.
- Morpeth Close is not fit for 200 plus cars going through several times a day.
- The increase in traffic down Oakleigh Drive is going to be detrimental to the area unless another access point is put in place
- Many children use Talbot Avenue and Morpeth Way as their cycle route.

Closure of Wainman Road Access

- Objection to the closure of Wainman Road
- Wainman Road is the main access to the Gloucester Centre and has not caused any problems.
- Closing Wainman Road as it is deemed a rat run through the estate appears the priority.
- Rat-runs will only be made worse by the closing off the access which has existed for over 30 years.
- Where is the sense of increasing traffic and reducing access putting the elderly and young people at risk.
- If there is no alternative access how can you expect any resident nearby to agree to this application?
- Currently, although Wainman road access reduces traffic on Oakleigh Drive.
- To close access from Wainman road and in addition building 100 homes is most ill advised.
- Wainman Road is a public highway and it will still be required to access this site.
- Sharing the options to access the development would reduce the through flow of traffic and avoid a bottleneck on Oakleigh Drive.
- Wainman Road could be left open and improved.

Parking

- There is never enough car parking on new estates so we foresee an overspill on to the surrounding roads - namely Morpeth Close and Oakleigh Drive, creating extra hazard when travelling around the estate.
- The proposed plans wouldn't allow for private parking for each dwelling. Morpeth Close is a narrow road and with the potential of parked cars building up would impact on flow of traffic.
- Flats will need 12 -14 car parking spaces per block, plainly there is not enough provision

Construction Traffic

- HGV and other heavy vehicles would be rolling down the streets for the next year.
- The current roads are not going to cope with the heavy construction traffic
- Construction traffic poses a risk to the young and elderly residents.
- How are the construction lorries gaining access to the site with only one entry?
- Mud will be spread through the estate especially on Newcastle Drive and Oakleigh Drive.

Pollution

- An extra 200-400 cars will generate extra noise & pollution.
- We are trying to reduce pollution, but more and more is being created in areas where it is already high with the parkway.
- This will have many safety concerns and environmental impact which feels like Peterborough City Council are not taking into consideration.
- This area already has to live with the constant noise from surrounding factories and businesses.
- The noise pollution created would be damaging to our elderly community and to our wildlife.
- Pollution is already at a dangerous level and will get worse,
- Residents wellbeing will suffer causing more people sent to already over stretched doctors and hospitals.

- The air quality of the new houses being so close to a busy dual carriageway would be very poor at busier times.
- Our kids already breathe in enough toxic fumes from stationary traffic.
- There are no significant comments from the Pollution Officer on the impact of this on the local community .

Facilities/Amenities

- There are not enough facilities, or doctors and you struggle to get appointments now.
- The schools, doctors can't cope as it is.
- There's not enough schools, doctors surgery's etc already and that's without the new sugar way build and this proposal
- Local residents accept that this land will be developed, but 100 houses, 250-400 additional people and no additional services, does not make a happy community.

Biodiversity

- Bats - No licence has yet been obtained. Bats are now hibernating and will not come out of hibernation until March, when the proposed demolition will take place.
- No mitigation for the bat habitation has taken place to date and it is already too late for next spring.
- The Barn scheme remains grossly inadequately sized (in all three dimensions) for the bat species it is intended to serve.
- Bat habitats are protected and if no provision is made and destruction is carried out, this will be against the Wildlife and Countryside Act and illegal.
- Environmentally you are proposing to destroy mature trees and affect the bat and bird colonies nesting. This must be illegal right?
- There seems only lip service is being paid to environmental concerns regarding the bat colonies.
- I object to trees being removed and bats being dislodged from their homes.
- No one is convinced the new bat boxes to a new site will help the bats but instead kill them off.
- Natural England has endorsed the plan, since it is not a Site of Special Scientific Interest. However, they have clearly not been informed of the fauna and flora, including endangered species that inhabit the site and must be protected by law.
- Peterborough Planning very much follows this view, since they have not requested placement of the bat boxes, justification of their siting, monitoring to see whether anybody is requesting a viewing (bats, of course) and how long it will take for any bats to decide to occupy these bat boxes or bat barn.
- What will happen to all the other displaced species is anybody's guess.
- Rare butterflies seen in the area. Demolishing their habitat is wrong when too many animals, wild flowers being made extinct by over building.
- I urge planning to deny this planning and live up to the signs entering Peterborough - ENVIRONMENT CAPITAL
- The flora will disappear, as they are no significance to Peterborough City Council green credentials.
- The area has all kinds of wildlife living in this area like Jack deer, hedgehogs and newts.
- Loss of trees equals loss of bird habitat and bat feeding grounds.

Impact on trees

- Trees will be destroyed and pollution will go up.
- You haven't said exactly what is going to happen to the trees and wildlife.

- The environmental impact of felling trees is huge trees absorb large amounts of toxic gases from around the area.
- Some trees and shrub areas are now to be retained, which is positive, but still, 60 plus mature, healthy trees are to be destroyed.
- Some existing trees clash with the housing layout.
- It is not a full planning application so more trees could be lost.
- Please can we have assurances that indicated new trees and bushes are part of the developer commitment.
- It also shows that some of the beloved trees (E.g. the 4 cherries will be in the SuDS pond) are to be translocated – they should be retained with root ball protected.
- Some trees will be in the new property's gardens, what is to prevent the new owners from chopping them down?
- The proposed demolition is March 2021 – the bird nesting season. This will be against the Wildlife and Countryside Act and illegal.
- Loss of trees and habitat isn't very environmental, especially as Peterborough is 'The Environmental Capital'.
- PCC want to be known as the greener city, yet your allowing perfectly healthy mature tree's cut down.
- The WSP Arboreal is a work of fiction, since it clearly demonstrates no knowledge of bat behaviour and the tree management plan is confusing and simply does not make sense.
- The mature trees block a lot of sound and pollution from the parkway.
- It says these trees are going to be dug up with a root ball taken with them but moved to other areas not stated, these should be added back into the plans so they can be enjoyed by the local people that they were meant for!
- They are destroying mature trees, yet have pushed for tree planting schemes.
- Residents would rather keep existing mature trees – It will be years or decades before saplings replace the full function of a mature tree.
- Peterborough Planning are pushing through this application without regard to the concerns of residents and the plight of the fauna and flora of this quiet haven.

Open space

- It would be nice to see more green areas, aligning with Public Health England's report - "Improving access to greenspace - A new review for 2020". It emphasis green space as an important asset for supporting health and well-being.
- It is important to have more greenspace by reducing the house numbers and this will positively impact the mental health of new and existing residents.

Amenity

- My property backs onto the Gloucester Centre and I object to the proposed building of 100 new homes on the Gloucester Centre due to increase in noise, pollution, traffic.
- I will personally feel the impact of over 200 cars passing my house 24/7 enormously.
- There will be more litter around the area.
- Please do consider the local community that already exists here.
- You need to listen to the residents that live here and act accordingly.
- Property along boundary wall to Gloucester Centre ground level lower by approx 1 half meters allowing new residents to overlook into our properties.
- New builds will also cause loss of light and overshadowing to properties along boundary.
- I also understand from planning flats not built because they don't blend in with surrounding area?
- The development will impact on views of open spaces/trees.

- It would also increase the noise significantly in what is supposed to be a peaceful residential area.
- This proposal also ruins the quiet paths from Caldervale to the underpass which almost every dog walker uses at least twice a day with no other quiet walk with decent length.
- We bought this house due to the quiet nature of the area, the friendly and local feel and minimal traffic past my address, especially as I have young children.

Drainage

- From an environmental perspective it is not good to concrete over so much land. Is there capacity for all the runoff rainwater?

Crime

- Flats - just look at the areas in Peterborough that have crime and you want to create another area for the crime rate to go up.
- Finally, it has been known in other areas of the UK when building 'affordable housing' and flats that crime increases, this would be devastating as burglaries in Orton Longueville are already an ongoing issue.

Consultation

- This is the second time that PCC has issued a planning application during a national lockdown.
- While the country is in the midst of the worst pandemic in over 100 years, PCC planning decided to published the revised planning application – during the second lock down
- At the start of the pandemic and subsequent lockdown in March 20, PCC planning published two very important and controversial applications - the Bat Barn and bat boxes on telegraph poles (ref 20/00282/FUL) and - phased demolition of all buildings (ref 20/00411/PRIOR).
- I objected to the "approval by stealth" approach and PPC Planning's complete disregard of residents' objections and was told that they were simply following the Government guideline of "business as usual".
- I was informed by the head of Peterborough Planning that the prior notification application had the council not decided the application within the timeframe specified in the legislation then the demolition would have gained automatic consent.
- If automatic consent was a given, why did Peterborough Planning advertise the application on the portal and invite comments when the application was not even required to be considered?
- There were revised important documents that were placed on the portal the day before Peterborough Planning approved it (even though it was unnecessary).
- Was it Peterborough showing bias and supporting this proposal ie rubber stamping it to make it legal, despite the effects it would have on the local community.
- Further, the head of Peterborough Planning stated "As the buildings are of no architectural or historical merit we could not have reasonably refused consent". The buildings may be of no architectural or historical merit, but they are habitats for many species of fauna, including endangered bats.
- The 2 week time scale for residents to respond is unacceptable.
- PCC have also failed to notify every resident by post.
- Many residents are elderly and do not have access to the internet and following government guidelines, staying home and not going out to buy stamps and posting letters.
- It will be impossible for their voices to be heard.
- The time scale may be the normal response time, but we are not living in normal times.
- Peterborough Planning appears to be following the "business as usual" rules to the extreme.
- The whole issue of public consultations on this development has been underhand, and a sham from the start. Shame on you PCC.

- Little has changed from the previous outline plan - simply re-arranged a few house and appear to be saving some trees.
- The supporting documents produced from various City Council service groups simply give "no comment" or views remain the same as previous.
- There was no obvious site plan so what are we commenting upon at this stage?
- It is not colour coded so it is unclear where pavement stops and landscape starts/ and to determine if there is enough parking
- 4 Units are not easily distinguished (Houses or Social Housing?)

Misc

- I often wonder whether the planning department really think about what developments they allow to be built.
- I am concerned that my property is going to lose value due to the planned redevelopment.
- The value of nearby houses will be affected, especially if they were to be used as social housing/bought by landlords wanting to buy cheap to rent out.
- PCC has not looked into this proposal with any professionalism or depth. The lack of understanding you continue to display is alarming.
- Those who are supporting this development is a case of it's ok as long as it's not in my back yard.
- I find it an absolute disgrace that all of the objections that were previously made on this development have been completely disregarded
- The fact that you ask residents their opinion and then take absolutely no notice says it all for me.
- What is the point of objecting if we are not listened to?
- This is all being now pushed through when we are in pandemic situation and many unable to object.
- Too many houses, which I can only assume is to give the developers the biggest return. Where is all the water and waste going to go?
- I am fully aware of how the developers work, and if enough money is put forward, they will get their own way.
- The correspondence between Savills and the Planning Officer (letter dated 19/10/20) is a typical "Boris Letter" (vague and without details). It is full of jargon, eg "pinch point", vague comments about the impact on Morpeth Close (what about Newcastle Drive, Oakleigh Drive, Thornleigh Drive, etc, etc), mentions "blocks of flats" (not in keeping with the houses on the estate) and glosses over the plight of wildlife on the site (bat licences !, bat boxes!, monitoring ?, etc).
- Peterborough Planning is following the Peterborough Plan and will push through this development regardless of the impact on residents and the environment.
- They are determined and have power to do anything they want regardless of the distress caused to residents.
- They are insisting on Social housing on this site, yet have none in the Fletton Keys development.
- They are destroying habitat of endangered species, yet claim green credentials.
- The legacy of the Great Leader will be a concrete jungle, surrounded by huge warehouses and beware if you go into zombie city centre at night.

Support

- Contrary to the numerous objections being voiced and petitions being brought to my door I have no objections to the proposed development and in fact see it as an opportunity for the Conservative led council to "walk the walk" rather than their usual practice of "talking the talk"
- I would suggest that one of the petitioners at my door let the real reason for their objections slip when ,after her list of reasons, added that the development would include "social housing".

5 Assessment of the planning issues

a) Background

The hospital buildings are considered surplus to requirement by the NHS and therefore the site has been sold to the applicant - Homes England. The applicant has entered into pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority.

A planning application has been approved for the construction of a Bat Barn and the erection of 5 poles to accommodate Bat Boxes. The proposal is for the provision of mitigation and compensation measures for when the buildings housing the bat roosts are demolished. – ref. 20/00282/FUL.

An application for Prior Approval has been approved for the demolition of the buildings within the Gloucester Centre site - ref. 20/00411/PRIOR.

b) The Principle of Development

The application site is allocated for residential development within the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (LP37.21) for up to 100 dwellings. This allocation establishes the principle for residential development at this site.

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise (NPPF para. 47). At para. 11 of the NPPF it is advised that decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development and development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan should be approved without delay.

Furthermore, there is a presumption in favour of the redevelopment of Brownfield land. The NPPF para. 118 advises that substantial weight be given to the using of suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs.

The proposal would also contribute towards the City Council's housing land supply and the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes.

The site lies within the urban area boundary and is well related to existing facilities within Orton Longueville including a public house, recreation area, convenience store, post office, primary school, secondary school and medical practice; all within a reasonable distance to the site.

Up to 100 dwellings are proposed at the site, 30% of which will be affordable housing in accordance with policy LP8 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan. This would be secured through a S106 agreement. It is envisaged that the new homes will be a mix of sizes and house types in accordance with the latest Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

Representations:

A number of the neighbour representations received have queried the need for the development stating that Peterborough is already over populated and significant building of residential areas is taking place all around Peterborough. They query the need for low cost housing, that outlying areas of Peterborough are more able to accommodate the demand for new homes and suggest alternative uses such as homes for the elderly, office development, a community centre and so on.

As stated above the decision to build houses on this site has already been made with allocation of the site for residential development and the adoption of the Local Plan. Despite the number of developments that are taking place across Peterborough there is a need for 942 dwellings per year,

starting in 2016. The overall housing need for the plan period is therefore 18,840 homes between 2016 to 2036. This development would meet some of this housing need.

Comments have also been made on the impact on the existing character of the area. There is significant objection to the proposed flats. The layout has been amended showing 4 no. flatted developments rather than one larger flatted development on the initial layout. It is not considered that the development of the site for residential use would impact on the surrounding area as this comprises primarily residential development. The design and scale of the development would be considered at reserved matters stage, when consideration will be given to the impact on the existing character of the area. It is accepted that there are currently no flats within the immediate surroundings and developments are a maximum of two storey in height, however providing any proposed development is sensitive to existing neighbouring amenity, development higher than two storey could be accommodated on site without impacting on the visual amenity of the area.

It is also accepted that the existing residential developments do occupy more generous plots, however they are of their time and unfortunately with modern developments there are more land constraints. However, the development would need to respect the surrounding character whilst at the same time make efficient use of the site.

Concerns have also been raised regarding the provision of affordable homes on this site. Policy LP8 requires that for sites of 15 or more dwellings, 30% of dwellings should be affordable to ensure new housing delivers a balanced mix of housing tenures to meet all housing needs. The applicant proposes that 30% of the dwellings would be affordable and has provided an indication of the affordable house types, however, this would be agreed at a later stage.

It has been queried as to why some developments, for example, Fletton Quays do not provide any social housing. Each case is considered on its merits and in the case of Fletton Quays a viability appraisal demonstrated that providing affordable housing on site would not be viable.

Some concerns have been raised regarding the impact which this development will have in terms of pressures on existing services and that there are already insufficient facilities. Whilst these concerns are noted the site is allocated for development so the principle of locating development here is established. The application will make a payment toward local infrastructure under the Council's Infrastructure Levy charge (CIL).

There are a number of objections to the density of the development. The allocation proposes an indicative number of 100 dwellings on the site. The application proposed is for up to 100 dwellings. The illustrative plan indicates that the site could accommodate up to 100 dwellings however, it is not known at this stage what the number of bedrooms would be and the number of car parking spaces required, and so on. Therefore it is not known at this stage whether 100 dwellings could be accommodated on site and the numbers could well be less.

The principle of residential development on this site would accord with policy LP8 and LP37 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan and is supported subject to meeting the criteria of other relevant planning policy and material considerations.

c) Highway implications

Transport Assessment

A Transport Assessment (TA) has been submitted in support of the application in order to assess the likely impacts of the proposed development. A study has been undertaken covering the surrounding highway network to the north, east, south and west and includes Morpeth Close, Oakleigh Drive, Newcastle Drive, Wainman Road, Shrewsbury Avenue, Morley Way, the A605 Oundle Road and the A1260 Nene Parkway. Data on the existing traffic patterns and flows, a number of junctions, turning counts, queue lengths and Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) was obtained by surveys undertaken at the end of June 2018.

The TA states that as the proposed development will be replacing an existing land use the change in the overall number of trips generated by the site will be insignificant. In addition, the vehicle movements generated by the proposed development will also become dispersed across the surrounding highway network, and as such the impact of the trips from the proposed development on these routes will be negligible.

The Local Highways Authority has assessed the information contained within the TA. Whilst the TA makes the assertion that there was no significant queueing for any length of time at any of the main junctions on Shrewsbury Avenue, observation of the A605 Oundle Road / Shrewsbury Avenue / Botolph Green signalised junction and the modelling within the TA show that it is congested and operating at capacity.

Furthermore, it has been acknowledged within the TA that there is queueing, observed from video footage, from the A605 Oundle Road / Shrewsbury Avenue / Botolph Green signalised junction that extends through to the Shrewsbury Avenue / Wainman Road junction. However, this has not been acknowledged as being an issue at other junctions in between. It would also be expected that the significant queueing and blocking back through junctions along Shrewsbury Avenue would likely result in queueing along Wainman Road, Newcastle Drive and Oakleigh Drive. LOS values should be shown where RFC values cannot be reported within the junction modelling to help demonstrate whether the junctions are operating within capacity.

Nevertheless, the trip rates, traffic generation and trip distributions are appropriate and due to the proposed development creating less trips than the existing usage of the site, it would be agreed that the proposed development would have no detrimental impact on the highway network. Therefore whilst there are inconsistencies and incorrect statements made about the current situation in the TA, the LHA concedes that as the proposed trips are expected to be less than the current use of the site, the development is considered acceptable in terms of traffic generation.

Concerns have been raised regarding the proposed impact of the development on the existing level of vehicular movements within the area. However, the differences between the existing and proposed person trip arrivals and departures is due to the nature of these land uses. For the existing development the majority of person trip arrivals will be in the AM peak hour as people arrive at work, and the majority of person trip departures will be in the PM peak hour, as people leave work. Whereas, the proposed development is for residential use and as such the majority of person trip arrivals will be in the PM peak hour as people arrive home, and the majority of person trip departures will be in the AM peak hour as people leave home.

The Parish Council and other representations raised the question of why the traffic survey did not include the Royston Avenue junction. This matter has also raised by a number of neighbouring occupiers due to concerns that this is a heavily trafficked junction with intermittent queueing and causes significant congestion problems on the roads surrounding the site and adds to the issue of rat runs causing traffic jams and congestion on other narrow roads. The LHA has advised that this junction was not considered as part of the study area given that the impact of the traffic would be below the minimum threshold for traffic flows, which is in accordance with National and local guidance. Therefore the Local Highway Authority cannot request junction surveys or testing in this.

Furthermore, it is acknowledged that 'Rat Running' does occur through the estate. However this is an existing problem. The situation would not materially change as the development will generate fewer vehicles than the previous use of the Gloucester Centre. This being the case, the Local Highway and Planning Authorities cannot require interventions from the developer.

The question of the cumulative impact arising from planned development on Oundle Road and how/if this will effect Skanska delivering the widening of A605 Oundle Rd between Alwalton & Lynchwood Business Park scheduled to start early next year. The LHA has advised that site at Lynchwood, Alwalton and East of England showground have been factored into the future year modelling for the

A605 widening scheme. In addition there has been an allowance for background growth from developments in other areas of the city.

Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on construction vehicles on the existing roads. It is not known at this stage what the haul route will be however a pre-condition highway survey/inspection would be carried out prior to development. A similar inspection will take place on completion of the development.

In order to maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel to and from the proposed development for future residents, so as to reduce the limited impact of vehicle flows associated with the proposed development, the primary site access road into the site will form part of a number of proposed improvements; these include:

- 2m wide footways along both sides of the primary site access road;
- an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point with dropped kerbs and tactile paving across the primary site access road where it meets Morpeth Close;
- a number of uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points with dropped kerbs and tactile paving across the internal estate roads; and
- walking and cycling links from the site to connect with the surrounding footway / cycleway network.

Access

The means of access to and from the site is a matter for determination under this outline application. Vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access to and from the site will be taken via Morpeth Close via the existing access.

The Local Highways Authority (LHA) had initially requested that Morpeth Close be widened to 5.5m to match the new estate road within the site. However, the width of Morpeth Close is 5.4m which is considered to be acceptable.

The access location will be acceptable subject to it meeting the width of the access being 5.5m with 2m wide footways. As the access will be subject to a Section 278 agreement and the appropriate technical vetting the LHA have no objection to the access arrangements.

A Grampian condition is proposed requiring that no dwelling be occupied unless and until the vehicular access serving the development from Morpeth Close has been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Closure of Wainman Road Access

During pre-application discussions the applicant was advised that the Wainman Road access be permanently closed due to safety issues. There have been a number of objections raised to the closure of the access however, it is not deemed appropriate for a residential development to be accessed through an industrial area.

A recent application has been approved for a change of use of a former communal car park within the Wainman Road industrial estate for car sales ref. 19/00924/FUL. This has reduced the number of car parking spaces within the industrial estate. At the time concerns were raised regarding the impact the loss of the parking area would have on Wainman Road and the likelihood that this would result in cars parked on Wainman Road. Thus this situation is likely to make Wainman Road an even less suitable option for access to the Gloucester Centre.

A condition would be appended to the decision requiring the details for the closure of Wainman Road to be approved by the Local Planning Authority. In addition this would be subject to technical vetting as part of additional section 278 works.

A Tracking Plan will be secured as part of the reserved matters application to ensure a refuse vehicle can access and manoeuvre within the site.

Cycle Network

There is currently no footway provision along the south side of Morpeth Close for its entire length, however there is a shared footway / cycleway that forms part of the Sustrans National Cycle Network Route (NCNR) No. 53, which runs parallel to the south of Morpeth Close, connecting to the footway /cycleway network surrounding the site and beyond.

The illustrative plan shows changes to the cycleway/footway to the north west of the underpass which would be required to implement the drainage basin. The cycleway/footway would continue to the south east of the underpass however, there is currently no link shown with the proposed development. It is considered appropriate for a connecting route to be provided from the south end of the development through to the cycleway that runs parallel to Morpeth close, this would provide a new route for existing and future residents and would avoid unofficial routes being used to cross the grassed areas. These details would be secured by condition.

Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on the quiet paths from Caldervale to the underpass which is regularly used by dog walkers. The illustrative layout proposes a slight change to the alignment of this cycleway/footway however this would not substantially change as a result of the development.

Parking

The illustrative plan submitted demonstrates that there would be sufficient parking to serve the development. However, this would be agreed at reserved matters stage when the number of bedrooms are known. The layout will need to provide car parking and visitor parking in accordance with the parking standards within the Local Plan to ensure there is no impact of vehicles associated with the development on nearby streets.

Construction Traffic

A Construction Management Plan would be secured by condition. This would agree the details of a route for construction vehicles, wheel cleansing, noise and dust mitigation, working hours and so on. It is inevitable that construction traffic will have some impact on residents but this can't be a reason to refuse permission as a matter of principle.

Travel Plan

A Framework Travel Plan has been submitted in support of the application. The Travel Plan contains various measures and initiatives to encourage more sustainable modes of travel and to minimise the use of the car. This is promoted under policy LP13 of the Adopted Local Plan and para. 111 of the NPPF. Upon occupation of each dwelling Travel Information Packs will be provided to the occupier which will contain information regarding travel choices. The pack will also include either a cycle voucher or a Mega rider bus pass. The Travel Information Packs would be secured by a S106 agreement.

The Travel Choice Team has assessed the Travel Plan and advises that the Framework Travel Plan is acceptable.

Having considered all of the above and subject to conditions the highway impacts of the development are considered to be acceptable in accordance with policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

d) Meeting Housing Need

As stated under section a) the proposal would provide 30 affordable dwellings. The current tenure split expected to be delivered on this site is 21 affordable rented homes and 9 intermediate tenure in this instance. This would be agreed at a later stage.

In addition, the policy LP8 requires that all dwellings which would be available as social rented tenures will be required to be built to meet minimum National Space Standards (as defined by Building Regulations). The details submitted under the reserved matters application will be required to demonstrate compliance with this policy.

Policy LP8 also requires that all new dwellings should meet the part M4(2) of the Building Regulations to ensure that the dwellings would be adaptable for the changing needs of future applicants. On all development proposals of 50 dwellings or more, 5% of homes should meet Building Regulations Part M4(3)(2)(a). The details submitted under the reserved matters application will be required to demonstrate compliance with this policy.

The proposal would therefore accord with policy LP8 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

e) Noise

A Noise Survey was undertaken in December 2018 and comprised both attended and unattended measurements designed to capture representative noise levels from road traffic and commercial activities at the Wainman Road Commercial Estate. The survey acknowledges the site is relatively exposed to road traffic noise and therefore comprises a high-risk development site in terms of noise exposure. Noise assessment work has informed the evolution of the indicative layout to ensure that it responds appropriately to noise as a constraint.

The established commercial uses at Wainman Road were also considered early in the design process to ensure that the development would not result in unacceptable commercial noise impacts for future occupiers or create conditions likely to be detrimental to the continuation of those commercial uses in the future.

The Survey concludes that the indicative layout responds appropriately to noise constraints via buffering, screening, orientation, façade mitigation and the use of noise barriers, where necessary and that acceptable noise levels can be achieved in all internal and external residential amenity areas, subject to relevant detailed design calculations being undertaken at the design stage.

The Noise Pollution Officer has assessed the information submitted and considers that the assessment demonstrates that compliance with the national standards for acceptable noise levels in both internal and external residential amenity area can be achieved with some mitigation measures. Further work is therefore required during the final design process, a condition is required to ensure that suitable mitigation is provided.

It is accepted that the indicative layout has changed since the submission of the noise report. However, the layout is only indicative at this stage and the reserved matters application will need to demonstrate that acceptable noise levels, both internal and external, would be achievable.

It is considered that based on the information within the noise survey a design solution and appropriate mitigation measures would be available to address the noise implications of the site. The proposal therefore accords with para. 180 of the NPPF and policy LP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

There will inevitably be noise from construction but this will be managed as best as it practically can via a construction management plan.

The occupation of the proposed houses will not be unacceptable with the adjacent dwellings on noise grounds.

f) Drainage

The application is located in Flood Zone 1 and supported by a Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy. A Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) hierarchy has been followed in applying the use of sustainable drainage techniques to the proposed development.

As stated above the initial scheme proposed two drainage basins, however due to the number of trees which would have been lost this has been reduced to one basin. The basin would be used as the primary means of surface water attenuation. This will provide a level of treatment, notably with the inclusion of a sediment forebay, as well as biodiversity benefits on top of being an efficient means of surface water attenuation. Swales may be used to convey and/or attenuate surface water. Permeable surfacing is proposed in car parking areas across the site as a method of collecting water from the hard standing and providing source control as well as an element of upstream storage and pre-treatment.

Infiltration is not feasible within the site due to the presence of clays. No watercourses were identified as suitable for surface water discharge. It is therefore proposed to discharge to the existing Anglian Water surface water sewer located at the northwest site boundary. It is proposed that the discharge rate would provide a marked level of betterment over the existing offsite discharge.

Anglian Water has requested that a surface water management condition be appended to the decision as whilst it is accepted the percolation test results confirms that infiltration is not viable, there is no evidence to demonstrate that discharge via a watercourse etc has been thoroughly investigated in accordance with part H of the Building Regulations.

The Drainage Team have considered the drainage strategy for the site and are supportive of the information submitted subject to further details being secured by condition.

The proposal would therefore accord with policy LP32 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

g) Ecology

The site comprises of a predominately urban landscape with some connectivity to other habitats provided by the strips of scrub forming the site boundaries. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) was submitted in support of the application and states that the site supports habitats of negligible conservation interest (buildings, amenity grassland, introduced shrub, bare ground and hardstanding) and also habitats of a site value only (dense/continuous scrub and scattered trees). These habitats support common and widespread plant species which were recorded during the field survey. Habitats present within the site are suitable for bats, badgers and birds.

Bats: A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Nov 2018) submitted with the application confirmed evidence of five bat roosts in four of the buildings proposed for demolition, which includes two maternity (summer) roosts of soprano pipistrelle and common pipistrelle bats. The roost survey was carried out during the late autumn and it wasn't possible to establish the exact numbers of bats using the roosts and therefore what the impacts of the proposed development would be on bat species.

All bats and their roosts are fully protected by the Habitat Regulations. Therefore prior to any demolition works commencing, a European Protected Species licence will be required from Natural England (NE). NE will not issue a licence until planning permission has been obtained. Therefore the LPA must be satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to be able to assess whether a NE licence could be issued.

Bat activity surveys as recommended in the bat report should be carried out (between May and August) to inform mitigation measures prior to determination of the planning application, however the applicant proposed a detailed precautionary "worst case scenario" bat mitigation strategy. The

Wildlife Officer assessed the report and considered the proposed mitigation measures to be acceptable and that these could be secured by condition.

Subsequently a Bat Survey Report (Oct 2019) containing additional bat activity surveys was submitted. From June to August 2019 all of the buildings on the site were subject to dusk emergence and/or pre-dawn re-entry surveys. The results found that 16 bat roosting locations were present on the site within five buildings. This also included a maternity bat roost.

Para. 175 of the NPPF advises that 'if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequate mitigation or, as a last resort, compensation, then planning permission should be refused.'

In addition, policy LP28 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan states 'development should avoid adverse impact on existing biodiversity and geodiversity features as a first principle. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable they must be adequately and proportionately mitigated. If full mitigation cannot be provided, compensation will be required as a last resort where there is no alternative.' Para. 1d) goes on to say 'where adverse impacts are likely, development will only be permitted where the need for and benefits of the development clearly outweigh these impacts. In such cases, appropriate mitigation or compensatory measures will be required.'

In order to implement development on site all the existing buildings would be demolished and therefore features within the site known to be used by roosting bats cannot be retained or incorporated into the proposed development. Bat mitigation will be required to be implemented.

There are no mature trees on site, or trees with features considered to be suitable for roosting bats. The site does have some suitability for foraging and commuting bats, with the strips of scrub and scattered trees along its south-western and south-eastern boundaries. These habitats provide connectivity to the wider landscape, especially towards Nene Park north of the site. It is considered that the site has moderate suitability for foraging and commuting bats.

As stated above planning permission has been granted for a permanent compensatory bat roost building (Bat barn) for common and soprano pipistrelles. A condition has been appended to that consent requiring that no demolition would be undertaken on the buildings within the site housing the maternity roosts until the bat barn has been constructed, approved and signed off by a licenced bat ecologist. As part of the protected species mitigation licence requirement, WSP as the named ecologists will monitor the success of the replacement maternity roost (the proposed Bat Barn) for a minimum of five years post construction. This has also been secured by condition.

The location of the approved bat barn has been revised since the initial submission and would be located to the north west of the site adjacent to the drainage basin which is in proximity of the bat flight lines and away from the current cycle path route.

10 bat boxes are being provided on site, as well as a number of roosting features within the bat barn structure, including bat soffit boxes and Schwegler bat tubes.

The Wildlife Officer is satisfied that the submitted mitigation measures set out in the 2019 Bat Survey Report are likely to ensure that the favourable conservation status of bat species. As conditions have been appended to the decision for the Bat Barn/Boxes regarding demolition and monitoring it is not necessary to re-append the conditions here. The Bat Survey Report would be an approved document. A condition would be appended requiring integral bat boxes on 10% of all new dwellings and a condition requiring details of lighting to be agreed.

The mitigation/compensation strategy proposed is acceptable and would maintain the favourable conservation status of bat species identified on site and therefore accords with para. 175 of the NPPF and policy LP28 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

The strip of deciduous woodland running adjacent to the site on the opposite side of the A1260 could potentially support badger. Due to urban nature of the site and the surrounding area, the limited foraging and resting places within the site, and the barrier created by the busy A1260, it is unlikely that badger would use the site.

Habitats on site are generally sub-optimal for breeding birds (well maintained, landscaped shrubs and scrub). However, the scrub strips forming the boundary of the site, larger shrubs and scattered trees could be used by breeding birds for nesting, as well as the built-structures on site. As such, it is recommended that any demolition of buildings or vegetation removal works that occur during the bird breeding season (March-August), should be subject to a pre-check by a suitably experienced ecologist before any works to remove these habitats take place, to identify whether any birds, nests, eggs or young or present.

Although records of wintering birds were presented in the desk study data, the site is considered to be unsuitable for wintering birds, and no further survey is recommended.

To mitigate for the loss of nesting habitat, the Wildlife Officer requests that a range of nesting boxes are installed that cater for a number of different species such as House Sparrow, Starling & Swift. Full details regarding numbers, designs and locations of nest features should be provided by the applicant which may be secured by condition.

Suitable habitat is present within the application site to support hedgehogs which are a UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority species and listed as a Species of Principle Importance under s41 of the NERC Act 2006. The Wildlife Officer recommends that adequate gaps to be retained under all new sections of fencing.

The development proposals for the site will seek to enhance the current biodiversity at the site with the addition of extensive new planting and landscaping and retention of trees. The Wildlife Officer has advised that the existing trees and shrubs which form the western site boundary are retained and strengthened with additional native species planting. The use of native planting is recommended throughout the development, Full landscape planting details would be considered at reserved matters stage and conditional of this application.

Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on rare butterflies - black hairstreak, which use the site. The Wildlife Officer has advised that no suitable habitat was identified during the ecological survey of the site, and no records exist for this site, therefore this species is unlikely to be affected by the proposal.

The proposal has been assessed by the Ecologist and has no further comments to add following the PCC Wildlife Officer comments, other than requests the addition of a condition requiring the standard BS42020 protected species licence condition in this case, as that will ensure that the licence has been obtained and all mitigation agreed with Natural England.

Taking into account the above and subject to conditions development would not result in a net loss in biodiversity and would accord with policy LP28 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

h) Landscape Implications

The site is not within a conservation area and there are no trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order. An Arboricultural Report supports the application. The report advises that a total of 112 arboricultural features were surveyed. A total of 20 moderate quality B category trees were identified during the arboricultural survey. These features were identified based on their arboricultural and landscape merits and include 19 trees and one group of trees. The trees comprise various native and non-native tree species including alder (*Alnus glutinosa*), ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), birch (*Betula pendula*), lime (*Tilia* sp.), London plane (*Platanus X hispanica*), oak (*Quercus robur*), pear (*Pyrus*

sp.), poplar (*Populus* sp.) and sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*). These are established trees with the capacity to provide a measurable degree of public amenity value.

A total of 89 low quality C category arboricultural features were identified during the arboricultural survey. These features were identified based on their arboricultural and landscape merits and include 75 trees, ten groups of trees and four hedges. Low quality features comprise of various native and non-native tree species. Three very-low quality features have been identified and include trees T6, T9 and T42.

The initial layout would have required the removal of 11 moderate quality trees and the removal of 55 low quality trees, four low quality tree groups and two low quality hedges. Furthermore, a short section of low quality hedge H111 will also be removed at its north-eastern end. The trees identified for removal were predominately located within the interior of the site. It was proposed that the removal of arboricultural features would be mitigated through a robust programme of post development tree planting.

The Tree Officer was consulted on the application and did not agree with many of the assessments/categories of the trees as assessed, especially within the Category C trees and some Category B trees. The Officer considered that many of the Category C trees have a greater 'estimated retention span of 10 years' and have a far greater public amenity value than that expressed, especially as the current site is a 'public' site and a large part of the proposed development site will retain its public accessibility. The same is said for at least six of the Category B trees in as far as they have a greater 'estimated retention span of 20 years' and have no significant arboricultural defects.

In addition, the Officer considered the information on the number of trees to be misleading, as a number are not actually on the development site and there is not tree survey plan or Tree Constraints Plan. There are also a number of inconsistencies with the report with trees referred to in the report which do not appear on the plan. The Officer objected to the number of both 'B' and 'C' category trees being removed and that the proposal would result in there being no existing trees retained across the entire central parts of the site. The Officer objected to the excessive removal of trees and requested a revised a redesign of the layout to retain a greater number of trees across the site.

In addition, the report did not consider the impact on trees near the access where works would be required to reinstate the turning head.

Furthermore, the Officer objected to the proposed drainage basins which would include the removal of trees T.2 Sycamore, T.5 Oak & T.90 Ash all Category B, T.15 Cherry & T.91-94 Purple Leaved Plums all Category C and Group G.98, a tight group of 10 Silver Birch Category C.

As stated in section a) of the report, prior approval has been granted for the demolition of the buildings with in the Gloucester Centre site ref. 20/00411/PRIOR. The demolition of the Gloucester centre buildings will result in the removal of 16 no. trees and a small group of trees within the site and the translocation of 9 no. trees.

A revised Arboricultural Report has been submitted with the revised layout. The report proposes the retention of a greater number of trees to those proposed for removal under the initial layout. This is particularly so along the north-east boundary with existing residential properties which is welcomed. The Arboricultural Report states that the proposal scheme will require the removal of one moderate quality tree and 24 low quality trees, 4 low quality tree groups and partial removal of a low quality hedge. However, there are again, a number of inconsistencies within the Arboricultural Report.

The Tree Officer does not accept or agree to the detail within the report. Firstly because the Officer disagrees with the categorisation of a number of the trees as it does not acknowledge their true value. Officers consider that this will remain a matter of disagreement.

Secondly, because as the layout would not be considered for approval at this stage and is subject to change and therefore there is the opportunity for a greater number of trees to be retained. It is accepted that the layout is not approved at this stage however, the trees within the site are a material planning consideration. The Tree Officer has pointed out a number of trees which could be retained within a revised layout. For example tree 'T86' a B Category tree which is located close to the cycle way which is shown for removal. It is agreed that this tree could be retained within a revised layout; Tree 'T9' is shown for removal, however this is an off-site tree and the applicant has no right to remove trees on third party land; Tree 'T47' the Tree Officer considers to be a Category B tree, shown to be retained on the layout plan but the report states its removal; Tree 'T76' which is highlighted for Translocation however, it is stated within the report to be removed; Trees 'T78' and 'T79' are Categorised as Category C trees, however the Tree Officer considers these a Category 'B' tree and could be retained within a revised layout. Officers agree with the possible retention of some of the trees, however Trees 'T91-T94' are located within the area proposed for the drainage basin. These trees (Purple Leaved Plum) are Categorised as C/B.

The initial layout proposed two drainage areas which would have resulted in a significant number of trees being removed. The revised layout shows one drainage basin area, thus retaining a number of trees. It is accepted that this is an outline application and the final layout to be agreed at a later stage, however it is unlikely that the drainage basin could be located anywhere else on the site. The main reason for this is the need to position the dwellings back from the western boundary due to the noise constraints posed by the location of the Parkway. As tree 'T91-T94', if retained, would be located in the lower part of the basin, it is not considered that the integrity of these trees could be maintained.

The supporting text to Policy LP29 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan states that any unprotected trees (especially those as defined as Category A or B trees) will be expected to be retained if possible. Policy LP29 advises that where the proposal will result in the loss of trees not covered by a TPO or located within a Conservation Area, it is expected that trees that make a significant contribution to the landscape or biodiversity value of the area be retained, provided this can be done without compromising the achievement of good design for the site.

Therefore as the retention of trees 'T91-T94' would compromise the layout of the proposal in that there is no alternative location for the drainage basin, on balance, the loss of these trees is considered acceptable. The applicant proposes a significant number of replacement trees as part of the proposal and in accordance with policy LP29 of the Local Plan which would be secured by condition to be approved as part of a reserved matters application.

The Tree Officer is proposing to secure the retention of the trees he considers appropriate to safeguard, under a Tree Protection Order and these details are still to be finalised.

At the time of writing this report, the Arboricultural details are not agreed. An update would be provided to Members of the Planning Committee prior to the meeting. However, it is likely that a condition would be appended to the decision requiring any layout, to be considered under a reserved matters application, to be supported with an updated Arboricultural Report which clearly identifies the trees to be retained/removed and specifically has regard to the trees to be protection under a Tree Protection Order.

It should also be noted that a tree report was submitted by the applicant as part of a pre-application proposal. The Tree Officer, at the time, agreed with the categorisation of the trees, and advised that B category trees be retained as part of the layout.

The loss of trees on site has resulted in a significant number of objections from neighbouring occupiers. As stated above, the revised layout has reduced the number of trees to be removed from the site, particularly retaining trees along the boundary with properties to the north east and along the south western part of the site by the removal of one of the drainage basins. It is also the intention that a number of trees proposed for removal could be retained within a revised layout. In accordance with policy LP29 of the Local Plan consideration will be given to the retention of as many trees as

possible, particularly those which are category B trees. However, the site is allocated for residential development and is it considered inevitable that some of the trees will be lost due to the noise constraints of the site and the built development having to be set back from the Parkway. Policy LP29 accepts that where higher value trees would be lost then compensatory tree planting would be required. These details would be considered at reserved matters stage and subject to a condition.

Questions have been raised regarding the retained trees which are to be located within the gardens of the new dwellings and preventing these from being removed. This could be secured by condition, however, the Tree Officer is proposing that some trees are protected under a Tree Protection Order.

Concerns have been raised regarding the demolition of building during the bird nesting season. As stated above prior approval for the demolition of the buildings has been granted. Nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and an informative has been appended to the decision.

Comments have been made regarding Peterborough as the Environment Capital and yet approved the felling of perfectly healthy trees. As stated above the objective is to retain as many trees on site as possible particularly those with high value. The loss of lesser quality trees will have to be balanced with the need to provide housing in order to meet the City Council's housing figure and the fact that the site is allocated for residential development.

Questions have been raised regarding the trees to be translocated and where they would be positioned. It is anticipated that these trees would be relocated within the development. These details would be considered as part of the landscaping scheme under the reserved matters application.

i) Open Space

An area of 0.77 ha of on- site open space would be provided and this would be secured by a S106 agreement. Although the details of the location for the on-site open space is not agreed at this stage the illustrative layout plan shows the majority of open space to be located along the western boundary, some of which would be located within the area proposed for the drainage attenuation. The Technical Landscape Officer has advised that the area within the POS containing the SuDs basin feature will need to be dry green basins that would not "hold water " and can be used for informal recreational use. The Drainage Strategy proposes that this area would provide for recreational use, however, these details would be agreed as part of the reserved matters application.

The Technical Landscape Officer agrees with this provision subject to commuted sums being secured for an offsite contribution of £13,218.65 + 5 years maintenance costs for Oakleigh Drive Play Area; and an offsite contribution for Belsize Avenue Allotment site of £5,313.93 + 5 years Maintenance costs. These sums would be secured under a S106 agreement.

The development is therefore considered to accord with policy LP21 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

j) Contamination

A Preliminary Risk Assessment has been undertaken and submitted in support of the application to understand the potential for contamination of the site. The investigations to date have shown the site to be largely free from contamination. However, because elevated concentrations of carbon dioxide were reported in two locations, the report recommends further ground gas monitoring or that ground gas protection measures are provided which are to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority. The Pollution Control Officer recommends this is secured by condition. The Officer also recommends that as the site is still currently in use the investigation has not included areas currently covered by buildings, it would be prudent to append the unsuspected contamination condition. This would accord with para. 178 of the NPPF.

k) Neighbouring Amenity

Although the layout is illustrative at this stage it is considered that it does show that an acceptable relationship to the neighbouring properties can in principle be achieved. At this stage the layout is not approved and the details shown on the indicative layout may change.

The development would abut residential development in Basil Green and Thornleigh Drive to the north east. An indicative plan shows a minimum of 21m separation distance to these dwellings.

To the north-west the development abuts residential properties in Caldervale and Edenfield. The illustrative layout shows an adequate separation distance to these properties.

As stated above the application is at outline stage and further consideration would be given to separation distances to existing dwellings as well as orientation and layout of the proposed dwellings at reserved matters stage to ensure that there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on existing neighbouring occupiers.

It is considered that a suitable layout could be achieved without compromising the occupiers of existing residential development within the vicinity of the site and therefore the proposal would accord with policy LP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Concerns have been raised regarding the potential for increase in noise, pollution and traffic as a result of redevelopment of the site for residential development. However, it is not considered that this would be significantly different to the existing use, were the Gloucester Centre to be fully occupied.

Comments have been made regarding the difference in land levels between the application site and neighbouring land and the potential for overlooking into these properties. The layout of the development is not considered at this stage, however potential overlooking would be a material consideration at reserved matters stage.

There is concern from neighbouring residents that the development would result in the loss of light and overshadowing. The positioning of dwellings and impact on existing properties would be considered at reserved matters stage.

Comments have been made regarding the impact of a concentration of families on an area which is occupied primarily by middle age to older residents. The LPA cannot determine who will occupy the properties.

l) Residential Amenity

The illustrative plan has demonstrated that the dwellings would be provided with a satisfactory level of amenity with adequate sized gardens, separation distances between plots, parking provision. The layout of individual plots will be considered at detail design stage/reserved matters stage. This will include noise mitigation measures as discussed above. However, at this stage, it is considered that the amenity of future occupants would accord with policy LP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

m) Archaeology

An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment supports the application. The City Council's Archaeologist has commented on the proposal and advises that the development site and surrounding area (500m radius) contain no scheduled monuments and only sparse archaeological assets, probably as the result of limited archaeological investigations rather than being a true reflection of lack of archaeological remains. However, on the basis of the available evidence, remains dating from the prehistoric period may be present within the proposed development site. If

present, these are expected to have been truncated and/or disturbed during the construction of the Gloucester Centre, however, remains may survive in undisturbed pockets of land or in deeply stratified contexts. The Archaeologist recommends that an evaluation by trial trenching is secured by condition, together with monitoring of preliminary groundwork for site preparation and, subject to the results of the evaluation, monitoring of all other groundwork, including excavations for foundations, drainage features, service trenches, landscaping, etc. This would accord with policy LP19 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and para. 189 of the NPPF.

n) Fire

Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service has advised that adequate provision should be made for fire hydrants through the S106 or conditions. This would be secured by condition.

o) Water Management

In accordance with policy LP32 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019) a condition would be appended to the decision requiring the development to achieve the 'Optional' Technical Housing Standard for water efficiency as described by Building Regulation G2. This standard is intended to reduce water consumption and achieve water efficiency in new dwellings to a level equivalent to 110 litres per person per day (rather than the standard 125 litres), and is described in Building Regulation.

p) Building for Life

The Orton Longueville Parish Council has requested a copy of the 'Building for Life 12' document for this specific site. The applicant has included a section referring to this document within the Design and Access Statement setting out how the proposed scheme rates against the criteria for Building for Life.

Building for Life 12 - The sign of a good place to live (BFL12) is the industry standard for the design of new housing development. Para 129 of the NPPF advises that such design and assessment frameworks such as BfL are of most benefit if used as early as possible in the evolution of schemes, and are particularly important for significant projects such as large scale housing and mixed use developments.

It is neither a national or local plan policy requirement for BFL to be 'passed' in order for a development to be considered acceptable. The questions posed by BFL have to be considered in relation to the scale of development proposed e.g. is it impractical for it to provide on-site shops, health facilities, education facilities and the fact that this is an outline application.

q) S106

As indicated above the provision of affordable housing will be secured through a S106 Agreement. The S106 will also include the provision of Householder Information Packs and securing the area of on site open space and a mechanism for the open space to be offered for adoption by the Council, and of-site contributions.

A community infrastructure levy will be applied to this development. This is to meet the infrastructure needs arising from it including for things such as school places.

r) Other Comments

Consultation

Comments have been made regarding the consultation taking place during a national lockdown. It is accepted that the Government advice has been for people to stay at home where possible. The Local Planning Authority has followed its statutory duty to consult with residents who abut the site and in the case of this application the LPA consulted widely. The Government advice to the LPA

has been to continue to consult residents on application and to erect site notices. It remains a statutory requirement to publish the application.

Comments received from residents have been summarised within this report and have been taken account of in the various sections of the report.

Reference has been made to a prior notification application for the demolition of the buildings within the Gloucester Centre site ref. 20/00411/PRIOR. These applications are 'permitted development' however the LPA must advise the applicant if the prior approval is required for the method of demolition. The LPA is required to erect site notices.

A two week consultation period was given for residents, however the re-consultation was advertised in the Peterborough Telegraph and site notices were erected. The overall expiry date for public consultation was 3rd December.

Pollution

Concerns have been raised regarding the position of the homes so close to a busy dual carriageway and the impact of noise and air pollution. However it is considered that the relationship would be similar to adjacent residential development and in this case the buildings would be set back from the Parkway. It is not considered that the impact would be significant and the site is allocated for residential development. No specific concerns in this respect have been raised by the Council's Pollution Control Officer.

Crime

Concern has been raised regarding the incidents of crime in areas of affordable housing and flatted developments. It is a policy requirement for 30% of the dwellings to be 'affordable homes'. There is no reason to suggest that these developments result in the increase in crime however, this is not a material planning consideration.

Impact on the value of existing properties

This is not a material planning consideration.

Comments from Residents/number of objections

It is stated that objections have been completely disregarded. The applicant has made changes to the scheme and therefore the LPA has undertaken a reconsultation. All representations are taken account of and considered within this report. It is accepted that some objections to the proposal will remain.

Consideration of the application is based on planning policy and not on the benefit of profits to the applicant/developer.

Custom Build/Self-build Homes

Comments have been made regarding the provision of custom build/self build homes on this site. LP9 of the Local Plan states that proposals for residential development will be considered more favourably if they provide appropriate opportunities for custom build and self build. There is no policy requirement for custom build or self build homes on this site. Sites over 500 dwellings will be expected to provide serviced plots for custom build and self build homes.

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 is allocated for housing development in accordance under policy LP37 of the adopted Local Plan and therefore the principle of residential development is supported;
- A safe and convenient access can be provided and the development would not have any unacceptable adverse impact upon highway safety in accordance with policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan;
- The development would provide 30% affordable dwellings in accordance with policy LP8 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan;
- Subject to appropriate noise mitigation the proposal would provide a satisfactory level of amenity for future occupants of the development in accordance with policy LP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan;
- Subject to condition the site is capable of being drained in accordance with policy LP32 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan;
- Subject to conditions it is considered that the proposal would not have any unacceptable ecological impact in accordance with policy LP28 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan;
- Subject to conditions any contamination within the site will be identified and satisfactory remediation would be secured in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework; and
- In principle it is considered that the site can be developed without any unacceptable adverse impact upon neighbour amenity in accordance with policy LP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

7 **Recommendation**

The Executive Director of Place and Economy recommends Outline Planning Permission is GRANTED subject to:-

- (1) relevant conditions and authority being delegated to Officers to make any necessary or appropriate adjustments to these conditions including the imposition of new conditions; and
- (2) the completion of a S106 Agreement to secure affordable housing and delivery of open space as set out above.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- C 5 No demolition/development shall take place/commence until a programme of archaeological work including a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority in writing. The details shall include an evaluation by trial trenching, together with monitoring of preliminary groundwork for site preparation and, subject to the results of the evaluation, monitoring of all other groundwork, including excavations for foundations, drainage features, service trenches, landscaping, etc.

No demolition/development shall take place unless in complete accordance with the approved scheme. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full including any post development requirements e.g. archiving and submission of final reports.

Reason: To secure the obligation on the planning applicant or developer to mitigate the impact of their scheme on the historic environment when preservation in situ is not possible, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition because archaeological investigations will be required to be carried out before development begins.

- C 6 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until either further ground gas monitoring has been undertaken to assess the elevated carbon dioxide concentration and/or a remedial plan and verification report has been produced in accordance with the recommendations within the Preliminary Risk Assessment 2018. The details shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure potential risks arising from previous site uses have been fully assessed in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition because contamination must be adequately identified and remediated prior to construction works taking place to prevent risks of pollution during the ground works and construction process.

- C 7 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. This is in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

C 8 The plans and particulars to be submitted for reserved matters approval under condition 1 shall include an updated Noise Impact Assessment based upon the reserved matters layout and shall include details of proposed mitigation measures. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved mitigation measures which should be installed prior to the first use of the dwelling to which they relate.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate amenity for the future occupiers in accordance with policy LP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C 9 The plans and particulars submitted under condition 1 shall include details for all dwellings to meet Building Regulations Part M4(2), 5% of the dwellings to meet Building Regulations Part M4(3)(2)(a); and all rented tenure affordable housing to meet the minimum National Space Standards (as defined by Building Regulations).

Reason: In order to meet housing needs in accordance with policy LP8 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C10 No development shall take place on site, including the demolition of any building unless the local planning authority has been provided with a licence issued by Natural England pursuant to Regulation 55 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 authorising the development/demolition to go ahead.

Reason: To ensure the survival and protection of important species (a feature of nature conservation importance) and those protected by legislation that could be affected adversely by the development, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraphs 170 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition because the details must be before development/demolition commences.

C11 The development shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures set out in section 5 of the Bat Survey Report 2019.

Reason: To ensure the survival and protection of important species (a feature of nature conservation importance) and those protected by legislation that could be affected adversely by the development, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraphs 170 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

C12 The plans and particulars to be submitted under condition 1 shall include details of integral bat boxes to be installed on 10% of all new dwellings.

The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the survival and protection of important species (a feature of nature conservation importance) and those protected by legislation that could be affected adversely by the development, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraphs 170 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

C13 The plans and particulars to be submitted for reserved matters approval under condition 1 shall include details of the external lighting, including lighting for private roads, driveways or parking areas. The details shall include the design of the lighting columns, their locations and LUX levels.

The lighting shall be arranged so that no danger or inconvenience is caused to users of the adjoining existing or proposed public highway.

The lighting scheme shall be designed to ensure bat species are not negatively impacted, particularly in relation to the western area of the site where the bat roost structure is proposed to be constructed, along with bat foraging/ commuting areas around the tree belt and SuDS features.

The external lighting scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the area which it will serve is first occupied.

Reason: In the interests of amenity, highway safety and the protection of protected species and in accordance with policies LP13, LP17 and LP28 of the Adopted Local Plan (2019).

C14 The development hereby permitted shall not be begun until full and up to date details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme, in accordance with the Gloucester Centre Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (FRA001 –dated September 2020), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include but are not limited to:

- * Evidence to demonstrate that discharge via a watercourse etc has been thoroughly investigated in accordance with the surface water drainage hierarchy (Building Regulations – Part H).
- * Information about the design storm period and intensity, discharge rates and volumes, temporary storage facilities, means of access for maintenance, the methods employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent flooding and pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- * A full and up to date drainage layout plan, which also shows details of the private surface water drainage.
- * Construction / technical details of all drainage assets.
- * Cross sectional drawings of the proposed attenuation basin.
- * Overland flood flow and exceedance routes both on and off site; this should include how flows will be managed near the underpass.
- * Management and maintenance schedules for all drainage assets for the lifetime of the development, which shall include the arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a Residents' Management Company or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the sustainable drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: In order to ensure that the site can be adequately drained in accordance with policy LP32 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

C15 Notwithstanding the submitted information no development above ground works shall take place until provision has been made for fire hydrants in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling/building to be served by the scheme written confirmation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that the scheme has been implemented in full and is certified as being ready for use.

Reason: In the interest of community safety and to ensure that adequate supplies are available for fire fighting to support policy LP16 of the adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C16 The hard landscaping scheme to be submitted as plans and particulars under condition 1 shall include the following details:

- Hard surface materials
- Boundary treatments (to allow adequate gaps hedgehog/small mammals);
- Details of gates to footpaths to the side/rear of the terraced houses
- Building security for flatted development, including refuse and cycle stores - an access control system
- Refuse areas;
- Cycle parking provision for any flatted schemes
- A 3m wide footway/cycleway link to the existing footway/cycleway to the south of the site.
- A vehicle tracking plan.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the area or building to which they relate or in accordance with any alternative timeframe as maybe agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the visual and residential amenity in accordance with policy LP13, LP17 and LP28 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C17 The soft landscaping scheme to be submitted as plans and particulars under condition 1 shall include the following details:

- * Proposed finished ground and building slab levels;
- * Planting plans including retained trees, species, numbers, size and density of planting;
- * details of open space provision and a timetable for the delivery of the open space.
- * A section drawing showing level of drainage basin to demonstrate its usability for recreation purposes.
- * Maintenance schedule;
- * Landscape Management Plan;
- * Details of the design, numbers and location of bird boxes to cater for different species i.e. House Sparrow, Starling and Swift.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved reserved matters application prior to first occupation/ use of the element to which it relates. In the case of soft landscaping works these shall be carried out no later than the first planting/seeding season following the occupation/use of the element to which it relates.

If within a period of five years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub that tree or shrub which forms part of the public landscaped areas (not rear gardens) or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it is removed uprooted or destroyed or dies or becomes in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority seriously damaged or defective another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planned at the same place unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development and the enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with policies LP16, LP28 and LP29 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

C18 The plans and particulars to be submitted under condition 1 shall include an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Scheme.

The layout of the development shall ensure the retention of the following trees – to be agreed.

The development shall thereafter take place in accordance with the approved details and Tree Protection Measures. The tree protection measures shall be erected prior to the commencement of development or site works and therefore after retained until development within that area is completed.

Reason: In order to protect retained trees and hedges in accordance with policy LP16 and LP29 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan 2019. Policies DPD.

- C19 The development hereby approval shall achieve the Optional Technical Housing Standard of 110 litres per person per day for water efficiency as described by Building Regulation G2.

Reason: To reduce impact on the water environment and achieve water efficiency in accordance with policy LP32 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C20 No dwelling shall be occupied unless and until the vehicular access serving the development from Morpeth Close has been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plan ref. 6071-WSP-00-XX-DR-003 P02 the width of carriage way shall be 5.5m with 2m wide footways.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C21 No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicle access linking that dwelling to the public highway has been completed to a minimum of base course level and footways/cycleways shall be completed to surface course level. In the event the dwelling is occupied with the roads at base course level then a timetable and phasing plan for completing the roads shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The roads shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved timetable and phasing plan.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

- C22 The existing access to Wainman Road shall be permanently closed to vehicular traffic prior to first occupation/use of the site or within 3 months of the new access being brought in to use, whichever is sooner in accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Suitable temporary barriers shall be placed near but off the public highway as an interim measure if required.

The details shall include the removal of the carriageway and reinstatement of cycle way and landscaping.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

- C23 Forward visibility measuring 20 metres measured at 1m intervals at an offset of 1m from the channel line shall be provided at all bends in the horizontal alignment of the access roads and thereafter the visibility envelope maintained and retained free from any obstructions over a height of 600mm above finished ground level.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C24 Development shall not commence until a fully operational jetted drive-thru bath type wheel cleaning apparatus has been installed within the site on all exits and the area between this and the public highway is hard surfaced in either concrete or tarmac and maintained free of mud, slurry and any other form of contamination whilst in use. All vehicles leaving the site shall pass through the wheel cleaning apparatus which shall be sited to ensure that vehicles are able to leave the site and enter the public highway in a clean condition and free of debris which could fall onto the public highway. The wheel cleaning apparatus shall be retained on site in full working order for the duration of the development.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C25 A scheme of off-site highway works shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter implemented in full prior to first occupation/use of the building/site.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and in accordance with policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C26 The developer must contact the Highway Control Team to agree the extent of a pre-condition highway survey and carry out a joint inspection of the condition of the public highway before site traffic uses the road/s. A similar inspection will take place on completion of the road.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan.

- C27 No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall the following:-

- a) A scheme for the monitoring, reporting and control of construction noise and vibration including hours of working and scope for remedial action.
- b) A scheme for the control dust and scope for remedial action in the event that dust is identified as an issue or any complaints are received.
- c) A scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for construction vehicles to include the details of location and specification of a jetted drive-thru bath type wheel wash system together with the hard surfacing to be laid between the apparatus and public highway.
- d) A contingency plan including if necessary the temporary cessation of all construction operations to be implemented in the event that the approved vehicle cleaning scheme fails to be effective for any reason
- e) Haul routes to the site and hours of delivery.
- f) Measures to ensure that vehicles can access the site upon arrival to ensure that there is no queuing on the public highway.
- g) Details of site compounds and storage area.
- h) Details of contractors parking.
- i) Detail of the site enclosure or part thereof.
- j) Confirmation that tree protection measures are in place.
- k) Confirmation that the demolition will be carried out in accordance with the ecological assessment.
- l) A scheme for dealing with complaints.
- m) Details of any temporary lighting

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and highway safety in accordance with policy LP13 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition as the CMP needs to be in place before works start on site.

- C28 The plans and particulars to be submitted under condition 1 shall include details of existing and proposed levels. The plans shall include details of all finished floor levels, levels for associated garages and gardens, details of any earthworks, retaining features and confirmation that level access can be achieved. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity in accordance with policy LP16 and LP17 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C29 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents
- * Location Plan drg. no. 32131.001
 - * Proposed access drg. no. 6071-WSP-00-XX-DR-003 P02
 - * Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment 2018
 - * Bat Survey Report October 2019
 - * Noise Assessment July 2019
 - * Transport Assessment July 2019
 - * Flood and Drainage Strategy September 2020
 - * Detailed Arb Report (sections ?)
 - * Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment July 2019
 - * Preliminary Ecological Appraisal July 2018
 - * Utilities Report August 2018
 - * Framework Residential Travel Plan August 2018
 - * Preliminary Risk Assessment – July 2018

Reason: In order to ensure that the development complies with what has been applied for.

Copies to Councillors: Goodwin Janet, , Farooq Mohammed, Howard John