

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 22 SEPTEMBER 2008 AT 1.30PM

Items Attached

	Page No:
1. Procedure for Speaking	1
2. List of Persons Wishing to Speak	2
3. Briefing Update	3
Item 5.3 Residents Petition of Objection	12
Letter from Mr A Peasgood	16

**UPDATE REPORT &
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC SPEAKING SCHEME - PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Procedural Notes

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

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

1. Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives.
2. Objectors
3. Applicant or agent or supporters.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 22 SEPTEMBER 2009 AT 1.30PM
LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK

Agenda Item No.	Page No	Application	Name	Objector/Applicant/Agent /Supporters/Parish Council/Town Council/Neighbourhood Representatives
5.2	17	09/00687/FUL: 5 DRAGONFLY CLOSE, HAMPTON HARGATE, PETERBOROUGH	Mrs Davy	Objector
5.3	23	09/00838/FUL AND 09/00839/CON: 80 LINCOLN ROAD, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Fazal Councillor Khan Stewart Jackson MP Councillor Peach Mr Peter Lee (The Civic Society) Mr Jeremy Roberts Reverend John Price Mr Alan Peasgood (Manager, St Marks Church) Mrs Margaret Randall Mr Daniel Dandaja Mr Lance Bloom Mr John Walton (Accent Nene) Mr David Shaw Mr Julian Base (NHS) Mr John Blair (Architect) Mr Matt Tyres (Traffic Consultant) Ms Sue Mitchell (Assistant Director Public Health)	Ward Councillor Ward Councillor Objector Objector Objector Objector Objector Objector Objector Objector Objector Applicant Agent Supporter Supporter Supporter Supporter

BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 22 September 2009

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1 .	08/00292/FUL	Cross Keys Homes Shrewsbury Avenue Woodston Peterborough , Demolition of existing warehouses, erection of 132 dwellings, 5 x light industrial units, and 4 x workshops; extension to existing offices (Revised plans received 20/6/08) TRAFFIC DESIGN SCHEME (REVISED PLAN-20/07/09)

Both plan numbers are incorrect, 102/SP 02 rev 1 should read 102/SP 02 rev I, 1615/DXD01 rev A should read 1615/XD01 rev A.

Minor alterations and clarification are still required to the layout, however this can be resolved by condition and through the Section 38 process of adoption.

The following additional highway related conditions are proposed:

C8. Notwithstanding the layout shown on the submitted plans (102/SP02 rev I and 1615/XD01 rev A), development shall not commence before details of highway construction, highway drainage and street lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety and to ensure that the new highways are adequately constructed, drained and lighted, in accordance with Policies T1, T3, T5 and T7 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C9. Lighting shall be arranged so that no danger or inconvenience is caused to users of the adjoining public highway. Details of the proposed lighting shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing prior to its first use.

Reason: To avoid glare/dazzle which could lead to danger to highway users, in accordance with Policy T1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C10. The details to be submitted in compliance with conditions 8 and 9 above shall provide for external lighting of the private access roads and pathways to each dwelling from the nearest public road. Such details as may be agreed/approved shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the dwellings served by the external lighting system.

Reason: In the interests of public safety, in accordance with Policies T1, DA11 and DA12 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C11. The dwellings shall not be occupied until the garages shown on the approved plans have been constructed, in accordance with the details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The garages shall thereafter be available at all times for the purpose of the parking of vehicles, in connection with the use of the dwellings.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the local residents or occupiers, in accordance with Policies T1, T9 and T10 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C12. Business Blocks A and B, Units 1-5 shall not be occupied until the area for the loading and unloading of vehicles, as shown on the approved plans has been drained and surfaced in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority], and that area shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than for the loading and unloading of vehicles.

Reason: In the interest of Highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C13. The buildings shall not be occupied until the areas shown as parking on plan 102/SP02 rev I have been drained, surfaced and allocated to the dwellings and units in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles, in connection with the use of the buildings.

Reason: In the interest of Highway safety, in accordance with Policies T9, T10 and T11 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C14. No building shall be occupied until the spaces have been laid out within the site, in accordance with plan 102/SP02 rev I, for vehicles to turn so that they may enter and leave the site in forward gear, and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the turning of vehicles.

Reason: In the interest of Highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C15. No building shall be occupied until spaces have been laid out within the site for bicycles to be parked, and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than the parking of cycles.

Reason: In order to protect and safeguard the amenity of the local residents or occupiers, in accordance with Policy T9 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C16. Temporary facilities shall be provided clear of the public highway for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of all vehicles visiting the site during the period of construction. These facilities shall be in accordance with details which have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C17. No dwelling or building on the development shall be occupied before the highways linking that dwelling/building to the existing public highway have been completed to base course level.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policies T1, T3, T5, T7 and T8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C18. The redundant access area at Welbeck Way shall be permanently closed to vehicular traffic before occupation of the buildings. Details of the means of closure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development is commenced.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policy T1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C19. The proposed industrial access road from Welbeck Way shall be of a minimum width of 6m with a minimum of 10m kerb radii either side.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policies T1 and T8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C20. Development shall not commence before fully operational vehicle-cleaning equipment has been installed of a specification and in a position to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All vehicles leaving the site shall pass through the cleaning equipment before entering the public highway. In the event of the approved vehicle-cleaning equipment being inoperative, development operations reliant upon compliance with this condition shall be suspended unless and until an alternative equally effective method of cleaning vehicles has been approved by the Local Planning Authority and is operational on site.

Reason: To prevent mud and debris being brought onto the public highway, in the interests of highway safety, in accordance with Policies T1 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C21. The visibility splays as shown on plan 102/SP02 rev I at the junction of the access roads with the public highways shall be provided before the commencement of the development and shall be maintained thereafter free from any obstruction over a height of 600mm above footway level.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policies T1 and T8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C22. Before the new accesses are brought into use, visibility splays shall be provided on both sides of the accesses and shall be maintained thereafter free from any obstruction over a height of 600mm within an area of 2m x 2m (at the junction with Lansdowne Walk), 1.5m x 1.5m (at shared accesses and under-crofts), and 1m x 1m (on individual plot accesses), measured from and along respectively the highway boundary.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with Policies T1 and T8 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

C23. Prior to the commencement of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, a Construction and Demolition Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include amongst other matters:

- a noise management plan including a scheme for the monitoring of construction and

- demolition noise;
- a scheme for the control of dust arising from building and site works;
- 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 of working hours for construction and other site works;
- a scheme for construction and demolition access from the Parkway including measures to ensure that all construction and demolition vehicles can enter the site immediately upon arrival, adequate space within the site to enable vehicles to load and unload clear of the public highway and details of any haul routes across the site;
- a scheme for parking of contractors vehicles;
- a scheme for access and deliveries including hours.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and residential amenity in accordance with policies T1 and DA2 of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

Informatives

1. The development will result in the creation of new street(s) and/or new dwelling(s) and/or new premises and it will be necessary for the Council, as Street Naming Authority, to allocate appropriate street names and property numbers. Before development is commenced, you should contact the Technical Support Team Manager - Highway Infrastructure Group on (01733) 453461 for details of the procedure to be followed and information required. This procedure is applicable to the sub-division of premises, which will provide multiple occupancy for both residential and commercial buildings. Please note this is not a function covered by your planning application but is a statutory obligation of the Local Authority, and is not chargeable and must be dealt with as a separate matter.

2. This development involves the construction of a new or alteration of an existing vehicular crossing within a public highway.

These works **MUST** be carried out in accordance with details specified by Peterborough City Council. Prior to commencing any works within the public highway, a Road Opening Permit must be obtained from the Council on payment of the appropriate fee.

Contact is to be made with the Transport & Engineering - Development Team on 01733 453421 who will supply the relevant application form, provide a preliminary indication of the fee payable and specify the construction details and drawing(s) required.

3. The development is likely to involve works within the public highway in order to provide services to the site. Such works must be licensed under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. It is essential that, prior to the commencement of such works, adequate time be allowed in the development programme for; the issue of the appropriate licence, approval of temporary traffic management and booking of road space. Applications for NR & SWA licences should be made to Transport & Engineering – Street Works Co-Ordinator on 01733 453467.

4. The development involves extensive works within the public highway. Such works must be the subject of an agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. **It is essential that prior to the commencement of the highway works**, adequate time is allowed in the development programme for; approval by the council of the designer, main contractor and sub-contractors, technical vetting, safety audits, approval of temporary traffic management, booking of road space for off-site highway and service works and the completion of the legal agreement. Application forms for S278 agreements are available from Transport & Engineering - Development Team on 01733 453421.

5. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the need to make a formal application to the council for an agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 if it is the intention that any of the highways proposed as part of this development are to be adopted. Prior to the commencement of the construction of these highways, adequate time must be allowed in the development programme for technical vetting, approval of temporary traffic management, booking of road space for any off-site highway and service works and the completion of the Section 38 agreement. Application forms for Section 38 agreements are available from Transport & Engineering - Development Team on 01733 453421.

6. The wheel cleansing equipment shall be capable of cleaning the wheels, underside and chassis of the

vehicles. The road between the cleaning equipment and the public highway shall be surfaced either in concrete or blacktop and be maintained free of mud, slurry and any other form of contamination whilst in use.

7. It is an offence to deposit anything including building materials or debris on a highway which may cause interruption to any user of the highway (including footways). In the event that a person is found guilty of this offence, a penalty may be imposed in the form of a fine. It is the responsibility of the developer and contractor(s) to ensure that no building materials or debris are placed on or remain within the highway during or after the construction period.

8. If any thing is so deposited on a highway as to constitute a nuisance, the local authority may by notice require the person who deposited it there to remove it forthwith and if he fails to comply the Local Authority may make a complaint to a Magistrates Court for a Removal and Disposal Order under this Section. In the event that the deposit is considered to constitute a danger, the Local Authority may remove the deposit forthwith and recover reasonable expenses from the person who made the deposit. It is the responsibility of the developer and contractor(s) to ensure that no building materials or debris are placed on or remain within the highway during or after the construction period.

9. The type of cycle parking to be provided shall accord with the PCC Cycle Parking Guidance document attached; however the level of cycle parking shall be 1 stand per unit for Business Blocks A and B, and 1 space per flat. The additional cycle parking for the offices shall be provided at a level in accordance with Appendix IV of the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement).

2 .	09/00687/FUL	5 Dragonfly Close Hampton Hargate Peterborough PE7 8DD, Rear conservatory
-----	--------------	--

The following Comments have been received from Cllr Scott:

I am one of the Ward Councillors for Orton with Hampton Ward in which 5 Dragonfly Close is situated.

I was asked by one of the neighbours to the application site to visit her house which I did and I am writing in support of her objections to this particular planning application.

The neighbours at number 1 Dragonfly Close are not opposed to any development at number 5 but the size, height and scale of this particular application is objected to. They have made it quite clear to me that if the size of the conservatory was not so overwhelming to their property they would raise no objection.

The gardens in Dragonfly Close are not large and the proposed development will take up a significant part of the garden of number 5.

The house likely to be most affected by this is number 1 Dragonfly Close and the proximity of the proposal to number one is in my opinion unacceptable.

It is proposed that the conservatory will be 3.35 metres high which in itself will I believe have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties and is a material consideration.

Number 5 Dragonfly Close is a large house within this small close and of course with a large house there are many people living there so the impact on number 1 should not be underestimated.

If the scale and height of this development were to be reduced then I am quite confident that there would be no objection.

Sheila Scott

3 .	09/00838/FUL	80 Lincoln Road Peterborough PE1 2SN , Construction of 8 dwellings, 32 apartments, NHS Recognition Centre (A2 or B1 (a) use together with access car parking and landscaping
3 .	09/00839/CON	80 Lincoln Road Peterborough PE1 2SN , Demolition of all buildings on the site including offices and garages

For clarification, the site is located within the Park Conservation area.

Amended plans were received on the 10th September 2009, moving the residential units back into the site, further away from the site frontage. A re-consultation with the public and consultees was undertaken and the comments received are reported below.

The split of the 14 affordable apartments on site has now changed to 8 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom rented apartments, and 4 two bedroom intermediate rented apartments.

- **English Heritage** – Recommend refusal. The existing house at 80 Lincoln Road is a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area and the case for demolition, rather than retention and re-use has not been adequately justified. The scale, form, massing and siting of the new blocks will neither preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Park conservation area. Therefore whilst there is scope for some development to take place on this site, the current scheme is contrary to the guidance of PPG15, and so refusal is recommended.
- **Wildlife Officer** – A second bat report was received, dated September 2009, which updates the first dated July 2009, has addressed the concerns expressed in my previous comments. I would advise that the recommendations of both reports (other than 8.3 and 8.4 of the first report dated July 2009) should be secured in the issue of any planning permission for the development of the site.
- **Senior Architectural Liaison Officer** – The revised plans have addressed nearly all of my previous comments. I still have concerns that the entrances to Blocks C, D and E are at the rear of the site, however with the removal of cycle stores at the perimeter fence of these blocks and with appropriate lighting and areas of defensible space around the boundary of these flats some of the personal safety issues could be resolved. I therefore welcome the chance for this office to work with the developer as this project develops and if a Secured by Design application is received for this development.
- **Conservation Officer** - Recommend refusal. The amendment returns some of the lost view of the spire and frontage to St Marks Church from the south. This view however is still substantially harmed by the presence of the 4 storey Recognition centre building, which is considered to dominate and be intrusive in the streetscene. The proposed set back of the residential units makes the northern gable of the Recognition centre more visually dominant when viewed from the north. In view of this it is concluded that the amendment causes greater harm to the conservation area than the original scheme.
- **Landscape Officer** – Recommend refusal. It is my professional opinion that the proposals will still result in the loss of trees 6558 and Tree B which are considered to be significant trees within the street scene. The opportunity for replacement planting is considered to be limited with little scope for planting that can replicate the landscape value of the existing tree cover. My objection in relationship to tree loss and potential future impact on trees remains.
- **Environmental Health** – Comments and guidance given in respect of
 - Noise, dust and vibration from the demolition and construction works
 - Internal arrangement of apartments
 - Contaminated land
 - Imported soil

A condition is recommended in respect of unsuspected contamination:-

C18 - If during development, contamination not previously identified, is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the LPA, an addendum to the Method Statement. This addendum to the Method Statement must detail how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.

Reason: To ensure that the development complies with approved details in the interests of the protection of human health and the environment.

There is the possibility asbestos may be present in the existing buildings therefore this will have to be appropriately dealt with. A construction and demolition plan will be required.

- **Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service** – Should the Planning Authority be minded to grant approval, the Fire Authority ask adequate provision be made for fire hydrants. This could be secured by imposition of the following additional planning condition:-

C19 Prior to the commencement of development, or within other such period as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, a scheme for the provisions of fire hydrants should be submitted to and approved in writing to the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved scheme shall be implemented in full before the development is occupied.

Reason: In the interests of the health and safety of occupiers of the site and in the vicinity and in accordance with policy DA2 of the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) 2005.

- **Cllr Swift** - Recommend refusal. See attached comments
- **Cllr Peach** - Recommend refusal. See attached comments
- **Cllr Khan** – Would like the application deferred. If this is not possible would like to speak at Committee.
- **Cllr Z. Hussain** – ‘I wish to lodge my very strong objections regarding the planning application at the above site. Unfortunately, I am unable to attend the committee meeting in person as I am out of the country and would ask that the committee takes my points into consideration. My points are as follows;-
 - We already have too many flats in my Ward (Central).
 - The ward is overcrowded.
 - There is a need in the ward for houses, not flats.
 - This site is next to St. Mark’s church and this will adversely affect religious activities.
 - We need some open space left near the city centre.

It is time we considered the real implications of such dwellings which only make the situation worse. This application is not appropriate and the Planning Committee should consider the environmental impact it will have on the character of the area, the impact upon resources, school transport and places.

- **Stewart Jackson MP for Peterborough** - Recommend refusal. See attached comments.
- **Approximately 90 letters of representations/objections have been received to date and a petition of objection from local residents.** The further comments made were lack of consultation with residents, does not benefit local community, impact on local community, anti-social behaviour, and the noise impact of the church on future residents of the scheme.
- **As the phasing of the NHS Recognition centre and residential development is now known, alteration to the conditions to reflect phase 1 the Recognition centre and phase 2 the residential development is required. The Head of Service requests the Committee’s delegated authority to amend the conditions accordingly.**
- **If Committee approval is given, the applications will have to be referred to the Government Office for their agreement of the decision or confirmation of whether they require the applications to be called in for their decision making.**

4 .	09/00836/WCPP	Parkway Sports And Social Club Peterborough Road Eye Peterborough , Variation of condition 5 of planning permission 07/00011/OUT (restriction on unit sizes) in connection with construction of garden centre comprising plant area (8915sqm), garden centre building with restaurant (8000sqm), cafe/kiosk (250sqm), car parking, landscaping, service area and recycling collection together with improvements to access road and access to Eye Road, new bus stops and associated footway/cycleway access
-----	---------------	---

A Retail Impact Report has been received. The findings of the report are considered to be acceptable.

Item 3 - 09/00838/FUL and 09/00839/CON – 80 Lincoln Road - Cllr C. W. Swift OBE

I am at a complete loss and cannot understand why the planning department can make any recommendation for approval for this site, which is within the city centre redevelopment area. At the present time we are pulling down, within 400 yards of this application, a similar block of offices to create an open space in the city centre to give a better view of St John's church. It is being made into a pedestrian square with much improved access to the church so that people can sit down and look at the beautiful Church and the Cathedral with no through traffic and daily buses running by every five minutes. I feel that the monstrosity that we are removing from one part of the city is being deposited on this development. Therefore, I object most vociferously to the proposals as outlined in the following terms.

Objections:

1. the loss of open space.

This area is described by the city council as being one of the most socially deprived areas in the city and lacking in open space. It has the lowest area of open space of any ward in the city. If this development were to go ahead more open space would be lost

2, Overdevelopment.

More houses are needed but not in this area already cramped and overcrowded. This development has no provision for play areas.

3. Lack of privacy

The height of the building s is totally out of character with adjacent properties and takes away their privacy. In other parts of the city developments are not allowed to take place where windows are overlooking someone else's property. In this development a substantial amount will be overlooking many, many people's properties.

4. Increased traffic congestion

This application should be refused on the grounds of tile increase in traffic in an already congested area of the city.

5. Loss of views

It will have a detrimental effect on the view of St Mary's Church. The plans for the area should be consistent with the development and view of the St John's Church area in the city centre. This development will have an adverse impact on the development of the conservation area and the ecology of the area. The proposed design and layout is not in keeping with the rest of the proposals for the city centre development.

6. Lack of school places

There is no provision in this particular area for additional schools. All school places are at this present time, full to capacity and the council are currently transporting Children from the development area to schools in other parts of the city. Lack of school places alone, should prevent any provision of extra housing in this particular area.

7. Lack of consistency within the planning department

There seems to be a lack of consistency within the planning department in what has been accepted with this development with regards to items 1 - 5 above and what has been refused in other parts of the city,

As a city councillor of long standing, this application should be refused, or at least deferred for further consideration by the new Neighbourhood Councils, currently being set up and will be brought into being in October. My ward will combine with the central ward to form one of these new Neighbourhood councils.

There are five speakers allowed to speak at Committee for five minutes to share between them. I would have been one of them and what I would have said is the following:-

'I have confidence in the Planning Committee to treat these applications in the same manner as they would any others in this city, however, I do believe Officers' would have made a different recommendation but for the Sword of Damocles hanging over their heads. It must be made perfectly plain - are these applications being influenced by threats of the withdrawal of Government grants? Also, it is widely spoken that the contract for the building has been allocated to start and the work will be completed within 26-30 weeks.

It is a dangerous precedent to adopt and this is the second example of having to make decisions without public approval. Are we running a dictatorship or being blackmailed to give planning approvals?'

Item 3 - 09/00838/FUL and 09/00839/CON – 80 Lincoln Road - Cllr John Peach

I am writing on behalf of a number of residents of Park Ward that have contacted me since the above application received some publicity in the Evening Telegraph. Many people seem to have been unaware of these applications

I thus wish to register my strong **OBJECTION** to both these planning applications, which I understand will be heard by the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee on 22nd September 2009.

Having read the Planning Officer's report I note that both the Councils Head of Transport and its Historic Environment Officer both recommend refusal. Why they are you as the planning officer recommended approval?

I would respectfully request the Committee to **REFUSE** the applications on the following grounds, by reference to the City Council's Local Plan and the Park Conservation Area Appraisal:

It fails to comply with the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) in respect of **Policy CBE3** - in that it fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area - indeed, it will do the precise opposite and will have a major impact of reducing the residential amenity and quality of life of local residents in Lincoln Road, Manor House Street and Craig Street.

The demolition of the existing Thurston/Gayhurst Victorian villa contravenes **Policy CBE 4** - in that it will fail to make a positive contribution to the character and/or appearance of the conservation area; and there are NOT overriding reasons to support demolition, especially as the replacement building will not be of an enhanced or even equal aesthetic value as the original.

The proposals breach **Policy DA1** - In that the new development is incompatible with nearby spaces or buildings - in particular the significant obtrusive impact of the visual amenity of the nearby St Mark's Church.

The new building very clearly breaches **Policy DA2**, in that its density, layout, massing and height will not be satisfactorily accommodated on this site and WILL adversely affect the character of the area and in particular the neighbouring site, i.e. St Mark's Church.

The Head of Transport and Planning considers that the scheme "is not acceptable in terms of the lack of on site parking provision...", **thus contravening Policy T10 and *inter alia* Policy CC15 (City Centre Parking)**.

The loss of trees at the boundary of this site contravenes **Policy LNE9**.

Finally, the proposals would have an unacceptably detrimental effect on the residential amenity of nearby residents of the application site.

You will no doubt remember that only within the last few years the Park Ward conservation area (like a number of others around our Council area) was "reappraised" and "enhanced" in planning teams. Bearing this recent activity in mind I feel an even stronger reason for not allowing these applications.

Item 3 - 09/00838/FUL and 09/00839/CON – 80 Lincoln Road – Stewart Jackson MP for Peterborough

As the Member of Parliament for the Peterborough constituency, I am writing to register my strong **OBJECTION** to both these planning applications, which I understand will be heard by the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee on 22nd September 2009.

It is very rare that I comment on individual planning applications but feel strongly that it is appropriate to make an exception on this occasion.

I would like it to be noted that I consider the public consultation in respect of this application by both the applicants and the City Council - given its significance and potential impact on a residential area - to be woefully inadequate. Not only were many people unaware of these applications until advised by the Peterborough *Evening Telegraph* on 1st September but the consultation was undertaken - deliberately in my view - in the middle of the school holiday period - in the knowledge that many potential consultees and objectors would be away and thus unable to comment within the timescales originally envisaged.

Having read the Planning Officer's report, I believe it seeks to establish a dangerous precedent in this case: That established planning policy can be disregarded, if in the opinion of the Planning Department, the applications (bring) "...benefits to the city..." and that there is "...a need for the development..."; however subjective that value judgement is and however the conclusion is reached, without demonstrable and irrefutable evidence.

In my experience, this is one of the most equivocal planning reports I have ever read and in my opinion, fails to make a persuasive case on planning grounds for granting these applications.

I would respectfully request the Committee to **REFUSE** the applications on the following grounds, by reference to the City Council's Local Plan and the Park Conservation Area Appraisal:

1. It fails to comply with the Peterborough Local Plan (First Replacement) in respect of **Policy CBE3** - in that it fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area - indeed, it will do the precise opposite and will have a major impact of reducing the residential amenity and quality of life of local residents in Lincoln Road, Manor House Street and Craig Street.

2. The demolition of the existing Thurston/Gayhirst Victorian villa contravenes **Policy CBE 4** - in that it will fail to make a positive contribution to the character and/or appearance of the conservation area; and there are NOT overriding reasons to support demolition, especially as the replacement building will not be of an enhanced or even equal aesthetic value as the original.

No doubt, this is why the planning application is opposed by both the Peterborough Civic Society and the City Council's Historic Environment Officer.

3. The proposals breach **Policy DA1** - In that the new development is incompatible with nearby spaces or buildings - in particular the significant obtrusive impact of the visual amenity of the nearby St Mark's Church.

4. The new building very clearly breaches **Policy DA2**, in that its density, layout, massing and height will not be satisfactorily accommodated on this site and WILL adversely affect the character of the area and in particular the neighbouring site, i.e. St Mark's Church.

5. The Head of Transport and Planning considers that the scheme "is not acceptable in terms of the lack of on site parking provision...", **thus contravening Policy T10 and *inter alia* Policy CC15 (City Centre Parking)**.

6. The loss of trees at the boundary of this site contravenes **Policy LNE9**.

7. Finally, the proposals would have an unacceptably detrimental effect on the residential amenity of my constituents in Craig Street at the western boundary of the application site.

In conclusion, the case for **REFUSING** these applications is extremely strong in that they clearly contravene a number of the City Council's planning policies; and the case for disregarding these policies in the "greater interest" of the city has not been made and cannot be substantiated.

Objection to the proposed development :
80 Thurston House site Lincoln Road Peterborough.

ENCLOSED:

City centre Residents's signed PETITION OF
OBJECTION

Letters : Objecting to this proposal

Objection to Planning Application No 09/00838/FUL 80 Lincoln Rd, on Thurston House site

Signed Residents Petition against these proposals from:

RESIDENTS OF LINCOLN ROAD, CRAIG STREET, MANOR HOUSE STREET, PARK ROAD, put up an angry protest and very strong objection at learning of the proposed development on the site of Thurston House Lincoln Road : According to the report in the Evening Telegraph 31st August, these planned proposals are to erect buildings to deliver more services to the so called "excluded and vulnerable " who come from "the most deprived areas of the city". Every Resident of these streets, knows from long experience, that the interpretation of caring for "the excluded and vulnerable " means an open invitation to all the drug addicts and drunks, to leave there own damaged communities, invited here to hang about all day drinking and drug dealing on our streets. Disrupting and damaging our city centre community !

There has been total failure of Peterborough City Councils Planning Office to let Residents know what is going on. Failing to notify the residents of the above streets who are affected. Instead we learn about it from the Evening Telegraph !

It is well documented that the above streets have been severely damaged from drug and alcohol problems, transported here by the opening of the St Theresa Homeless Centre in Manor House Street, followed by the opening of the NHS Drug Rehab. Centre at the side of Thurston House on Lincoln Road) inviting all the so called "excluded and vulnerable" into this quiet residential area, disrupting and damaging residents lives and property here! This is well documented (copies available of numerous letters of complaints, Residents signed Petitions since 1999) sent to Peterborough City Council, Gillian Beasley Chief Executive, and numerous City Councillors, also to the Evening Telegraph, and Stewart Jackson MP for Peterborough. Making rubbish of our city centre community !

The whole area of the above streets has been damaged by the St Theresa Centre, and NHS Drug Rehab. Centre, turning the area into a market place for drug dealers to run their drug business with its easy access to vulnerable people, invited to come here by St Theresa's and the Drug Rehab. Centre ! Taking over our streets, sitting on residents garden walls, drinking, and drug dealing, and urinating in residents gardens. As well as prostitution flourishing on all of these streets, dependant on the successful drug trade here. Police and City Council ignoring the situation !

Businesses are also severely affected. Roger Terrell solicitors is under siege, and has to have tar painted on the top of the walls that surround his offices to prevent groups of drug addicts awaiting treatment at the NHS Rehabilitation Centre from disturbing his business, drinking/drug dealing, seated on his offices walls, which are situated opposite Thurston House, and the NHS Drug Rehab Centre, on Lincoln Road.

Residents were led to believe that St Theresa's was closing down, when its lease runs out shortly. Which would allow this area to recover .

We are therefore shocked that Peterborough City Council is planning continued permanent damage to this area of the city . Bringing continued problems to this area which previously were not here !

We strongly protest and object to this planning application !

SIGNED RESIDENTS OF LINCOLN ROAD, CRAIG STREET, MANOR HOUSE STREET :

Signature (unclear) 19 Manor House St
myra gilera 7 Manor House St.
Sue Chessa 7 Manor House St.
of (unclear) 5 MANOR HOUSE ST
K. Si " "
Przemyslaw Furczakowski MANORHOUSE 4
Zdzislaw Szpylak Manor House 5
Rafal Kociba " "
Andrew Catlos 10 Manor House STREET
Janet Taylor 12 Manor House St
Kavon Sully 13 Manor House St

SIGNATURES STILL BEING COLLECTED

COPIES: Stewart Jackson MP for Peterborough
Nazim Khan Councillor Central Ward

~~~~~

We are shocked that Peterborough City Council is planning continued permanent damage to this area of the city . Bringing continued problems to this area which previously were not here !

We strongly protest and object to this planning application !

SIGNED RESIDENTS OF LINCOLN ROAD, CRAIG STREET, MANOR HOUSE STREET :

|                                          |                       |                 |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 6 Craig Street                           | Mrs & Mrs D. D. D. D. | [Signature]     |
| 2 Craig Street                           | Mrs & Mrs R. S. S. S. | [Signature]     |
| 2 Craig St                               | Mrs T. S. S. S.       | [Signature]     |
| 4 Craig St                               | [Signature]           | [Signature]     |
| 12 Craig St                              | S. A. A.              | [Signature]     |
| 14 Craig St                              | Alene S. S.           | [Signature]     |
| 15 Craig St                              | ANN D. D. D.          | ANA MUKUN KUBER |
| 17 Craig St                              | M. T. T. T.           | [Signature]     |
| 18 Craig St                              | S. S. S.              | [Signature]     |
| 20 Craig St                              | [Signature]           | [Signature]     |
| Peterborough City Council<br>(Glad Hill) |                       |                 |
| 27 Craig St                              | [Signature]           | [Signature]     |
| 36 Craig St                              | [Signature]           | [Signature]     |
| 37 Craig St                              | [Signature]           | [Signature]     |

COPIES: Stewart Jackson MP for Peterborough  
Nazim Khan Councillor Central Ward

1107 5.2

[redacted], Broadway,  
Peterborough PE1 4DG

17th Sept. 2009

Ms. G. George  
Chief Executive's Dept.,  
Democratic Services  
Town Hall  
Peterborough PE1 1HG

Dear Ms. George,

Re: Planning Application 09/00838/FUL  
80, Lincoln Road, Peterborough PE1 2SN

In the light of your advice regarding the limited time available for objectors to speak on the 22nd September meeting, may I be permitted to make a final written submission to the Committee, having had the opportunity to see the agenda document.

The agenda document provides a reasonably comprehensive summary of the objections so far raised to this development. Unfortunately it does not concede the lack of consultation with local residents which was presumably deemed to be unnecessary on the strength of the House of Lords 'Tesco' Case. Neither does any consideration seem to have been given to problems with noise that residents on the block immediately adjacent to the Church Hall may on occasions possibly experience should the development be allowed as planned.

These omissions are however insignificant when compared with the report's audacity in sweeping away the acknowledged objections to the development on the basis of recent minor amendments made to the proposed layout of the development.

Leaving aside the question of overdevelopment of the site which the report does not consider other than to arbitrarily dismiss the acknowledged problems of parking provision, the fundamental question remains whether the development would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area as required by CBE3.

Having examined the amended plan I can concede that it makes possible the preservation of three otherwise endangered trees, but in no other respect does anything change (other than losing one parking space). The position of the proposed NIS Recognition Centre is unchanged and therefore the objections as regards height, proximity to the footway and reduction of views of the church remain unanswered.

Despite the amendments the proposed development is still contrary to the Park Conservation Area Appraisal, Policies CBE3 & CBE4 of the Councils Local plan and the case is certainly not made to disregard PPG15 which advises that there should be a presumption against the demolition of any building which makes a positive contribution to the character of a conservation area. Substantially the argument for demolition is no more compelling now than when the application was last refused.

The report attempts to justify the design of the NIS building by quoting the Design Review Panel's comments that 'modern design does have a place in the city' but I suspect that this is taken out of context and the architects concerned were probably genuinely unaware of the other issues regarding the site. May I urge that far more weight be attached instead to the Historic Environment Officer's statement that 'the loss of the building and its replacement with development which does not reflect the historic character of the area in its scale, position or use of materials is contrary to policy and should be refused.'

Yours sincerely,

*A. Peasgood*

A. Peasgood  
Manager, St Mark's Church Hall