

Application Ref: 21/00708/FUL

Proposal: Erection of 25 dwellings and garages, new access and public open space

Site: Cranmore House, Thorney Road, Eye, Peterborough
Applicant: Cranmore Developments Ltd

Agent: Mr Andrew Hodgson, Pegasus Group

Referred by: Head of Development and Construction
Reason: Previous call-in by Ward Councillors

Case officer: Mr Jack Gandy
Telephone No. 01733 452595
E-Mail: jack.gandy@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **GRANT** subject to relevant conditions

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

Site Description

The application site is approximately 0.9ha in size and is located on the northern side of Thorney Road. The site contains a small holding and a large Victorian house which has been extended, and associated outbuildings/farm buildings and a paddock area to the rear of the site. The buildings appear to be in a poor state of repair and are vacant.

To the east of the site, in part, is a residential dwelling in the form of a prefabricated bungalow and associated outbuildings (Alpine Lodge), and there are two mobile homes on the shared boundary, windows of which sit above the fence line. Beyond Alpine Lodge and along the western boundary is Dalmark Seeds. Dalmark Seeds is an agricultural seed drying business; the drying operations typically commences from 05:00 7-days a weeks, including a large number of HGV movements in and out of the site.

To the north there is vacant land which was historically allocated within the Local Plan for residential development, however further to the adoption of the 2019 Local Plan, this land is no longer allocated and forms residential garden serving No.17 Easby Rise.

Planning permission has been granted for residential development comprising 52 dwellings on land to the west of the site (13/00649/FUL) which is largely completed and occupied. Directly opposite the site on the southern side of Thorney Road planning permission has also been granted for residential development comprising 50 dwellings (14/00076/FUL); this is also an allocated housing site ref. SA5.7 and is largely completed and occupied.

To the south of the application site on the opposite side of Thorney Road is the Pioneer Caravan Site.

The site is allocated within the current Local Plan, under Policy LP39, specifically LP39.1: Cranmore House, Thorney Road, Eye.

Pre-Amble

In 2014 outline planning permission was granted under App Ref: 14/01122/OUT for the 'Erection of up to 14 dwellings including the demolition of existing house and outbuildings'. This was a resubmission following withdrawal of App Ref: 14/00141/OUT for the 'Erection of up to 14 dwellings including the demolition of existing house and outbuildings'. This application was

withdrawn further to Officer concerns, which primarily related to noise generated by Dalmark Seeds and the A47.

In October 2017 planning permission was submitted under App Ref: 17/02048/FUL for the 'erection of 35 dwellings and garages, new access to highway and public open space, following demolition of all existing buildings', however this application was withdrawn again due to concerns of noise generated by the adjacent Dalmark Seeds site and A47. Lengthy discussions took place between the Council and the Applicant to secure an acceptable layout which addressed these noise concerns, where an amended layout was agreed, which introduced two storey residential development along the eastern boundary and would have brought noise levels to within acceptable levels, albeit still high levels of noise.

In 2018, an application was submitted under App Ref: 18/01178/FUL for 'Demolition of dwelling and outbuildings and construction of 22 dwellings with associated access and parking', however the layout did not reflect the discussions which took place between the Applicant and Officers, and the application was subsequently refused and dismissed at appeal (APP/J0540/W/18/3215519).

Finally, in 2020, planning application 20/01089/FUL was submitted and considered for the 'Erection of 25 dwellings and garages, new access and public open space'. However, this application was refused on the basis that no robust ecological assessment accompanied the submission and therefore, the proposal failed to demonstrate that it would not adversely impact upon protected species or make provision for satisfactory improvement towards biodiversity net gain.

Proposal

The Applicant seeks planning permission for the, 'Erection of 25 dwellings and garages, new access and public open space'.

The proposal would comprise a number of detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings, as well as a two storey terrace of dwellings along the eastern boundary to Dalmark Seeds, and a bungalow.

Vehicle access to the site would be from Thorney Road to the south, where each dwelling would be provided with two off-street parking spaces, some of which would be provided with garaging or car ports. The scheme also proposes an area of Public Open Space (POS) of 740sqm.

The scheme has been subject to amended plans, which are discussed in further detail below.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
20/01089/FUL	Erection of 25 dwellings and garages, new access and public open space	Refused	05/05/2021
18/01178/FUL	Demolition of dwelling and outbuilding and construction of 22 dwellings with associated access and parking	Refused	15/10/2018
17/02048/FUL	Erection of 35 dwellings and garages, new access to highway and public open spaces, following demolition of all existing buildings.	Withdrawn by Applicant	02/04/2018
14/01122/OUT	Erection of up to 14 dwellings including the demolition of existing house and outbuildings – Resubmission	Permitted	02/04/2015
14/00141/OUT	Erection of up to 14 dwellings including the demolition of existing house and outbuildings	Withdrawn by Applicant	25/03/2014
9/00926/FUL	First floor bathroom above kitchen (retrospective)	Permitted	28/09/1999
P1499/88	Erection of bungalow (outline)	Permitted	16/03/1989
P1014/79	Use of existing workshop for dismantling, plus erection of fencing around sorting/loading/unloading yard and improvements of the vehicular access	Permitted	23/11/1979
P0386/76	Retention of use of site for scrap dealers business, formation of screened yard and associated planting	Refused	22/07/1976

3 Planning Policy

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

Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019)

LP02 - The Settle Hierarchy and the Countryside
LP03 - Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development
LP08 - Meeting Housing Needs
LP13 - Transport
LP16 - Urban Design and the Public Realm
LP17 - Amenity Provision
LP19 - The Historic Environment
LP21 - New Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities
LP28 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
LP29 - Trees and Woodland
LP32 - Flood and Water Management
LP33 - Development on Land Affected by Contamination
LP39 - Large Village Allocations

4 Consultations/Representations

PCC Wildlife Officer (22.06.21)

No objections: The Ecological Impact Assessment, Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Landscape Ecological Management Plan all demonstrate the detailed care that has gone into establishing that the development described in the application will have a net gain for biodiversity.

All that remains is the translation of the advisements within the Ecological Impact Assessment into methodology that may be implemented during construction and securing the fee for the ongoing management of off-site biodiversity.

This leads to a final fee of £2587.57.

Recommended planning conditions

- Submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to the Local Planning Authority, to ensure the recommended mitigation and compensation measures suggested in the Ecological Impact Assessment are followed correctly.
- Submission of a lighting design strategy to the Local Planning Authority, to ensure the recommended mitigation and compensation measures suggested in the Ecological Impact Assessment are followed correctly.

PCC S106 Planning Obligations Officer (02.07.21)

No objection: The application has been accompanied by a Viability Assessment, where it has been demonstrated that the development could not provide affordable housing, and achieve a reasonable profit margin of 17.5%. Based on the information provided, it is accepted that this scheme does not provide affordable housing in this instance.

PCC Tree Officer (01.06.21)

No objection: The application is acceptable in arboricultural terms, subject to conditions. The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) on or adjacent to the site.

Please condition the submitted arboricultural impact assessment and arboricultural method statement, together with the tree protection plan and a full and detailed landscaping scheme to include suitable and appropriate tree/shrub/hedge planting throughout the entire site, including in all garden areas, given the nature of the site, in order to offer both screening and enhancement to the proposed development. The indicative landscaping shown on the submitted plans are not considered detailed or comprehensive enough to satisfy the landscaping requirements of the site and comply with the Council's policies.

PCC Archaeological Officer (02.06.21)

No objections: The proposed development site is located within an area of archaeological interest. The proposed development site may contain pre-medieval remains of regional/national importance, with particular reference to the Iron Age and Saxon periods. The existence of significant later remains should not be excluded.

On the basis of the available evidence recommend that a programme of archaeological work is secured by condition, comprising:

- A desk-based assessment (DBA) of the site and general area will be carried out in advance of all recommended archaeological fieldwork. There is no need to submit a separately bind DBA, although relevant information should be incorporated within subsequent field reports; and
- A Non-intrusive geophysical survey (magnetometer survey) will be carried out in those areas of the proposed development site which were not covered by previous surveys. The results of the survey will inform the programme of subsequent intrusive techniques of investigations, including evaluation by trial trenching and possible area excavation, if applicable.

PCC Pollution Team (05.07.21)

No objection: This is a challenging site. It suffers from road noise, although this is comparable to other nearby residential properties. The difference with this site is the proximity to the adjacent industrial site and the resulting impact from processes carried out during the day and night, with the early morning (04:00hrs) processes being of particular significance.

The rating level of +18dB resulting from noise from industrial sources particularly at night is concerning. BS 4142 states that a rating level of +10dB or more is likely to be an indication of significant adverse impact. During previous consultations this section has indicated that the maximum 'plus' rating level it is willing to consider is a rating level of +10 to +12dB, which is considerably higher than the usual maximum of 'rating level equal to background', in recognition of the challenges faced at this site.

The noise report has indicated that the worst affected property is plot 8, and whilst this maybe the case Figure 7 of Acoustic Associates Noise report SEM/J3453/17677 May 2020, indicates that plots 1-9 will be impacted to a similar level.

The proposed glazing and mechanical ventilation as detailed in Section 3.2 of the report (SEM/J3453/17677 May 2020) would achieve suitable internal noise levels however this is reliant on the windows being kept closed for the majority of the time when the industrial processes are occurring. Should Officers be minded to permit this development the glazing and mechanical ventilation mitigation measures must be secured by condition; any diversion from these measures would require further application, consideration and approval.

The Pollution Control Officer has sought a 2.4m high barrier along plots 14-18, which is also sought to be secured by condition.

With respect to plots 4 to 11, these units would have the main bedrooms to the front of the property. The LPA have advised previously that the main bedroom should be to the rear of the property with the box room and bathroom at the front as this is the main facade to be affected by noise. However it is noted that the developer has placed two bedrooms at the rear of the properties. In considering this change the new layouts for these plots are accepted as the majority of bedrooms are on the least noisy aspect. The internal layout should be conditioned.

Plots 18 to 24 have been amended so that garage would be used as a bedroom; this has resulted in non-habitable room (kitchen) being placed next to a noise sensitive habitable room, a bedroom, which could give rise to noise complaints.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services (11.06.21)

Objection: Further information is required prior to determination of the application. Highway boundary information should be obtained by the Applicant and the proposals adjusted to remove the highway areas from the site; all visibility splays should be shown; the full extent of the highway required 2m footway (including the existing areas to be widened) including the retained areas of verge to the front of the application site should be shown; and clarification of the cycle stands proposed within the stores should be sought.

Off-site highway works would be required as a result of this development. These would need to be undertaken under a S278 Agreement. The works include: construction (or widening of any existing sections) of a 2m wide footway along Thorney Road; removal of redundant vehicular access, reinstatement of full height kerbs and construction of footway; construction of new bellmouth access; and relocation of any affected street furniture, and any required amendments to existing service installations (these works would be carried out at the full cost of the applicant/developer).

Police Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) (02.06.21)

No objections: The Officer has viewed the documents in relation to crime, disorder and the fear of crime and completed a search of the Constabulary crime and incident systems for Eye covering the last 2 years. The area is considered to be of medium vulnerability to crime.

There is mention within the Design and Access statement of Local Policy LP16 (H) which states that Secured by Design principles should be followed. It is clear from the documents that some consideration has obviously been given to crime prevention. This does appear to be an acceptable layout in relation to crime and the fear of crime providing good levels of natural surveillance from neighbour's properties with many of the homes facing each other. Pedestrian and vehicle routes are aligned together within the cul-de-sac and well overlooked which should provide some level of territoriality amongst residents. Vehicle parking is in-curtilage between and to the sides of properties or in garages. Most homes have protected gardens and have been provided with some defensible space to their front.

An external lighting plan is requested. The recommendation is that all adopted and unadopted roads, private roads and parking areas should be lit by columns to BS5489:1 2020. Home security lights to the front and rear of the properties should be dusk to dawn LED bulkhead lights. This office would be happy to consult with the applicant to discuss Secured by Design and measures to reduce the vulnerability to crime.

Anglian Water (02.07.21)

No objections: The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Peterborough (Flag Fen) Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows. The foul flows for the proposed development is being proposed to be connected via gravity regime to private sewers, therefore this is outside of our jurisdiction to comment. The applicant will need to seek permission from the sewers owner. Please do not hesitate to re-consult us if any changes are submitted with the planning.

From the details submitted to support the planning application, the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service (26.05.21)

No objections: Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority request that adequate provision be made for fire hydrants, which may be by way of Section 106 agreement or a planning condition.

Lead Local Drainage Authority (11.06.21)

No objections subject to the following condition:

The development hereby permitted shall not be begun until details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include, but are not limited to:

- Construction details of all drainage and SuDS assets, which include but is not limited to, details of the proposed permeable paving, storage crates and filter drain, which shows how they will interact.*
- Confirmation of the parties responsible for the maintenance of the drainage assets.*

The site is located within the North Level Internal Drainage Board district, as such we recommend contacting them as soon as possible to discuss the proposals of this application.

Waste Management (26.05.21)

No objections.

Eye Parish Council (24.05.21)

No objections: Eye Parish Council would like to request that funding from this community development be used to assist with the future development for Eye Primary school which serves the children of Eye.

Senior Landscape Technical Officer (09.06.21)

Objection: Working to PCC's current Open Space Strategy, combined with PCC's provision standards and off-site calculations, the exact on-site allocations or off-site commuted sums PCC would expect for this development would be:

Neighbourhood Parks (POS): PCC expect to see 0.11ha of on-site POS provision. The current provision is 0.074ha and hence there is a shortfall of 0.036ha)

Children's Play: PCC expect an off-site contribution of £5,603.48 + 5 years maintenance costs for play facilities in Eye.

Allotments: PCC expect an off-site contribution of £1,218.46 + + 5 years maintenance costs for Eye allotment sites.

Natural Greenspace: PCC expect an off-site contribution of £2,7550.05 + 5 years maintenance costs for Eye Nature Reserves.

POS is not adequate in terms of provision and needs to be rectified. Furthermore, the layout of the POS is inadequate and boundary walls must be improved upon.

North Level IDB (07.06.2021)

No objections: The Board has no objection in principle to the proposal, but advises the following:

- The receiving water course for the surface water is in riparian ownership and while a 3 metre easement is shown on the south side of the watercourse, it is essential that all potential purchasers of Plots 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 are made fully aware of their responsibilities for the ongoing maintenance of the watercourse.

- In addition to the above, the following condition is suggested: 'Post planning, the site owner will engage with the downstream landowner and, subject to their approval (which we are advised would not be unreasonably withheld) and agreement with the IDB, undertake works to improve conveyance of flows along the boundary ditch from the site down to the culvert beneath the A47 through targeted and proportional improvements. It is envisaged that this will take the form of a level survey of the channel to ensure the free flow of surface water to the existing culvert under the A47'.

- A development levy in accordance with the enclosed comments will also be payable to the Board for dealing with the increase in run-off from the site.

- Peterborough City Council will comment regarding the viability of the SUDs system as proposed.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 35

Total number of responses: 3

Total number of objections: 2

Total number in support: 0

Two letters of representation have been received from local residents, both whom object to the proposed development. The following matters are raised:

No. 45 Thorney Road, Eye

- Being right next door to this project is going to cause a lot of noise, pollution and major disruption.
- The village struggles to cope with the amount of traffic and cars as it is, there just isn't the infrastructure to deal with even more. It will encourage more traffic and drivers doing well over the normal speed limit.
- Anything built on these premises is going to cause to my property: i) Loss of light or overshadowing; ii) Overlooking/loss of privacy; iii) Highway safety; and iv) Even more traffic generation and unsafe driving.

No. 17 Easby Rise, Eye

- To clarify from the outset, I wholeheartedly support the residential development of the Cranmore House site. The reason that I have listed my comments here as 'Object' is largely because of the layout of the estate road within these plans, which I have discussed directly with the developer already so he is aware of my thoughts on this matter.

- To explain further; my wife and I have an interest in the planning application and any future development of the land associated with this application, namely Cranmore House, Eye, Peterborough, as we own the land to the North of this site, under title number CB430361. This additional land that we own, of c.1.5 acres in size, is immediately adjacent to the East of our residential home and garden.

- Our site was previously allocated land with SA 5.5 listing, although this allocation was removed when the current local plan was completed which we are in ongoing discussions with the relevant department within the local authority regarding as it transpires that this may have occurred as an error. We are taking further advice on this matter also.

- In principle, we support this application made by the owner of the land within this planning application and would be in favour of seeing the site within this application developed for residential dwelling purposes and assuming the layout is deemed to be acceptable to the local planning office then 25 properties would seem appropriate to the local infrastructure and site.

- However, our objection is because of the estate road that can be seen on the plans, and as above the developer is aware of my thoughts and has confirmed that he is prepared to make amendments following our discussions which is greatly appreciated and well received.

- The estate road shown on these plans includes entry from Thorney Road, Eye, to the South and then runs to the Northern most point of the proposed development where it then reaches a 'dead end', so to speak blocked by what appear to be allocated parking spaces. By installing an estate road that leads to a 'dead end', our allocated land could become 'land locked'.

- Other feasible or acceptable access points for future traffic include two other potential routes in addition to the Cranmore House site that we are in ongoing discussions regarding. However, access from the North is restricted by the busy A47 and the East by the Dalmark Seeds factory.

- Access from the South via the Cranmore House site, and this proposed development, represents the most acceptable option without which our land becomes inaccessible and prevents future potential development either by us or future land owners.

- We are aware that our land sits within the village envelope of Eye that has been earmarked for development in order to contribute to the growth of the village and the housing requirements of Peterborough and the surrounding area.

- If we were to develop our land in the future we would only consider residential dwellings in keeping with the local area and taking in to account neighbouring properties and local infrastructure. As any development would be immediately adjacent to our own residential home, we of course need to ensure that any potential future development is completed with close

consideration of that and other existing neighbours.

- Previous planning applications, including the most recent prior to this that was ultimately refused by the local authority and then then Planning Inspectorate (18/01178/FUL), included an estate road that could be extended in the future if required, subject to agreement between the respective land owners at the time of course. However, this latest submission appears to have allocated parking spaces (for Plot 17) at the end of the road thus blocking future extension of the estate road.

- We would be supportive of this application if the estate road provided an appropriately sized pedestrian and vehicular roadway for vehicles of all types to travel upon up to the boundary line of our land to the North of this site with the possibility of extending this in future to allow access on to our land.

- We would also require for any dwelling that is built on the Cranmore House site to not have any encroachment, be it light, sight or territory, on our land, whilst also taking in to account potential future development of residential dwellings should we pursue that in the future.

- We also note that the North Level Drainage Board have advised that the riparian drain that sits within our property boundaries, and to the Northern point of this site, requires improvement to support the surface water drainage of the proposed new development. Such surface water drainage is also referenced in the drainage reports submitted by the developer's representatives.

- We would not seek to restrict any improvements to the drains; however, we would require a full scope of and plan of works that the developer intends to undertake as part of this development to ensure that it is completed without creating significant disruption to our property and its boundaries.

- We would be willing to discuss any required improvement works to the riparian drain as part of the conversations relating to future access whereby, I hope that between us and the developer we can reach an amicable agreement. However, prior to such discussions taking place and concluding accordingly we would not welcome any encroachment on or access to our riparian drain for the purpose of this development.

-Finally, we would object to any commercial development or the development of any industrial or commercial complex or property on this site given the close proximity to our property; both the land that we own and our immediately adjacent home, as well as the proximity to other residential properties to this Cranmore House site. Although I appreciate that this is not relevant to the current submission of course.

- The area has already seen rapid growth and residential development in recent years and I am in favour of necessary development in the village of Eye as long as the number of properties is proportionate with the site in question and does not have a significant impact on the infrastructure or green open space and park areas of this part of the village which this proposal and submission does appear to be.

- In summary, we would be in support of this proposal in its entirety subject to the plans being amended to ensure that the estate road does not have a 'dead end' because of the allocated parking at its Northern most point. We would require that future access to our retained land can be achieved by extending the estate road on to our land with minimal disruption to the existing estate road layout and design.

- I hope that my comments here are deemed to be fair and reasonable and on the basis that the above points are acceptable and agreed to as part of any decision for this application then we as adjoining neighbours are in full support of the proposal and would welcome the development of the land for residential purposes.

- I would be more than happy to clarify any points or to add any extra detail upon request or should you require.

Councillors Simons and Brown raised objection to the previous application on the site (20/01089/FUL), and they referred the application for determination by Committee should Officers recommend approval. Whilst no comments from these Councillors have been received in respect of this current revised application, Officers have followed the call-in request.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Layout
- Access and Parking
- Neighbour Amenity
- Amenity of Future Occupiers
- Meeting housing standards
- Wildlife
- Trees
- Contamination
- Drainage
- Archaeology
- Infrastructure

a) Principle of Development

The application site is situated within the village settlement boundary of Eye village, which is identified as a Large Village by Policy LP2. The site is also allocated for residential development by Policy LP39.1, which sets an indicative number of 14x dwellings. As such, the principle of residential development can be considered. In addition, the previous application on the site which were determined (reference 20/01089/FUL) whilst refused, were not refused on the matter of principle. As such, Officers are of the view that this matter cannot now soundly be revisited.

A letter of representation has been received with respect to a parcel of land situated to the immediate north of the application site. Further to reviewing the planning history, planning permission was granted in 2014 under App Ref: 14/02028/FUL for the erection of 5x dwellings and 4x flats on this parcel of land, and was allocated under the Local Plan.

It is been previously advised, during consideration of planning application reference 20/01089/FUL, that further to the granting of planning permission the site was cleared and ground works had commenced. There were a number of pre-commencement conditions which were required to be discharged before development commenced on site. These conditions included details of the layout and form of construction roads, including drainage, levels and lighting, a construction management plan, details of fire hydrants, a surface water management strategy and a noise mitigation scheme. This application was time limited to be commenced within 3 years of planning permission being granted; the application therefore expired on 27th April 2018. As such, Officers consider that this permission has fallen away.

It is important to note that when the 2018 application was considered by the Local Planning Authority (App Ref: 18/01178/FUL), one of the reasons for refusal related to the provision of vehicle access to this parcel of land. The reason for this is that the parcel of land was allocated within the previous Core Strategy and was at that time a material planning consideration, however this policy document has since been superseded by the current Peterborough Local Plan (2019). The land in question is no longer allocated for residential development. There is therefore no planning policy requirement to consider this neighbouring parcel of land and the proposal to which this case relates is considered on its own merits.

In accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF (2019), 'planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material

considerations indicate otherwise'. Officers are conscious that the land to the north of the site has previously had planning permission for residential development, however this permission does not appear to have been implemented, and therefore has fallen away. Further, the site is not allocated in the current, adopted Local Plan, therefore is not a material planning consideration, and there is no planning requirements for the proposed access road forming part of this application to link to the area of land to the north.

Accordingly, the principle of development is considered to be acceptable, subject to the following material planning considerations.

b) Design and Layout

The scheme would result in the loss of the existing dwelling and associated agricultural buildings. These are of no historic or architectural merit and their loss is accepted.

The scheme as submitted would comprise atypical two storey detached and semi-detached new build properties along the western and northern boundary. These properties have been set back from the central access road, with car parking positioned to the side, some of the dwellings of which would be provided with dedicated garaging.

To the east of the application site would be a bespoke terrace of two storey dwellings, with gardens, pergola's and car parking to front. These dwellings have been designed in such a way so that they would attenuate noise from the adjacent Dalmark Seed site, which would benefit the wider site, and possibly neighbouring residential properties beyond. A bungalow is also proposed (Plot 25), adjacent to Alpine Lodge, with an area of Public Open Space at the front of the site.

Through amendments applied under planning application reference 20/01089/FUL, including fenestration improvements to Plot 1 to improve the appearance from Thorney Road and the proposed access road.

The pattern of development is considered to be consistent with the character of the immediate area, which is predominantly characterised by the Dalmark Seeds site to the east and new build residential development to the immediate west and south. Whilst the line of dwellings along the eastern boundary of the site is unusual and with nothing of known comparison within the City Council's authority area, it is not considered to be unacceptable.

The development has addressed the first and second reasons for refusal, as set out under the 2018 application, which originally sought to introduce a 3.6m high acoustic barrier along the eastern boundary, and 2.5 storey house types, which were not considered to be in keeping with the properties along Thorney Road.

The Police and Architectural Liaison Officer (PALO) has raised no objections to the proposal, however has sought details of lighting. The Fire Officer has also raised no objections to the proposal, however has sought details of fire hydrants to be secured by planning condition. Subject to securing details of materials, levels, lighting and fire hydrants. These matters could readily be secured by condition to achieve an acceptable final layout.

Officers consider that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the immediate area, and would respect the context and pattern of development of the area. Whilst the dwellings to the eastern boundary would be unusual, they would not result in a harmful layout or appearance of development. Further, it should be noted that design/layout impacts did not form a reason for refusal of the previous application (20/01089/FUL) and therefore Officers do not consider that this application could reasonably be resisted on this basis.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

c) Access and parking

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) have objected to the proposal on a number of grounds that relate to technical matters. The content of the comments are identical to those received under 20/01089/FUL, given that the layout and design proposed is the same as previously submitted under 20/01089/FUL but the comments are framed differently, with a clear objection stance. LHA Officers have advised that although their comments did not specifically state 'objection' during consideration of the previous planning application (20/01089/FUL), no opportunity came forward to provide 'final' comments on the previous scheme. It is considered however that the matters raised can predominantly be addressed either through planning conditions or separately through the provisions of the Highway Act 1980.

It is considered that an acceptable access to the development site could be secured, alongside satisfactory off-street parking arrangements to serve each dwelling and internal access roads/footways. The vehicular access to the site would be 5.5 metres in width, allowing for safe passing of 2no. vehicles and refuse vehicles. In addition, 2 metre wide footways would be provided to both sides, connecting to the existing public highway network.

The LHA have sought further details of visitor parking and pedestrian crossing points. Three on-street spaces have been identified as being capable of used by visitors, as well as pedestrian crossing point (narrowing of the road) some 50 metres into the application site. The LHA has advised that the proposed vehicular access includes highway boundary and this should be revisited. However they have not advised that this is a highway safety matter, and the proposed access accords with the design that was considered to be acceptable previously. This therefore is a matter to be resolved through the Highway Act and is acceptable for planning purposes. It is not considered that the access design need alter to accommodate this, however if for any reason this were to be the case, the Applicant would need to formally apply to revise the access drawing.

The proposed garages are considered to meet the dimensions required by the Local Planning Authority and it is considered satisfactory cycle provision for each dwelling could be secured, either as illustrated or through planning conditions.

The Local Highway Authority have sought to control the height of boundary fencing and the location of structures adjacent to the boundary. These matters can be secured by way of a planning condition.

With regards to visibility splays serving the accesses to individual dwellings, the LHA has requested that these be shown on the submitted drawings. Whilst these are not shown, Officers consider that there is adequate space from the back edge of the proposed highway to the front of every dwelling to achieve 1.5m x 1.5m pedestrian visibility splays. This is sufficient for all individual accesses and would ensure that users would have adequate sight of oncoming pedestrians.

Finally, with regards to cycle parking, it is considered that each Plot can adequately secure cycle storage, either through designated cycle stores as proposed or within the garages, which have an internal depth of approximately 7 metres.

Subject to conditions with respect to the provision of on-site parking, details of the proposed access, provision of visibility splays, garaging and cycle parking, as well as a construction management plan, it is not considered that the proposed development would constitute an adverse highway safety hazard and satisfactory parking would be provided for future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

The LHA have also raised the need for S278 works, specifically the position of footways, splays and turning heads; an informative will be attached for the avoidance of doubt. The LHA have also queried what would happen with the drainage easement, however the Council's Drainage Engineer has raised no objections to the proposal, as discussed in further detail below and therefore it is not

considered that this needs to be addressed.

d) Neighbour Amenity

As part of the 2018 application, two reasons for refusal raised concerns of the juxtaposition of the 3.6m high acoustic barrier along the eastern boundary and the associated impact on Alpine Lodge, as well as the relationship to properties along Millport Drive and Thorney Road due to a poor separation and overbearing impact, in particular to No. 63 Millport drive to the north-west of the site.

Compared to previous planning applications, the proposed scheme no longer proposes a 3.6m high acoustic barrier along the eastern boundary, and the layout has been amended so that an area of Public Open Space and a bungalow would be situated adjacent to Alpine Lodge. As such, this relationship is considered to be acceptable; the amenity of these neighbour occupiers would not be adversely impacted upon.

The layout as submitted would ensure a satisfactory back-to-back distance between the rear elevation of Plots 1-13 and properties along Millport Drive and Thorney Road, and Plot 14 has been amended so that it would sit in line with No. 62 Millport Drive. As such, the development would have a satisfactory relationship with these neighbouring properties, and is accepted in this instance.

Further to repositioning Plot 14, Officers must consider the relationship to 64 Millport Drive. Plot 14 would introduce two first floor windows serving a bathroom and bedroom. The bathroom window is a non-habitable room and would otherwise be obscurely glazed. When implementing the 45 degree horizontal and vertical rule from this first floor window to this neighbour's rear windows and primary amenity space, the garden area immediate behind the dwelling, given the angles and distances involved, and the level change between the application site and properties along Millport Drive, it is not considered this plot would result in an unacceptably adverse loss of privacy, and the relationship is accepted in this instance.

The development would not result in an unacceptably adverse overbearing impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, nor would it result in an adverse loss of light, outlook or privacy. As such, the proposal accords with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

e) Amenity of Future Occupiers

A key, fundamental constraint on this allocated housing site is noise and disturbance generated by the well-established Dalmark Seeds business to the immediate east, as well as noise generated by the A47. As such, to address this key concern, the physical layout of the site has been designed to attenuate noise from this neighbouring business, hence the introduction of Plots 18-24 along the eastern boundary, as well as the internal layout of a number of plots.

The application has been accompanied by a detailed noise assessment (Acoustic Associates, SEM/J3453/17677, May 2020), and the Council's Pollution Control Officer has previously raised no objections to the proposal under application reference 20/01089/FUL. Whilst no comments have been submitted by the Pollution Control Officer at the time of writing this report, despite requests for such, Officers consider that there are no fundamental changes from this previous application such that the previous recommendation would be altered.

As noted within the previous Pollution Control comments, this is a challenging site. It suffers from road noise, although this is comparable to other nearby residential properties. The difference with this site is the proximity to the adjacent industrial site and the resulting impact from processes carried out during the day and night, with the early morning (05:00hrs) processes being of particular significance.

The rating level of +18dB resulting from noise from industrial sources particularly at night is

concerning. BS 4142 states that a rating level of +10dB or more is likely to be an indication of significant adverse impact. During previous consultations, the Pollution Control Officer indicated that the maximum 'plus' rating level they are willing to accept would be a rating level of +10 to +12dB, which is considerably higher than the usual maximum of 'rating level equal to background', in recognition of the challenges faced at this site.

The noise report has indicated that the worst affected property would be Plot 8, and whilst this maybe the case, Figure 7 of Acoustic Associates Noise report SEM/J3453/17677 May 2020 indicates that Plots 1-9 would be impacted to a similar level.

The proposed glazing and mechanical ventilation as detailed in Section 3.2 of the report (SEM/J3453/17677 May 2020) would achieve suitable internal noise levels however this is reliant on windows being kept closed for the majority of the time when the industrial processes are occurring. Should Officers be minded to permit this development, the glazing and mechanical ventilation mitigation measures must be secured by condition; any diversion from these measures would require further application, consideration and approval.

The Pollution Control Officer has sought a 2.4m high barrier along Plots 14-18, which is also sought to be secured by condition.

With respect to Plots 4 to 11, these units would have the main bedrooms to the front of the property. Officers have advised previously that the main bedroom should be to the rear of the property with the box room and bathroom at the front of the property, as this is the main facade to be affected by noise. However, it is noted that the developer has placed two bedrooms at the rear of the properties. In considering this change, the new layouts for these plots are accepted as the majority of bedrooms are on the least noisy aspect. It is therefore considered necessary to secure the internal layout through a planning condition.

Plots 18 to 24 have been amended so that garage would be used as a bedroom; this has resulted in non-habitable room (kitchen) being placed next to a noise sensitive habitable room, a bedroom, which could give rise to noise complaints. Should planning permission be granted, details of additional noise attenuation would be sought to mitigate the transfer of noise between these plots.

A condition would also be attached ensuring that no new openings are created on the rear (east) elevation.

Each dwelling would be provided with satisfactory levels of light to primary habitable rooms, and would be served by gardens commensurate in size to the dwelling it would serve. Officers are conscious that the garden serving Plot 13 would be overlooked by Plots 14-16, however this would be a case of buyer beware.

Subject to conditions being appended with respect to glazing and mechanical ventilation, the provision of suitable barriers to Plots 14-18, the internal layout being secured by planning condition, internal mitigation for Plots 18-24 and permitted development restrictions with respect to the creation of rear openings to Plots 18-24, the proposal would ensure satisfactory amenity and living conditions for future occupiers.

On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

f) Meeting housing standards

Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) requires all new dwellings to conform to Part M4(2) of the Buildings Regulations unless there are exceptional reasons to justify against meeting this requirements (for example, listed building or topography constraints). Further to review of the proposed plans, it is considered that this requirement can be adequately met. A compliance condition shall be appended to ensure this standard is met and maintained.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

g) Wildlife

Under the previous planning application reference 20/01049/FUL, both the City Council's Wildlife Officer and the Wildlife Trust objected to the proposed development. This was on the grounds that no bat activity surveys and accompanying ecological assessments were submitted to determine the proposal's impact upon bats. Additionally, there was little evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would contribute to obtaining 'Biodiversity Net Gain'.

The revised planning submission now comprises: an Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA); Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report; and Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). Upon assessment, the City Council's Wildlife Officer considers the proposal now demonstrates that a net gain in biodiversity would result with no undue impact to bats.

To ensure that the recommendations stipulated within the EclA are implemented, the Wildlife Officer has recommended further details comprising a 'Construction Environmental Management Plan' (CEMP) are submitted to the Local Planning Authority for assessment. It is considered that this matter can be secured through a planning condition. Additionally, a lighting strategy is also recommended to ensure that the proposed scheme does not impact upon local wildlife, as recommended within the EclA. This matter shall also be secured through a planning condition.

Finally, a legal agreement is necessary to secure the values from the Biodiversity Net Gain scheme. The Wildlife Officer advises that, using a baseline average figure for neutral grassland meadow establishment of £1,686 per ha, the 0.19 ha of grassland to be established will be £320.34. All Biodiversity Net Gain schemes require ongoing management for a recommended period of 30 years, therefore the average cost of meadow management over the next 30 years plus estimated inflation of 3% is £2,267.23. The Applicant has agreed to this fee, therefore, subject to the legal undertaking being secured, along within the implementation and discharge of the suggested planning conditions, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in ecological terms.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and Paragraph 170(d) of the NPPF (2019).

h) Trees

The City Council's Tree Officer has raised no objections to the proposal, advising that the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement submitted are acceptable, and seeks that these details be conditioned.

Protective fencing would be used to retain and protect the existing hedging on the northern boundary, which is supported. The submitted landscaping plan does not provide sufficient detail, therefore a detached landscaping plan is sought to be secured by planning condition.

Subject to securing the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, method statement and protection by planning condition, as well as a landscaping scheme, it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

i) Contamination

The Council's Pollution Control Officer has raised no objections to the proposal with respect to contaminated land, subject to securing a detailed contaminated land assessment of the site, which would include preparing a remediation scheme and reporting in the event that contamination is found, as well as uncovering unsuspected contamination during construction.

Subject to securing these by planning condition, the proposal would make provision for future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP17 and LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

j) Drainage

i) Surface Water Drainage

The submitted Drainage Strategy notes that the underlying ground conditions are deemed unviable for the disposal of surface water runoff via infiltration based upon local geological records and knowledge of local sites. As such, the scheme has been designed to meet greenfield run off rates (1.6l/second), or less, including a 1 in a 100 year event, and would utilise on-site storage attention beneath the central road. Surface water would discharge to the north into Northholm Drain, which is covered by the North level Internal Drainage Board (NLIDB). It is understood that the proposed development would require some form of level changes across the site, however a proposed levels plan does not form part of this application and would be secured by planning condition.

The North Level Internal Drainage Board (NLIDB) originally objected to the proposal during consideration of planning application reference 20/01089/FUL, advising that a new surface water discharge scheme would require formal land drainage consent, as well as proof that the drain has capacity to take additional flows. The watercourse would also require maintenance and there are concerns to the suitability of the SUDS proposed. A further letter was received from the NLIDB, advising that they would withdraw their objection subject to an agreement between landowners to ensure the drain is fit for purpose. The Applicant would need to apply for land drainage consent and enter into an agreement to undertake off-site improvements, which would be undertaken outside of the planning process.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have responded with no objections, seeking a condition be attached seeking details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme.

As such, subject to securing details of levels, and the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme, satisfactory measures would be put in place to ensure surface water drainage is satisfactorily mitigated, and would not result in a risk of flooding either within the immediate locality or downstream.

ii) Foul drainage

The submitted Drainage Strategy states that foul effluent would be drained, via gravity, in a north westerly direction beneath the proposed access road to the existing foul sewer beneath Millport Drive and Whitby Avenue, ultimately draining to the existing Anglian Water (AW) sewage pumping station located adjacent to the north western corner of the Whitby Avenue (Larkfleet Homes) development. Adequate provision has been made within the layout to accommodate future sewer easements and to provide a 3m wide maintenance strip along the northern boundary drain. Anglian Water have not commented on this application, but for consistency purposes in relation to the previous planning application and the comments previously made, it is necessary to secure this matter through a planning condition.

iii) Water Efficiency

In addition to flood risk, Policy LP32 places a duty on new developments to secure efficient use of water and meet the Optional Technical Standard of 110 litres of water usage per person per day. It is therefore necessary and appropriate to secure a planning compliance condition to ensure that this requirement is met.

On the basis of the above and subject to the implementation of appropriate conditions, it is considered that the proposed development would make provision for a satisfactory surface water and foul drainage scheme, with water efficiency matters secured, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

k) Archaeology

The Council's Archaeology Officer has raised no objections to the proposal, noting that the development site may contain pre-medieval remains of regional/national importance, with particular reference to the Iron Age and Saxon periods. The existence of important later remains should not be excluded.

On the basis of the available evidence, it is recommended that a programme of archaeological work is secured by condition, which would include a desk-based assessment, non-intrusive geophysical survey, and the results of the survey would inform the programme of subsequent intrusive techniques of investigations, including evaluation by trial trenching and possible area excavation, if applicable.

Subject to securing this investigation by planning condition, the proposal would make provision for uncovering buried archaeology, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

l) Infrastructure

i) Affordable Housing

The application has been accompanied by a Viability Assessment, which has been assessed by the Council's S106 Planning Obligations Officer.

The appraisal is based on development costs minus the gross development value (GDV) to identify the Residual Land Value (RLV). The RLV is measured against a Benchmark Land Value (BLV) to determine viability.

To calculate RLV, all development costs including developer's return are measured against the gross development value (GDV), the result of this calculation identifies either a positive or negative residual land value (RLV). The submitted costs and anticipated revenues are acceptable, including 17.5% profit of GDV:

- An Environmental Noise Assessment identified abnormal costs including enhanced soundproof double glazing, mechanical ventilation with heat recovery (MVHR) to all plots and additional acoustic barriers;
- The proposal includes 7 specialist 'Wall House' types designed to mitigate noise. These do not have any back gardens or windows on the eastern elevations, demand for these dwellings will therefore be lower and this is reflected in their anticipated revenue. The location of the proposal will have an impact on demand, with boundaries to scrubland and commercial property; and
- Based on an initial geo-technical investigation there is potential for contamination and made-up ground at the site. At this stage there has been no additional cost applied to the potential mitigation.

Based on the abnormal costs associated with bringing this site forward, it has been demonstrated that the development could not provide affordable housing, and achieve a reasonable profit margin of 17.5%, and based on the information provided, it is accepted that this scheme does not provide affordable housing in this instance.

ii) Public Open Space

Based on the development proposed, the development should provide an on-site provision 0.11ha of public open space. The scheme as submitted provides 0.074ha of on-site public open space, and as such there would therefore be a shortfall of 0.036ha.

In light of this, the proposed development would place additional demand upon exiting open space (POS), where Policy LP21 of the Local Plan requires that an off-site financial contribution be made.

The Council's Open Space Officer has advised that Eye Nature Reserve, Eye Allotments and play

facilities in Eye require investment to its infrastructure, and in line with Policy LP21, an off-site contribution of 9,573.99 (+ 5yrs maintenance costs) is sought towards Children's Play, Allotments and Natural Greenspace.

However, as set out above, the Section 106 Officer has reviewed the submitted viability assessment, and accepted that there is insufficient monies available to provide affordable housing, or public open space. As such, and in this instance, Officers will not be seeking an off-site contribution towards Public Open Space or affordable housing. However, the development would still be captured by the Community Infrastructure Levy, therefore funds would be secured separate to the planning process, which would go towards infrastructure that is needed to support new development, such as transport schemes, flood defences, schools and health care facilities, as well as parks and open spaces.

Whilst the on-site provision does not accord with the Council's adopted policy standards, Officers consider that it is of a size which is commensurate with and appropriate for the proposed development. Furthermore, it should be noted that this did not form a reason for refusal of the previous application and Officers consider that this matter is not one for which the proposal could not be resisted.

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 principle of development is acceptable
- The character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area would not be adversely harmed by the proposed development, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would not adversely impact upon the safety of the surrounding highways, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would not unacceptably impact upon the amenity of neighbours, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The amenity of future occupiers of the proposed development would obtain an acceptable level of amenity, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposed dwellings could be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) of the Buildings Regulations, in accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposed development would not result in adverse harm to local wildlife, in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposal would not contribute to unacceptable to the amenity of trees, in accordance with Policy LP29 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Subject to measures being applied, the proposed scheme would not be at adverse risk to contamination, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- The proposed development would not be at adverse risk of flooding and appropriate measures are secured for drainage management, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).
- Subject to measures being appropriately applied, it is not considered that the proposal would unacceptably impact upon any significant, known buried heritage assets, in accordance with Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

7 Recommendation

The Executive Director of Place and Economy recommends that Planning Permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions and the securing of a Section 106 legal agreement:

- C 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- C 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Location Plan 1:1250
- Proposed Site Layout and Boundary Treatments (Drawing number AL0011, Revision P13)
- Proposed Floor Plans - Plot 01 (Drawing number AB0201, Revision P02)
- Proposed Floor Plans - Plots 02, 03 and 12 (Drawing number AB0202, Revision P01)
- Proposed Floor Plans - Plots 04-11 (Drawing number AB0203, Revision P01)
- Proposed Floor Plans - Plots 13 (Drawing number AB0204, Revision P01)
- Proposed Floor Plans - Plots 14 and 15 (Drawing number AB0205, Revision P01)
- Proposed Floor Plans - Plots 16 and 17 (Drawing number AB0206, Revision P01)
- Proposed Floor Plans - Plots 18 to 24 (Drawing number AB0207, Revision P01)
- Proposed Floor Plans - Plot 25 (Drawing number AB0208, Revision P01)
- Proposed Elevations - Plot 01 (Drawing number AB0801, Revision P03)
- Proposed Elevations - Plots 02, 03 and 12 (Drawing number AB0802, Revision P01)
- Proposed Elevations - Plots 04 and 11 (Drawing number AB0803, Revision P01)
- Proposed Elevations - Plot 13 (Drawing number AB0804, Revision P01)
- Proposed Elevations - Plots 14 and 15 (Drawing number AB0805, Revision P01)
- Proposed Elevations - Plots 16 and 17 (Drawing number AB0806, Revision P01)
- Proposed Elevations - Plots 18 to 24 (Drawing number AB0807, Revision P01)
- Proposed Elevations - Plot 25 (Bungalow) (Drawing number AB0808, Revision P01)

- Brick texture details (Drawing number AC0004, Revision P01)
- Garage Elevation and Floor Plans (Drawing number AC0003, Revision P02)
- Cycle Store - Elevations, Floor Plans and Sections (Drawing number AC0001, Revision P02)
- Pergolas and Porches - Elevations, Floor Plans and Sections (Drawing number AC0002, Revision P01)
- Topographic Survey (Drawing number 1)
- Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy (Drawing number 407.10763.00001.18.001)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Drawing number 4018.Cranmore.Pegasus.AIP)
- Tree Protection Plan (Drawing number 4018.Cranmore.Pegasus.TPP)

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

- C 3 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall take place unless and until details of the following external materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Walling (samples);
- Roofing (samples);
- Cills and lintels;
- Windows and doors;
- Roof lights;
- Driveway and access surfacing; and
- Rainwater goods.

The samples/details submitted for approval shall include the name of the manufacturer, the product type, colour (using BS4800) and reference number. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained as such.

Reason: For the Local Planning Authority to ensure a satisfactory external appearance, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 4 No development shall take commence unless and until a programme of archaeological work, including a Written Scheme of Investigation (comprising a desk-based assessment and methodologies comprising non-intrusive geophysical survey (magnetometer survey), which will inform further subsequent intrusive investigations trial trenching methodologies, assessment and analysis), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place unless in complete accordance with the approved scheme. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full including any post development requirements e.g. archiving and submission of final reports.

Reason: To mitigate the impact of the scheme on the historic environment when preservation in situ is not possible, in accordance with paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no groundworks harm potentially important buried heritage.

- C 5 No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied unless and until the highway linking that dwelling to the adopted public highway has been constructed to at least base coarse level with a temporary top dressing. The internal access road and footways shall thereafter be completed no later than first occupation of the last dwelling.

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

- C 6 Prior to the first occupation of each dwelling hereby permitted, the areas shown for the purposes of parking and turning on the drawing 'Proposed Site Layout and Boundary Treatments' (Drawing number AL0011, Revision P13) shall be provided. The garages and cycle shelters shall be provided in accordance with the drawings 'Garage Elevation and Floor Plans' (Drawing number AC0003, Revision P02) and 'Cycle Store - Elevations, Floor Plans and Sections' (Drawing number AC0001, Revision P02). Such provision shall thereafter be retained for these purposes associated with the dwellings hereby permitted, and not put to any other use.

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

- C 7 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 3 Class L of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the residential units hereby permitted shall each be a single residential unit within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) only.

Reason: The site is not served by sufficient parking to accommodate the demands generated by small-scale houses in multiple occupation such that harm would result to

highway safety from such a use, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 8 The development hereby permitted shall achieve the Optional Technical Housing Standard of 110 litres of water usage per person per day.

Reason: To minimise impact on the water environment, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C 9 No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied unless and until a scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the following:-

- Planting plans including species, numbers, size and density of planting;
- Details of replacement tree planting
- Details of all hard and soft boundary treatments, including fences and gates;
- Hard surfaces including driveways and patios.

The approved hard landscaping scheme (boundary treatments and hard surfaces) shall be carried out prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which it relates and retained thereafter.

The soft landscaping shall be carried out within the first available planting season following first occupation of any dwelling to which it relates or alternatively in accordance with a timetable for landscape implementation which has been approved as part of the submitted landscape scheme.

Any trees, shrubs or hedges forming part of the approved landscaping scheme (except those contained in enclosed rear gardens to individual dwellings) that die, are removed or become diseased within five years of the implementation of the landscaping scheme shall be replaced during the next available planting season by the developers, or their successors in title with an equivalent size, number and species to those being replaced. Any replacement trees, shrubs or hedgerows dying within five years of planting shall themselves be replaced with an equivalent size, number and species.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity of this area and to preserve the amenities of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C10 No development shall take place, excluding works of demolition, unless and until full details of the finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floor of the proposed buildings, in relation to existing ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: In the interests of accessibility for future occupiers as well as in the interests of surrounding neighbour amenity, in accordance with Policies LP16 and LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition as the site levels are required prior to any groundworks taking place which may influence them.

- C11 No development shall be begun until details of the design, implementation, maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include, but are not limited to:

- i) Construction details of all drainage and SuDS assets, which include but is not limited to, details of the proposed permeable paving, storage crates and filter drain, which shows how they will interact; and
- ii) Confirmation of the parties responsible for the maintenance of the drainage assets.

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

Reason: Reason: To ensure appropriate drainage measures are retained for the longevity of the dwellings permitted, in accordance with Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). This is a pre-commencement conditions as appropriate and acceptable drainage matters need to be secured to serve the dwellings hereby permitted.

- C12 No development other than groundworks and foundations shall commence unless and until a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants to serve the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of general amenity and fire safety, in accordance with Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019)

- C13 Prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, details of a scheme comprising details of all external lighting sources shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include, but not limited to:

a) light spillage diagrams;

b) those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and

c) details as to where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy and prior to first occupation of the dwelling to which it relates. The lighting shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details. .

Reason: In the interests of reducing crime risk, in the interests of future occupiers and in order to protect specie of principal importance, in accordance with Policies LP16, LP17 and LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C14 No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) unless and until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following:

a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.

b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".

c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements) including ensuring no Non-Native Invasive Species are spread across the site.

d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.

- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the recommended mitigation and compensation suggested in section 5 of the Ecological Impact Assessment (agb Environmental Ltd, 2021) are followed correctly in accordance with Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no protected species are harmed by any works.

C15 a) No development shall take place until an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This assessment must be undertaken by a competent person, and shall assess any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. Moreover, it must include:

- (i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
- (ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - human health,
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
 - adjoining land,
 - groundwaters and surface waters,
 - ecological systems; and
 - archaeological sites and ancient monuments;

b) No development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s), and a timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

c) The remediation scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable of works. Within 3 months of the completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a validation report (that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out) must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

d) In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing within 5 days to the Local Planning Authority and once the Local Planning Authority has identified the part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination development must be halted on that part of the site.

An assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Condition 15 a), and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme, together with a timetable for

its implementation, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the requirements of Condition 15 b).

The measures in the approved remediation scheme must then be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a validation report must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with Condition 15 c)

Reason: To ensure all contamination within the site is dealt with in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure that no development takes place which could result in potential harm to human health or controlled waters.

- C16 If, during development, contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure all contamination within the site is dealt with, in accordance with Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019) and paragraph 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

- C17 Prior to first occupation of any residential unit hereby permitted, the glazing and ventilation measures as specified in Section 3.2 of the document entitled 'Revised Environmental Noise Assessment For The Proposed Residential Development At Cranmore House, Thorney Road, Eye, Peterborough (May 2020)' (reference: SEM/J3453/17677, dated May 2020) shall be installed. Thereafter, the installed measures shall be retained and maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of future occupiers, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C18 Notwithstanding the information shown on the drawing 'Proposed Site Layout and Boundary Treatments (Drawing number AL0011, Revision P13)', prior to first occupation of the dwellings within Plots 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 hereby permitted, details of a 2.4 metre high acoustic barrier to be erected along Plots 14 to 17 and Plot 18 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall comprise a layout plan of where the 2.4 metre barrier would be erected, details of the barrier itself including materials and colour finish. The approved barrier shall be constructed prior to first occupation of Plots 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 and shall be maintained and retained as such thereafter in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of protecting future occupiers from adverse noise impacts, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C19 The dwellings hereby permitted and identified as Plots 4-11 (inclusive) on the drawing 'Proposed Site Layout and Boundary Treatments (Drawing number AL0011, Revision P13)' shall be laid out internally in accordance with the drawing 'Proposed Floor Plans - Plots 04-11 (Drawing number AB0203, Revision P01). The floor layouts to these plots shall be retained and maintained as such thereafter in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of protecting future occupiers from adverse noise impacts, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C20 No development other than groundworks shall commence unless and until details of a noise attenuation scheme regarding internal noise mitigation for Plots 18 to 24 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved and thereafter maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of protecting future occupiers from adverse noise impacts, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C21 Notwithstanding the requirements of Classes A, B and C of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window or door openings shall be installed to the east-facing rear elevations of Plots 18-24 (inclusive), unless expressly authorised by the granting of any future planning permission.

Reason: In the interests of protecting future occupiers from adverse noise impacts, in accordance with Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C22 The dwellings hereby permitted shall be constructed to meet the requirements of Part M4(2) of the Buildings Regulations.

Reason: In the interests of providing homes to meeting the changing needs of occupiers overtime, in accordance with Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

- C23 No development shall take place unless and until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include amongst other matters:

- HGV routing from surrounding public highways;
- a scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for construction vehicles, including contingency measures should these facilities become in-operative and a scheme for the cleaning of affected public highways;
- a scheme for the storage of materials clear of the public highway;
- a scheme for parking of contractors vehicles; and
- a scheme for access and deliveries including hours.

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

Reason: In the interest of highway safety, in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019). This is a pre-commencement condition as these details need to be agreed before development can commence on site.

- C24 Prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, vehicle-to-pedestrian visibility splays measuring 1.5 metres x 1.5 metres shall be provided to both sides of each vehicular access as shown on the drawing ' Proposed Site Layout and Boundary Treatments (Drawing number AL0011, Revision P13)'. The visibility splays shall thereafter be retained and kept permanently clear of all obstacles above 600mm in height.

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

Copies to Cllrs Allen, Brown and Simons