

<b>CABINET</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM No. 5</b>
<b>14 June 2010</b>	<b>PUBLIC REPORT</b>

Cabinet Member responsible:	Councillor M Cereste (Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Economic Development)	
Contact Officers:	Andrew Edwards (Head of Delivery)	Tel. 384530
Reporting Officer:	Richard Kay (Policy and Strategy Manager)	Tel. 863795

**PETERBOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: THE PETERBOROUGH DISTRICT HOSPITAL SITE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

<b>R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S</b>	
<b>FROM :</b> Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning and Economic Development	<b>Deadline date :</b> 14 June 2010
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	
That Cabinet adopts the Peterborough District Hospital Site Supplementary Planning Document as formal planning policy as part of its Local Development Framework.	

**1. ORIGIN OF REPORT**

1.1 This report is submitted to Cabinet: (a) following approval of the Council's Local Development Scheme by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government; (b) in accordance with the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005; and (c) following approval by Cabinet of a consultation draft Hospital Site SPD on 29 March 2010.

**2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT**

2.1 The purpose of this report is to enable Cabinet to adopt the Peterborough District Hospital Site Supplementary Planning Document (hereafter referred to as the 'Hospital Site SPD') as formal planning policy as part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF).

2.2 The officer-recommend Hospital Site SPD is available on the Council's web site at: <http://democracy.peterborough.gov.uk/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD310&ID=310&RPID=138422&sch=doc&cat=13030&path=13030> and copies have been placed in the Members group rooms.

2.4 This report is for Cabinet to consider under its terms of reference 3.2.3 'to take a leading role in promoting the economic, environmental and social well-being of the area'.

**3. TIMESCALE**

Is this a Major Policy Item/Statutory Plan?	<b>NO</b>
---	-----------

**4. PETERBOROUGH DISTRICT HOSPITAL SITE**

**Introduction**

4.1 The Peterborough District Hospital Site will be vacated by the end of 2011 following the transfer of remaining medical services to the new City Hospital on the Edith Cavell site. The site will become vacant and will require comprehensive regeneration. The purpose of the Hospital Site SPD is to provide detailed guidance to prospective developers as to the type

and level of development the Council will expect to see come forward on the site and in turn meet the objectives of the Local Plan, the emerging LDF, the Local Area Agreement and the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

- 4.2 The Hospital Site SPD has been prepared jointly by King Sturge (acting on behalf of the Peterborough and Stamford NHS Trust) and PCC Officers. However, as the SPD will become official Council planning policy once adopted, the final text as presented to Cabinet is that as recommended by PCC Planning Officers.

### **Summary of the Hospital Site SPD**

- 4.3 Your report and presentation of 29 March 2010 summarised the content of the draft Hospital Site SPD, and is not repeated here. However, the basic headlines of the proposals are:

- **Site Area:** 10 hectares (25 acres), currently containing a range of hospital and residential buildings. Most of the site will be cleared to make way for new development.
- **Residential development:** The Hospital Site SPD makes provision for 350-550 new houses, mainly in a mix of family housing and apartments, at varying densities (generally higher to the east). 30% of all new dwellings proposed to be affordable; and a minimum of 20% to meet lifetime homes standards.
- **Retail** – Small-scale retail facilities of no larger than 500m<sup>2</sup> gross in total.
- **Historic buildings** – Historic buildings of local importance on the site should be retained and re-used, namely The Gables and the core part of the Memorial Hospital.
- **Transport/access** – Redevelopment of the site will create and improve access to and through the site. New east and west links are proposed and an opportunity for direct connectivity, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists, into the Station Quarter/Railway station and surrounding residential suburbs.
- **Trees** – trees that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and those that are not protected by law but make a positive contribution to the character of the area will need to be retained and preserved.

- 4.4 The Hospital Site SPD has fuller details as to what is expected from the site, and the above should therefore be considered only as a summary.

## **5. CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 The draft Hospital Site SPD was presented to the LDF Scrutiny Group (17<sup>th</sup> March), PEP Committee (23<sup>rd</sup> March) and Cabinet (29<sup>th</sup> March). The draft Hospital Site SPD was then published for formal consultation for the statutorily required 4 weeks; between 9<sup>th</sup> April and 6<sup>th</sup> May 2010. To advertise the consultation period, leaflets were dropped in the surrounding residential area, two radio interviews were given, formal press notices and informal press articles appeared in the local newspaper, and the documents were available in both Hospital reception areas and in Bayard Place reception. All material was available on the Council's website.
- 5.2 Following the consultation, the representations have been considered and a statement has been prepared setting out a summary of the main issues raised and how these issues are to be addressed in the final document. This is attached at Appendix 1. Overall, there were no significant issues raised, and as such it was not considered necessary for a fundamental rethink of the SPD.
- 5.3 As a result of the comments received, together with a final review of the document by officers, the following substantive changes have been made by officers (and are thus recommended to Cabinet) compared with the draft Hospital Site SPD previously seen by Cabinet (29 March). As can be seen, they are relatively few, and reflect the number of suggestions received during the consultation process:

- Additional references to historic assets (listed buildings etc) incorporated to the text, further ensuring they are carefully considered as part of detailed planning application process;
- New reference added to the SPD for the need for a single wider Nature / Biodiversity / Open Space / Green Infrastructure Strategy as part of a future planning application;
- Additional reference to the need for future detailed development proposals to consider particularly carefully the issue of parking, both on site and off site. Parking was an issue frequently raised during the consultation exercise, probably reflecting the high level of on-street parking which currently exists in the neighbouring area;
- Reference added to the need to consider the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit Assessment.

5.4 Some suggestions have not been taken forward, either because they were not considered appropriate or because they were detailed matters more appropriate to a full planning application stage. Please see appendix 1 report for full details.

5.5 Planning and Environment Protection Committee was scheduled to consider the final version of the Hospital Site SPD on 8 June 2010. Any comments made by that Committee will be reported verbally to Cabinet.

## 6. ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

6.1 It is anticipated that Cabinet will adopt the Hospital Site SPD as formal planning policy for the site, with the SPD forming part of the Council's planning policy LDF.

## 7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Cabinet is recommended to adopt the Hospital Site SPD. All statutory regulations regarding consultation have been completed and representations received taken in to account. Having an adopted SPD for the Hospital Site is beneficial to the Council, because it has a clear benchmark to assess any future development proposals for the site, and beneficial to developers, because they have a clear understanding as to what the Council expects on the site. This minimises risk on all parties and will enable a timelier redevelopment of the site than would be the case without such adopted policy.

## 8. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

8.1 Various development options for the site have been considered and have been tested for the viability of each. The development proposed in the document is, in simple terms, considered to be the 'preferred option', and there were no overriding reasons given during the public consultation period to warrant an alternative solution to be investigated.

## 9. IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The SPD will guide regeneration of the hospital quarter; it will help to deliver a mix of housing and a small amount of ancillary retail.

9.2 **Legal Implications** - The Council must follow due Regulations in preparing the SPD. Once the Hospital Site SPD is adopted, the Council has a legal duty to refer to it when determining planning applications for the hospital site and, to some extent, the surrounding area. If Cabinet adopts the SPD today, there is an opportunity for such a decision to be legally challenged by a third party, but this rarely occurs. If it does, the appropriate steps will be taken to resolve the matter, in consultation with Cabinet if necessary.

9.3 **Financial Implications** - There are no immediate financial implications flowing from the approval of the Hospital Site SPD. However, Members should be aware that there could be:

- Indirect financial implications for the Council in terms of its Vawser Lodge asset. This falls within the SPD area, and is labelled as possibly coming forward for housing. However, the SPD is sufficiently flexible for this to happen or not happen depending on

what the Council wishes to see happen to that asset (hence, the SPD only has indirect financial implications);

- Indirect financial implications arising from the development of the hospital site (e.g. provision of infrastructure and services for the new residents, s106 arrangements, and increased council tax or other receipts).

9.4 **Environmental Implications:** Environmental issues are prevalent throughout the Hospital Site SPD, with requirements such as the need for Code 4 of the Sustainable Homes to be implemented, habitat and biodiversity creation/protection, protection of trees, increased and improved provision for cyclists and pedestrians, the need for a travel plan, and the need for a waste management plan. The site itself is obviously very close to services and facilities, which should encourage sustainable travel choice. Overall, the SPD, if delivered on site, would have many and significant environmental benefits.

## 10. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985)

- Peterborough Local Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Replacement) July 2005;
- Peterborough Core Strategy Proposed Submission Version (as approved by Council December 2009 and published in January 2010);
- Draft Hospital Site SPD, April 2010.

**The Peterborough District Hospital Supplementary Planning Document  
Consultation Draft**

**Comments Received and Responses to the Key Issues  
May 2010**

(version for Cabinet 14 June 2010)

***Explanatory Note:***

*This document sets out a summary of the comments and issues raised at the consultation stage of the draft Peterborough District Hospital Supplementary Planning Document, together with the Council's response to the key issues raised.*

*This is a public document, and helps meet Peterborough City Council's commitment to consult and keep people informed of progress on the Local Development Framework (which the Supplementary Planning Document forms a part). Full details on Peterborough City Council's commitments on community consultation can be found in its Statement of Community Involvement, available on the Council's website.*

*This document has been prepared by the Planning Policy Team at Peterborough City Council.*

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. Peterborough City Council wishes to particularly thank all those who took the time between April and May 2010 to complete the response form or to write to us with thoughts, ideas and concerns about the draft Hospital Site SPD.
- 1.2. This document is to highlight to everyone a summary of what was said and how we propose to take those comments forward.
- 1.3. Some responses were detailed in nature and clearly this document cannot summarise every point made, but rather it tries to capture the most important or frequently mentioned issues. However, rest assured that all comments received have been read and considered in detail, even if you cannot explicitly see it summarised here.
- 1.4. On the following pages, we set out in a standard format the comments received for each paragraph or issue.

### **Next Steps**

- 1.5. Taking account of the findings set out in this report we will shortly be publishing a final version of the SPD for consideration by the Cabinet. This is expected in June 2010.

## 2. Consideration of the Issues Raised

Please note that all references to 'section x' are referring to such items as can be found in the Consultation draft of the Peterborough District Hospital Site Supplementary Planning Document (April 2010).

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 2 – SPD Area</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reference in the SPD to Grade II listed Westwood House.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to Westwood House will be added into the Site History section.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 2.4 – Wider Location</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mention of the character to the north of the site.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The final document will be updated with a paragraph on the character to the north of the site.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 4.1</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for retention of the Memorial wing; encouraging use of cycles and pedestrian use; using existing mature vegetation.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This support is noted.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 4.1 - Opportunities</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to the listed buildings should include Westwood House and any other BLI's in terms of improving their setting.</li> <li>The referencing to the retention of the Gables is weak and at odds with the much firmer wording of policy CBE11. It also conflicts with the Council's commitment to enriching the potential of heritage buildings within regeneration schemes contained in the emerging LDF Core Strategy.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments noted and will be considered further, with further text added to the SPD if appropriate.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 4.2 - Constraints</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question why the set back of the listed Sessions House is identified as a "constraint" when this could equally be an opportunity for improved public space.</li> <li>Why is the Memorial Wing identified as a "constraint" when text seems to refer to the building as an "opportunity"?</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land to the front of the Sessions House is under private ownership and not included within the redevelopment area. Given its private ownership, the area to the front of Sessions House is unlikely to be made available for public open space.</li> <li>The Memorial Wing can be viewed subjectively as both an opportunity and constraint and is referenced as such.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 4.3 – Overarching Vision</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little consideration given to the effects of the redevelopment on the wider area, specifically the setting of the City Centre Conservation Area to the east.</li> <li>The relationship of the site with the city centre needs to be assessed and included as an issue in the SPD.</li> <li>Welcome the reference to harmonisation of development with listed buildings and the surrounding area.</li> <li>Suggest explicit reference to the BLI's is also included.</li> <li>Welcome the requirement to retain the core of the Memorial Wing, the need for indicative storey heights</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The city centre is some distance from the site, separated by a railway line. The expected height of the scheme suggests it will have no impact upon the conservation area.</li> <li>The general relationship of the site with the city centre has been an important consideration in preparing the SPD.</li> <li>No changes considered necessary.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.1 – retail element</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for provision of a small scale retail facility.</li> <li>• Cannot see the need for new retail uses.</li> <li>• Would prefer expansion of existing shops in the area.</li> <li>• Hospital Quarter is 'out of centre' and not suitable for town centre or food retailing uses.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The retail element will be a small element of the wider scheme. The retail element is expected to provide convenience basket sized shopping for new residents.</li> <li>• Due to its size and nature, it is not envisaged that the retail offering will compete with other surrounding local centres.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.1 – Mix of Uses</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urgent need for a new Primary School</li> <li>• Should be built on current school playing field adjacent to Angus Court</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD draft is worded so as to be non prescriptive as to the location of educational facilities.</li> <li>• The SPD draft does highlight a demand for educational provision across all age groups.</li> <li>• The need for a Primary School in the general locality (not just the hospital site) is an ongoing debate within the Council and its specific size, location and timing of delivery are still to be decided.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.1 – Mix of Uses</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential led scheme is the most suitable form of development for the area.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment noted</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.1 – Mix of Uses</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the removal of the need for office space in the Hospital Opportunity Area.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment noted.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.4 – Environmental Sustainability</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add in paragraph which requires a drainage strategy for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to be submitted with the Masterplan.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This matter can be consider at a detailed application stage rather than this broad strategic stage.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.4 – Environmental Sustainability</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning applications should be supported by a detailed ecological assessment, particularly due to the presence of bats on the site.</li> <li>• Welcome the fact that development proposals will be designed to benefit bats and other priority BAP species in and around the site.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments noted</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.4 – Environmental Sustainability</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the scheme provide extra care/ sheltered accommodation?</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A variety of different residential dwelling types may be forthcoming through the application process. The SPD is not prescriptive on this.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.5 – Design Parameters</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The treatment of the area of the site situated between the listed Wagon Repair Shop and Sessions House needs careful consideration.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The listed buildings are referenced in the SPD. Design considerations will come forward further in future planning applications.</li> </ul>



<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.6 – TPO issue</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is currently no TPO on the corner of Midland Road and Thorpe Road, contrary to the referencing in section 5.6. The TPO is currently draft</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This factual inaccuracy will be addressed in the final document.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.6 – Memorial Wing</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Memorial Wing to be converted into residential accommodation for the over 60's with supporting services including shops, doctors</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of the Memorial Wing core is a key theme of the SPD. Community uses are advocated for it's re-use. Any alternative uses will need to be discussed through the planning application process.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.6 – The Gables</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Gables is referenced as "A Building of Local Townscape Merit". This description understates the attractiveness of the building. The city needs to retain such distinctive buildings.</li> <li>The SPD needs to conform to PPS5 guidance on the historic environment with regards to The Gables. The LPA should take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets.</li> <li>The Gables, from a place-shaping and local distinctiveness perspective will need to be weighed against the other public benefits arising from the redevelopment of the hospital site.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The referencing comes from the adopted Local Plan. As the building does not benefit from a statutory listing, no further weight of protection can be afforded through the SPD.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.6 – Layout &amp; Urban Form</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two storey building on the corner of Thorpe Road and Aldermans Drive should be retained.</li> <li>Re-development as a whole should go some way to re-establishing Aldermans Drive as a visually pleasing vista.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The corner building is referenced in the SPD as having a level of positive townscape merit and the emphasis is on its retention and re-use.</li> <li>One of the overarching themes of the document is to produce high quality urban design across the whole SPD area.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.6 – Link to Station Quarter</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any forthcoming proposals will need to be mindful of the adjoining Station Quarter</li> <li>Reference to a co-ordinated approach to masterplanning, with Station Quarter is welcomed.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft SPD references the need for a co-ordinated approach to masterplan development with adjoining sites.</li> <li>Comment noted</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.6 – historic assets</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reference to the setting of the Grade II* and Grade II listed railway structures.</li> <li>No reference to the setting of 64 Thorpe Road and The Lodge.</li> <li>Should be noted that the Grade II listed Westwood House. Its setting could be affected depending on existing and proposed landscaping.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All comments noted</li> <li>Further reference will be made to the listed railway structures in the final document.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.6 – education issues</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site 1 would make an ideal location for University buildings associated with a Medical School.</li> <li>The current site is largely publicly owned (albeit through the Trust and PCC). A public facility such as a University Centre, Community Centre, Arts Centre and new Primary School would better recognise this previous use rather than private housing.</li> <li>The North end of Site 4 (to the north of 'The Gables') would be an ideal location for a replacement for West Town Primary School with access from Aldermans Drive.</li> </ul>

<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All comments noted, some of which will be important issues at a planning application stage.</li> <li>• The need for a Primary School in the general locality (not just the hospital site) is an ongoing debate within the Council and its specific size, location and timing of delivery are still to be decided.</li> <li>• The provision of a university on this site is no longer considered appropriate or deliverable.</li> </ul>
-----------------	---

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.6 – cycling / access</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve pedestrian and cyclist safety along Thorpe Road by redeveloping the frontage to the north side of Thorpe Road and taking the cycle and footpath to the north of the line of mature trees.</li> <li>• Attention also needs to be given to westward movement of cyclists.</li> <li>• There are too many accesses proposed off Thorpe Road. These junctions just lead to traffic congestion and potential accident spots. Improved junctions at Aldermans Drive and Midland Road would provide sufficient access.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All comments noted</li> <li>• Specific cycle and pedestrian routes will be formalised through the planning application process and Green Travel Plan which will put forward proposals for cycle routes.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.6 – open space</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site 2 would make a good Allotments area to replace those lost at Westfield Road/The Grange</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of open space, including allotments, wither on-site or off site will form part of the detailed planning application process, in line with the Council's adopted Local Plan policy on the need for open space provision as part of new developments.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.8 - parking</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overspill car parking along Westwood Park Road and other street is currently overused by hospital workers and train commuters.</li> <li>• Please consider the parking requirements for both workers and visitors to avoid local roads being taken up for parking.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On site car parking may be regulated through any forthcoming planning application, and we can consider a controlled parking zone around the site.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.8 – Highways/ Transport</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the development principle to deliver sustainable modes of transport.</li> <li>• Support for requirement for a comprehensive Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.</li> <li>• Requests that the Transport Assessment also considers the impact of development on the trunk road, in particular it's junction with the A15 and A1260.</li> <li>• Redevelopment should include cycle paths linking Westfield Road, Mayors Walk, Aldermans Drive and Thorpe Road.</li> <li>• A new pedestrian/ cycle bridge to the city centre would be welcomed</li> <li>• Future developers should make appropriate contributions to ensure the delivery of Peterborough Station upgrades/ improvements.</li> <li>• There is an argument to make that the pedestrian/ cycle bridge is unnecessary. If such a link were developed further, all developers benefiting from such a proposal should contribute to providing the non-railway elements of this link.</li> <li>• Transportation and traffic issues will need to be fully addressed.</li> <li>• Welcome the reference to a co-ordinated approach with nearby sites insofar as transportation matters are to be addressed.</li> <li>• Welcome the clear requirement for a cycle/ walking route through the site and its future connection through to the Station Quarter.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD requires the submission of a Green Travel Plan at planning application stage.</li> <li>• Cycle routes and linkages through the site and beyond will be an important consideration at the planning application stage.</li> <li>• Planning obligation contributions will be expected from any proposal to assist delivery of new pedestrian / cycle routes.</li> <li>• Station upgrade contributions will be realised through a wide variety of partners,</li> </ul>

	including developers and landowners. It will be at the planning application stage to determine what level of contribution to infrastructure works are needed by developers of the hospital site.
--	--

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 5.11 – Environmental Assessment</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the requirement identified in 5.11 that all planning applications will be supported by a screening request for an EIA.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments noted. Screening process underway.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 6 – Application Stage</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the proposal that a Nature Conservation report will be required at application stage.</li> <li>May be better to refer to a biodiversity strategy which could incorporate public open space and vegetation/ landscaping proposals.</li> <li>Support the proposal to seek innovative solutions to open space provision</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments noted.</li> <li>Reference to the need for a single wider Nature / Biodiversity / Open Space / Green Infrastructure Strategy to be added to the SPD</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 6 – Application Stage</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long term management and maintenance proposals should be included within the strategy.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPD amended as appropriate to reflect long term management and maintenance of the site.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 6 – Application Stage</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that the need to make provision for off-site indoor community sports facility provision becomes an integral part of the SPD.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is currently referencing to the Council's POIS document in the draft SPD. Off site sports facility provision will be dealt with through planning obligations.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 6 – Application Stage</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference should be made to a Site Waste Management Plan and the submission of a RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit Assessment will also be required as part of a planning application.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The list contained within section 6 is not expressed to be exhaustive. However, reference to RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit Assessment to be added to the final SPD</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 6 – Application Phase</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All Briefs and applications for development in this SPD area should be submitted at pre-application stage to the Design Review Panel.</li> <li>A retail impact assessment at planning application stage should be referenced. This should investigate the impact of the proposals on the Mayors Walk Shopping Centre.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is standard practice for all large applications in Peterborough.</li> <li>A retail impact assessment may or may not be necessary dependent on the size of the retail offering proposed.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Section 6 – Application Stage</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend that redevelopment of Brownfield land is undertaken in accordance with CLR11 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination' and PPS23 'Planning and Pollution Control'.</li> <li>Welcome early liaison with the EA with regard to assessing the potential risk posed to controlled waters from the past use of the site.</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All planning applications will need to be in line with national planning guidance.</li> <li>The EA will be a statutory consultee in any forthcoming planning application.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Opportunities &amp; Constraints Plan</b>	
<b>Summary of</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not included within contents page. Essential that it is included in the final document.</li> </ul>

<b>Comments Received</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This reference in the contents page will be updated as appropriate.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: Overall document</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the overall objectives and opportunities which the SPD seeks to address</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments noted</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: General Questions</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is it envisaged to continue to restrict access from the Holditch Street site to the back of Percival Street?</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is too early to be sure, as this will be dependent on the final design of site 3.</li> </ul>

<b>Paragraph Reference: General Questions</b>	
<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will residents be subject to parking charges and will there be sufficient parking spaces?</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking will be provided in line with adopted development plan policy.</li> </ul>