

Application Ref: 23/00251/FUL

Proposal: Temporary change of use from Sui Generis Showground and F1 exhibition hall to B8 car storage and distribution with ancillary car preparation and maintenance and erection of x2 mobile office cabins, x2 paint booths/ovens and marquee (part retrospective)

Site: Exhibition Hall, East Of England Showground, Oundle Road, Alwalton
Applicant: c/o Lee Sharp East of England Showground Services Ltd
Agent: Mr Nick Harding - Lincs Town Planning Services Limited
Referred by: **Councillor Julie Stevenson**
Reason: Highway safety, noise and disturbance, hazardous materials, smells and archaeology.
Site visit: 30.03.2023

Case officer: Mr Asif Ali
Telephone No. 07572 463902
E-Mail: asif.ali@peterborough.gov.uk

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

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

Site Description

The application site is a parcel of land within the East of England Showground which includes the Arena and Pavilion buildings. The application site encompasses approximately 19 hectares of the Showground site with the remaining approximately 31 hectares of the Showground site not within the red edge of the application site. There are two main access routes into the East of England Showground site - one from the north (Orton Northgate) off Joseph Odam Way and the other access is from the east (Orton Southgate) off Dunblane Drive.

The application site is surrounded by predominantly residential properties to the north and east of the East of England Showground with industrial/commercial uses to the south and south-east of the site. To the west of the site lie open fields which border the A1, the A1 runs north-west to south-east.

The wider East of England Showground site is located outside of the urban boundary area and as such is classified as open countryside. A large part of the wider East of England Showground is also allocated for redevelopment under Local Plan policy LP35.7 and is subject to a specific policy LP36 setting out development principles. Two outline planning applications for residential development (650 dwellings) and residential/mixed use development (850 dwellings, school, care home, hotel, retail etc), have been submitted on the wider East of England Showground Site, which are currently being considered by the Local Planning Authority. No decision is expected to be made by the Local Planning Authority on these applications in the near future as consultations with local residents and consultees is still ongoing.

Proposal

The application is part retrospective in nature as the car storage and distribution use has been operating on site since at least February 2023. The application seeks a temporary permission for 5 years.

The proposal includes the following elements:

- Conversion of the exhibition hall (arena) for car repair and preparation, this would include the provision of paint booths inside the Arena building
- Change of use from open fields and car park area to car storage and distribution area
- Erection of temporary structures: 1no. Marquee, 2no. paint booths and 2no. portacabins which are proposed to be used for car repair and painting uses for a short-term temporary period until the works have been completed to the Arena building. The Marquee would measure 40.1m by 20.3m in terms of footprint.
- The proposal states the total number of employees on site will be 160.
- There will be a total of 8 HGV movements (4 car transporters) as well as 160 delivery vehicle movements per day.

The application states that the proposed development will use the Orton Southgate access off Dunblane Drive. The existing Showground use would operate from 35ha of remaining land located to the north of the site accessed from the Orton Northgate access off Joseph Odam Way.

2 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision	Date
23/00412/OUT	Outline permission for up to 650 dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure, with access secured and all other matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) reserved. Including demolition of all buildings	Pending Consideration	
23/00400/OUT	Outline permission for up to 850 dwellings, care village (up to 3.27 hec gross), up to 20,300 sq m of Class E [Class E (a), (b), (c), (d), (e),(g) (i)] and F1 floorspace of which: 1. Not more than 1000 sq m of floor space being Class E (a); 2. Not more than 1000 sq m being Sui Generis drinking establishment / drinking establishment with expanded food provision; bed hotel (up to 250 bed), car parking / servicing, 2 fe primary school, associated open space & infrastructure. Demolition of all buildings except for Arena and barn. All matters reserved save for access.	Pending Consideration	
06/00755/REM	New exhibition facility with associated toilets, playroom and service yard, upgrading of parking area	Permitted	21/07/2006
04/00586/OUT	New exhibition facility	Permitted	14/06/2004
03/01717/FUL	Single storey extension to the Peterborough Suite	Permitted	12/07/2004
98/00261/FUL	Use as car park	Permitted	06/10/1998

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 Settlement 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.

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.

LP28 - Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

Part 1: Designated Site

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

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

Local Sites- Development likely to have an adverse effect will only be permitted where the need

and benefits outweigh the loss.

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

Part 2: Habitats and Geodiversity in Development

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

Part 3: Mitigation of Potential Adverse Impacts of Development

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

LP29 - Trees and Woodland

Proposals should be prepared based upon the overriding principle that existing tree and woodland cover is maintained. Opportunities for expanding woodland should be actively considered. Proposals which would result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland and or the loss of veteran trees will be refused unless there are exceptional benefits which outweigh the loss. Where a proposal would result in the loss or deterioration of a tree covered by a Tree Preservation Order permission will be refused unless there is no net loss of amenity value or the need for and benefits of the development outweigh the loss. Where appropriate mitigation planting will be required.

LP30 - Culture, Leisure, Tourism and Community Facilities

LP30a) Development of new cultural, leisure and tourism facilities will be supported in the city centre. Facilities elsewhere may be supported in accordance with a sequential approach to site selection.

LP30b) Development proposals should recognise that community facilities are an integral component in achieving and maintaining sustainable development. Proposals for new community facilities will be supported in principle.

LP30c) The loss via redevelopment of an existing community, cultural, leisure or tourism facility will only be permitted if it is demonstrated that the facility is no longer fit for purpose, the service provided can be met by another facility or the proposal includes a new facility of a similar nature.

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.

LP36 - East of England Showground

Within the Showground the facilities related to the function of shows, conference facilities, employment related development and residential development (650 units) will be supported in principle subject to there being no unacceptable adverse impact on the surrounding uses. A comprehensive master plan should be submitted in advance or alongside any significant proposals. The loss of existing leisure and sports facilities will not be supported unless replacement facilities are provided.

4 Consultations/Representations

Orton Waterville Parish Council (Final)

Objection – not in keeping with being accessed through a residential area. Most significant concern is the access to the site via Dunblane Drive which is residential. The Showground operated without residential properties nearby but the residential developments of Orton Northgate and Southgate are now located close by now and the proposal would be unacceptable in term of traffic and

pollution.

PCC Peterborough Highways Services (Final – 27.09.2023)

Objection -

Further information is required as follows:

- Update Transport Statement to; clarify frequency and relationship with Showground events, Personal Injury Accident data, staff vehicle movements, comparative data from another site used by the occupier to provide trip generation data, flow diagrams as well as appropriate mitigations and assessments to support the data submitted.
- Submission of a 2 week survey of the access from Dunblane Drive to outline the number of car transporters and other vehicles coming in and out of the site.
- Confirm whether the existing car place adjacent to the site access is to remain in use or cease.

Despite a meeting with the transport consultants on the 6th of September no information has been submitted required to demonstrate that there would be no significant adverse impact on the highway.

The LHA would have concerns over events traffic using the Dunblane Drive access when this (DHL) use is in operation. It has occurred previously (during the course of this application) and resulted in a car transporter blocking one side of the circulatory carriageway of the Orton Parkway/Newcombe Way roundabout with no vehicles being able to pass as observed by the LHA Officer.

The LHA would seek to restrict the use of the Dunblane Drive access to solely for the proposal, with all other traffic associated with the remainder of the Showground site having to use the Joseph Odam Way access.

The submitted swept path drawings indicate that the vehicles may conflict, if more than 1 car transporters are trying to use the Dunblane Drive / Newcombe Way junction, which would result in works being required to the highway in this location. The need for these works to be carried out is dependent on the number and frequency of car transporters visiting the site.

Further information is required on EV charging bays and cycle parking, and a Travel Plan should be secured by s106 or condition.

Anglian Water Services Ltd

No objection subject to a condition requiring a surface water management strategy and informatives relating to Anglian Water assets and foul water.

Active Travel England

No comments as the ATE's statutory consultee remit applies on application made valid on or after 1 June 2023.

National Highways (Final)

No objection.

PCC Conservation Officer

No objection.

PCC Tree Officer

No objection subject to condition.

PCC Pollution Team

Comments advising on limits relating to the annual consumption of organic solvent in relation to the respraying of vehicles.

Archaeological Officer

Satisfied with the Archaeology Statement submitted by the Applicant, however, request that groundwork for the marquee foundation slab be discussed and carried out under archaeological supervision.

Lead Local Drainage Authority

No objection.

Environment Agency

No objection subject to condition.

PCC Wildlife Officer

No objection.

Peterborough Cycling Forum

No comments received.

SHELAA Contact

No comments received.

Huntingdon District Council

No comments received.

Opportunity Peterborough

No comments received.

Local Residents/Interested Parties

Initial consultations: 84

Total number of responses: 152

Total number of objections: 151

Total number in support: 1

152 comments were received as of 26/09/2023, 151 in objection and 1 in support. The comment in support made no further comments, and the objections can be summarised as below.

Objections:

- Development begun before planning permission has been granted.
- Access via Dunblane Drive will cause significant issues for residents.
- Hours of operation too extensive which will result in adjacent houses being adversely impacted by early and late arrivals, and there will be no respite for residents.
- Vehicles waiting at the entrance of Dunblane Drive prior to opening hours or awaiting access causes dangerous obstructions at the turning.
- Large transporters creating dangerous backlogs into Newcombe Way particularly at busy times.
- The additional private car movements from staff and other entering and exiting the site will adversely impact the rush hour traffic.
- The proposal is for an industrial use which should have an access via the industrial site or off the A1.
- Council should insist on adequate and effective transport access prior to granting permission.
- Proposal contrary to LP30 of the Local Plan.
- Proposed use already adding to the level of noise disruption.
- The proposed '5 year temporary' development will not be less impactful than current showground activity.
- The buildings and land within the application site are individually or jointly used for approximately 30 events per year. So, the number of events are small.
- Car transporters too big for the current road layout, damaging surrounding verges and infrastructure.
- There are alternative and more suitable access options to the Showground for car transporters

which should have been explored before developing the site and designating the Dunblane Drive access the preferred access point.

- If the proposed entrance is not signposted or communicated to drivers effectively it could lead to delivery vehicles and transporters trying to come through Northgate to get to the Showground entrance, resulting in delivery vehicles and transporters to turn around in small residential streets.
- The proposed industrial use is a significant change of use and is not in keeping with being accessed through a residential area.
- As of this week, large 'industrial' gates are being installed at the Dunblane Drive entrance, entirely inappropriate in what is a residential area.
- There will undoubtedly be an increase in safety risk with additional daily traffic.
- Vehicles for industrial use should not access the site via a quiet residential area.
- The air pollution will affect resident's quality of life.
- Car transporters and cars driving at the back of my property are very noisy and polluting as well as being an eyesore when they drive past.
- The cab drivers of the transporters will be able to look into all the houses and gardens as they drive along the access road.
- The traffic survey claims the walk to the nearest bus stop is 950m which is measured from the nearest possible point of the new development. If measured from the likely work place of the employees when they finish this distance will be 1350m.
- Entirely possible that the eventual number of employees, transporters, delivered vehicles and dispatched vehicles will be different from those specified in the application.
- If minded to approve in any form it is essential that the operation should be constrained by conditions restricting DHL to the figures quoted in the application and no more.
- Chemical pollution.
- The Showground has been diminished with more and more development permitted increasing traffic, adding pressure to local services.
- Dust from road into Showground, not good for asthma and noise.
- Always understood that there would be occasional but not continual disruption from the showground.
- No traffic survey carried out for the Dunblane Drive ingress.
- Lack of transparent engagement with the residents of Orton Southgate and Northgate.
- No visible master plan provided as per Policy LP36 and demonstration on how the showground functioning will be retained.
- Whilst LP36 is primarily focused on housing, it cannot be right that it is not considered for this application.
- The application states 4 car transporters, however, in a recent meeting with the Applicant the number of car transporters was 4 to 8.
- In responding to the access through Dunblane Drive and the original approvals relating to the Showground provided for free access for vehicles 24/7. That is a red herring. That free access was to support Showground activities and is irrelevant to the current requirement to support an industrial facility.
- Local wildlife will be disturbed or ruined.
- House prices will be reduced due to the proposal.
- Multiple occasions where car transporters have been reversing out of Dunblane Drive onto Newcombe Way or reversing out of the Dunblane Drive entrance.
- Gates for the Dunblane Drive access should be set back further so as to provide berthing for at least 2 HGVs which would avoid blocking up Dunblane Drive and Newcombe Way.
- Traffic management needs to be a serious consideration in not just this application, but any future use of the site.
- Changing parking locations and reduced parking capacity on site has led to traffic impact from Showground events held in 2022 and 2023 due to this proposal. 30/40 minute waits have become the norm at certain times.
- Goods Vehicle Operator's Licence has been applied for, the notice was published on 23 March but locals were not made aware until 14 April, a day after the 21 day notice period to object.
- Applicant has installed a portable kiosk right outside my house, accompanied by a lighting generator. The noise from the generator is causing me unacceptable impact.
- The residential areas of Orton Southgate and Orton Northgate were designed to complement an

already existing showground not a business.

- Multiple instances of more than 4 car transporters using the site, far in excess of the stated numbers.
- There have been all of the listed facilities on site at the East of England Showground since August 2021 as my business City Auction Group and PurpleRock were using paint booths, vehicle repair areas, logistics zones, parking for 1250 vehicles and supporting offices until the end of September 2022.
- We don't want our precious East of England Showground complex and valuable green space turned into an increasing noisy and busy industrial complex, construction site and car park.
- The Showground should not be developed for housing or for industrial uses.
- The Peterborough Panthers Speedway Team being forced to cease trading without being offered alternative land as in LP30.
- The elimination of the Arena as a leisure facility without its immediate or even guaranteed replacement means that this application does not comply with Peterborough's extant Local Plan and should be rejected in its entirety.
- Residents want to live in a decent area, suitable for families, clean air, hazard free from industrial activity. This is continuing to have a detrimental impact on quality of life.

5 Assessment of the planning issues

The main considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Design and character
- Highway safety
- Neighbour amenity
- Other

a) Principle of development

Rather than physical redevelopment of the site, the application seeks the temporary five-year change of use of a parcel of land including of open land from car parking/grassed areas to a car storage area. The proposal would also result in the change of use of the Arena to storage and ancillary car repair associated with the storage and distribution use proposed. Some temporary structures would be erected for the car repair and painting uses for a short-term temporary period until the internal works have been completed to the existing buildings on site. The Agent has stated that they would be willing to agree to a short-term period such as the end of this year for all the temporary structures to be removed and the land returned to its original state before the structures were erected.

Given the location of the site in open countryside beyond the settlement boundary, Policy LP2 and LP11 are relevant. The application also proposes development on an allocated site, and as such Policy LP36 is relevant in the consideration of this application. Furthermore, the proposal would result in the loss (albeit temporary) of a leisure/cultural facility and as such policy LP30 is relevant

Policies LP2 and LP11

Policy LP2 limits development within the open countryside unless it meets the listed exemptions including those listed in policy LP11. Rather than new permanent physical redevelopment, the proposal would alter existing buildings on site and change the use of open land to car storage. The change would be from one commercial use to another commercial use and would be temporary and reversible in nature. However, the proposal is beyond the defined urban area of Peterborough and therefore classed as open countryside. It does not fall neatly into any of the categories of development allowed under LP2 or LP11 and is therefore contrary to these policies.

Policies LP36 and LP30

Policy LP36 outlines uses (of a significant scale) which will be supported in principle on the part of

the showground site, which is allocated for development, subject to an approved masterplan. The uses which are supported include:

- Facilities directly related to the function of shows on the Showground itself;
- Conference facilities (D1 and D2);
- Employment related development;
- Residential development of around 650 dwellings.

LP36 also states that a comprehensive master plan in advance of, or alongside, any significant proposals will be required and, if approved by the council in advance, this would become a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications. Such a master plan must demonstrate how the functioning Showground will be retained. Policy LP36 further states -The loss of any existing leisure and sports facilities will not be supported unless replacement facilities are provided in accordance with Policy LP30. Also adding that any proposal should have no adverse impact on the surrounding uses especially neighbour amenity as well as ensuring any proposal maintains the character of the area.

Policy LP30 states that the loss, via redevelopment, of an existing community, leisure, tourism or community facility will only be permitted if it meets one of the exceptions set out below:

- k. The facility is demonstrably no longer fit for purpose and the site is not viable to be redeveloped for a new community facility; or
- l. The service provided by the facility is met by alternative provision that exists within reasonable proximity; or
- m. The proposal includes the provision of a new facility of a similar nature and of a similar or greater size in a suitable on or off-site location.

The five-year permission, sought by the applicant, whilst temporary, would be a significant development which would result in the loss of a unique community, leisure and cultural facility through the conversion of the Arena. This would trigger the need for a masterplan of the site demonstrating how the functioning of the showground would be retained. Further, a five-year loss of the Arena building would also require the applicant to demonstrate how the proposal meets the exception criteria of Policy LP30 listed above. Neither a Masterplan nor sufficient information against Policy LP30 has been provided with the application. The Applicant submitted a statement received on 30 June 2023 which outlined their responses to LP30 and LP36, together with a Viability Overview Statement. However, no evidence was submitted to support the overview set out within the statement, therefore only limited weight can be given to this.

The Statement acknowledges that the redevelopment of the Arena to another community facility has not been considered by the applicant, relying on the temporary nature of the development as sufficient justification.

The scale of development as well as the temporary nature of the proposal are key considerations when assessing under policies LP30 and LP36. Importantly, the interpretation of 'significant' for LP36 which is the trigger for the masterplan as well as the interpretation of 'loss' for LP30 which is the trigger for meeting one of the exceptions in order for the LPA to support the development, require careful consideration.

First in relation to LP30, whilst a loss in most cases is clear, especially via physical redevelopment, a temporary use is not as clear cut in defining a loss. This needs to be assessed on a case by case basis. The Arena would be much less likely to return to its original use, the longer the time period given over to another use. Officers have taken a view that a 5-year temporary permission would be tantamount to a loss. Whilst the Applicant has provided their justification in why the 5-year period is requested, this is based on optimising economic benefits in return for their investment into the site and while the public benefit from the development, i.e. a temporary source of employment, is considered and afforded moderate weight, this would not outweigh the harm from losing a unique facility which serves the city and provides a unique public benefit.

As such the proposal does not fall neatly into any of the categories of development allowed under

LP36 and LP30 and is therefore contrary to these policies.

Notwithstanding the above, a shorter temporary permission may be considered not to constitute a 'loss' for the purposes for LP30 and would allow a much greater chance for the Arena to return to its original use until the redevelopment of the entire site is carried out under a comprehensive masterplan for the future vision of the East of England Showground site. Similarly, a shorter temporary permission would not constitute 'significant' development for the purposes of LP36.

Principle of development conclusion

Being beyond the defined urban boundary of Peterborough, and therefore technically in open countryside, the proposal conflicts with policies LP2 and LP11. However, the proposal relates to a site which is previously developed and would involve a reversible change of use from an existing commercial use to another and would not result in any significant physical development or harmful encroachment onto undeveloped land. This together with the temporary nature and economic benefits from job creation would be sufficient to outweigh this technical policy conflict.

Furthermore, it is considered an appropriate condition can be secured for a shorter temporary period of 3 years which would not trigger the "demonstration of loss" and "masterplan" requirements of both policies LP30 and LP36.

In conclusion, the principal of development is acceptable subject to a temporary three-year limitation and subject to compliance with all other relevant policies which are addressed below.

b) Design and character

The proposal would result in the erection of temporary structures located within the site which would be a stop-gap measure until the conversion of the existing exhibition hall building on site has been completed. The conversion process for these buildings would result in limited external changes with vents being erected on the roof top of the Arena building. The alterations would not adversely impact the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

The proposal would result in a change in the character of the site as a result of the proposed car storage and distribution use. This represents a change from a leisure type use to an industrial and warehousing use. The application, however, is proposed for a temporary period only that could be secured by way of a planning condition if the application was recommended for approval. While the applicant has proposed a time period of five years, officers consider that a three year time period would be more appropriate in order not to compromise any future redevelopment of the site in comprehensive manner and to limit the impact on the character of the site and surrounding area. As a result, subject to such a condition, there would not be an adverse impact on the character of the site and surrounding area.

The proposal would not materially impact upon any relevant heritage assets.

In light of the above conclusion, it is considered that appropriate measures can be secured by way of conditions to avoid any adverse impact on the design and character of the site and surrounding area, and as such there would be no conflict with Policies LP16 and LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

c) Highway Safety

There are existing planning consents relating to the wider Showground site which are relevant to the consideration of this application.

The Applicant has confirmed that whilst they do not intend to carry out Showground events from the remaining parcel of land not impacted by the application site, they still wish to retain the right to carry out these events under the previous planning permissions. Therefore, the LPA would need to consider the impact of both uses being carried out at the same time in the worst-case scenario as

the LPA would have no control over the existing uses. The Applicant has stated that as the access into the site remains unrestricted, they are able to access the site with an unlimited number of vehicles as the site currently stands using either the Dunblane Drive or Joseph Odam Way accesses. Whilst the Applicant has included both accesses to the Showground site within the red edge, they have stated that the proposed use will solely make use of the Dunblane Drive access. This would include access by car transporters, staff vehicles as well as all other vehicles.

National Highways raised no objection to the proposal noting that the proposal would not result in a severe impact on the strategic road network, namely the A1 and its junctions.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) are responsible for the local highway network and have raised an objection to the proposed development due to insufficient information being provided in order to assess the impact on public highway safety. The further information requested is in relation to:

- updating the Transport Statement,
- a survey of the site access at Dunblane Drive, and
- an assessment of the cumulative impact of the proposed use combined with the remaining Showground use.

The existing Showground site is a sui generis use, the very nature of the approved use on site is unique (not falling within a specific use class category) and plays host to major events that are held typically outside of peak network hours and are generally spread out over a number of days to account for setting up and packing away. The applicant intends to retain use right of the remaining 35ha land for Showground uses. Officers contend that there is a marked difference in the operation of Showground activities from the proposed car storage and distribution use which proposes a Monday to Friday use from 6am to 6pm. For this reason, additional information is required to enable the LHA to make an assessment of the materially different traffic movements arising from the proposed use to assess the likely impact on the public highway safety.

The initial highway information submitted for the proposed development stated there would be 4 transporters visiting the site per day with 80 vehicle deliveries per day. The number of employees on site was initially to be 140, however, during the application this was raised to 160 employees. The Applicant has also stated that the proposed development use would only use the Dunblane Drive access and any Showground facilities/events traffic would be accessed via the Orton Northgate access. Whilst this is noted, without sufficient highway information being provided to demonstrate the highway impact, suitable conditions or mechanisms to secure appropriate measures such as controlling accesses for specific uses cannot be secured.

Given the above it is considered that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in an adverse level of impact on public highway safety as such the proposal would be contrary to Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

d) Neighbour amenity

Local residents have raised multiple concerns with regards to the car transporters missing the entrance into the application site on the Dunblane Drive access and continuing onto the access road that leads into the residential estate which has caused damage to the public highway as well as traffic issues. The roads serving the residential estate are not designed for accommodating HGV traffic, however, there is no weight restriction currently in place on Dunblane Drive and the roads that lead off Dunblane Drive. The highway impact would be considered within the details that have been requested within the above section, however, it is important to note that only limited control can be exerted on HGVs missing the Dunblane Drive access in light of the current highway situation ie, lack of a weight restriction on Dunblane Drive.

With regards to other elements of the proposal, the development would not result in a significant level of overbearing, overshadowing or any adverse dominant impact on the amenity of the adjoining neighbours.

The proposal would result in HGVs passing neighbouring properties adjacent to the Dunblane Drive access while the access road out of the site onto Dunblane Drive has properties on Rosyth Avenue and Dunblane Drive which either back on or are located adjacent to the access road separated by a small grass verge nearer the access. Some occupants of these properties have raised concerns in relation to drivers being able to view into their gardens and windows from their raised position in HGVs. However, it is considered that the current use of the site allows for a similar impact with exiting HGV drivers having an elevated view in relation to some adjacent neighbouring properties and the proposal would not adversely change the existing situation in respect of that matter. It is further considered that the HGV traffic would be moving along the access road and that any views into the garden would be momentary and restricted during operating hours of the proposal. On balance, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an adverse level of overlooking.

In light of the above it is considered that the proposal would not result in an adverse level of impact on neighbour amenity in accordance with Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

e) Other

Orton Waterville Parish Council (PC) raised an objection to the proposal noting the significant change of use and the introduction of an industrial operation which is not in keeping with being accessed through a residential area. The PC noted most significant concern is the access to the site via Dunblane Drive which serves a predominantly residential area. The PC also noted that whilst the Showground operated without residential properties nearby, the residential developments of Orton Northgate and Southgate are now located close by and the proposal would be unacceptable in term of traffic and pollution. The PC comments with regards to impact on the character of the area and of traffic impacts on residential amenity have been addressed in the relevant sections above.

With regards the pollution impact, the Council's Pollution Control team raised comments in relation to the respraying of road vehicles and the need for an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016 if the annual consumption of organic solvent is likely to exceed 1 tonne. Concerns relating to vehicular pollution, noise and hazardous materials was not raised by the Pollution Control team and it is considered that the proposal would not in a significant level of vehicular movements compared with the existing use that would require any air quality measurements.

The Council's Tree Officer raised no objection to the proposal subject to securing the development in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Report.

The Council's Wildlife Officer raised no objection to the proposal noting that the proposal results in the temporary change of use of poor modified grassland. However, it was noted that even poor modified grassland has value within the biodiversity metric 4.0. Given the temporary basis there is no need to secure any additional biodiversity gain, but any permanent loss of the poor modified grassland would require appropriate ecological net gain.

The Environment Agency raised no objection to the proposal subject to securing the submitted flood risk assessment by condition.

The Council's Archaeological Officer is satisfied with the Archaeology Statement submitted by the Applicant; however, they did request that groundwork for the marquee foundation slab should be discussed and carried out under archaeological supervision.

Anglian Water raised no objection to the proposal but recommended the inclusion of a condition requiring the submission of a surface water management strategy as well as informatives relating to Anglian Water assets and foul water. In the event of an approval, it is considered appropriate to secure these details by condition and informative as appropriate.

The Council's Drainage team raised no objection to the proposal.

6 Conclusions

The proposal is unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below.

7 Recommendation

The Executive Director of Place and Economy recommends that Planning Permission is **REFUSED** for the following reason:

- R 1 Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in an adverse level of impact on public highway safety. The proposal would retain Showground uses from the remainder of the application site whilst introducing a car storage and distribution use for which they have failed to provide sufficient details to demonstrate that it would have an acceptable impact on the public highway network. As insufficient information has been submitted which does not allow the Local Planning Authority to fully assess the highway impact of the proposal, it is considered the proposal would be contrary to Policy LP13 of the Peterborough Local Plan (2019).

Copies to Councillors – Councillor Nicola Day
Councillor Kirsty Knight
Councillor Julie Stevenson

This page is intentionally left blank