

Neighbourhood Council Minutes

NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL RESPONSES TO SITE ALLOCATIONS PRESENTATION

EXTRACTS FROM DRAFT MINUTES

Dogsthorpe East and Park Neighbourhood Council, held 1 September 2010:

The Policy and Strategy Manager gave a presentation on the Site Allocations Document and made the following points:

- No decision would be made on the Site Allocations Document at the meeting, as the document would be considered by Council later in the year.
- The Site Allocations Document was essentially a map which allocated new land for housing, retail or employment development. Once finalised, the document would encourage developers to come forward with proposals which accord with the detail on the map.
- There were a number of policies behind items for new development. The Site Allocations were not about planning permission as developers would need to seek permission for each proposal in its own right. The document was about setting principles about appropriate sites for different kinds of development.
- The preparation of the document was very regulated by the government, and had already been through two consultation stages. In 2009 all the possible sites known to the Council were put out for consultation. In March and April 2010, the Council put forward preferred sites.
- The next part of the consultation sought to finalise the map, which would then go to an independent inspector who gives final approval.

The Policy and Strategy Manager then talked through some of the site allocations particular to the Neighbourhood Council area:

- The John Mansfield School and a remote playing field to the north would be promoted for housing development, with an anticipated 250-300 houses across the two sites.
- The bus depot on Lincoln Road was proposed as a small housing site if the business relocated.
- Part of the Community College was also earmarked for housing development for approximately 40 houses.
- Former Perkins workers' sports field was proposed for housing.
- Two smaller sites marked for employment development were included in the current local plan, but had not yet come forward for development.
- A large area marked for employment development was known as Red Brick Farm and would provide a large extension of the east employment area. This large area would not be developed overnight, but formed part of a 20 year programme of development.

The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that the comments received at the meeting would be reported to formal Council for a final decision in November 2010. Following this, a further period of formal public consultation in January and February 2011 would take place, with responses being forwarded to the independent inspector.

During consideration the following points were noted:

- Wayne Stimpson sought clarification as to whether there were plans for green spaces or allotments amongst the site allocations identified. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that whilst there were no specific sites allocated for green spaces or allotments, Council policy would ensure that for larger housing sites, developers must provide a certain amount of open space. This would occur at the detailed planning development stage.
- The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that due to some flood risk and archaeological issues, the creation of one massive employment area was unlikely. It was possible that part of this area could be set aside as open space, which may include allotments.

- Dave Harman sought explanation on the economic justification for the plans as areas of the city currently stood vacant. The Policy and Strategy Manager explained that the process was about trying to balance new housing with job opportunities for the next 20 years. As Peterborough grew, it was anticipated that the vacant areas in the city would quickly be filled and new areas would need to be identified, hence the plan.
- John Shearman sought clarification as to whether there would be a judicious mix of housing in these developments, and confirmation that archaeological investigation would take place on the Red Brick Farm area prior to development. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that the rule of thumb with development was that 30% would be affordable housing with a mix of housing sizes on each site. With regard to archaeology, Council policy would require an assessment to be carried out before any works commenced on site.
- Cllr Peach sought clarification as to why the travellers provision was pulled from the strategy, but not the housing provision, and asked the Policy and Strategy Manager to confirm that the Council no longer had targets on affordable housing. The Policy and Strategy Manager confirmed that the Coalition government had abolished regional housing targets and whilst the matter still required clarity it was understood that regional groups could set their own targets, which would be tested independently. The Council no longer had housing, traveller or employment targets to meet, however the Leader on 7 June had issued a press statement stating that the Council would come up with its own target for travellers. The Leader also stated that the Council would carry on with the housing target that was developed through the RSS as it goes alongside what the community strategy says about growth.
- Cllr Peach asked if there would be any provision for executive homes on some of the sites, particularly sites near the city centre, as there was a need for this type of housing in Peterborough. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that the core strategy gives generic support for executive homes, and that the Site Allocations Document would allocate sites which would be suitable for a high proportion of executive homes. The Policy and Strategy Manager agreed to respond to Cllr Peach with further information on this matter.

Di Newman asked how issues of contamination would be managed on land that was once industrial use and now allocated for housing or employment, and what measures would be in place with developers to ensure the use of green fittings and materials in line with the environment capital aspirations. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that the council was currently reviewing its environment policy to fit in with the city's environment capital aspirations and once this was complete, officers would investigate how to support this through the planning process. With regard to contamination issues, this would be addressed through a contamination land report which would be required when a planning application was submitted, and possibly the involvement of the Environment Agency.

Fletton, Stanground and Woodston Neighbourhood Council, held 2 September 2010:

In the absence of the relevant officer, the Neighbourhood Manager gave a brief presentation on the Site Allocations Development Plan which detailed the sites in the Neighbourhood area that had been proposed to be developed over the coming years.

The details on the plan had not yet been approved and were still at the consultation phase. More decisions would be made by the Council in Jan/Feb 2011 and an independent inspector would review any plans/decisions taken by the Council shortly after.

The Neighbourhood Council was invited to comment on the site plan for the area. Questions asked included:

- The map is difficult to read as there are no road names, can road names be added?
- There was a presentation at a past meeting whereby Woodston was identified as a potential artisan area of the city; can this presentation be given again incorporating the proposed developments?

ACTION: Responses to the above questions to be provided at the next meeting, via the update boards.

Rural North Neighbourhood Council, held 16 September 2010

The Clerk advised that Members were not obliged to vote to show support or opposition tonight but officers were requesting opinions and comments on the proposed sites for development in the area. Comments from elected Members would not bind them to that point of view for future meetings discussing the Site Allocations Document.

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the Site Allocations plan and the approval process within the council that was needed before a final document was approved including:

- This is latest version on current recommendations from officers which will go to Cabinet (8 November), then full Council (8 December) to approve a draft version for 6 week consultation then on to the secretary of state and inspector and finally to full Council (possibly December 2011) for formal adoption;
- Some sites already have planning permission in this area;
- Gypsy and Traveller pitches now dropped from the document; none will be allocated. A transit site will not be in this area;

Comments and responses to questions included:

- Cllr Sanders – Eye and Thorney residents have already given responses at previous consultations; Parish councils' opinions should be foremost in planning considerations; officers must collate previous consultation responses before a final draft is presented;
- Thorney Parish Council – what happened to sites proposed in flood plain areas near Thorney? *These sites were removed as the Environment Agency opposed on the basis that they are in a higher risk flood zone. Flood zones are based on the assumption that there are no flood defences (as they could fail). It would therefore be difficult to put these sites back in;* Why additional site off Sandpit Road after the previous document? *There was an initial concern with the site which has now been reconsidered as acceptable;*
- Helpston Parish Council – 61 new dwellings proposed for Helpston when 45 were earmarked for the village envelope in total. Are figures from Core Strategy still valid? Requests city councillors object to the Site Allocations document;
- Glinton Parish Council – Concerned that city council will seek to build more houses to gain from government incentives;
- Eye Open Space Group – Previous opposition to growth in Eye was not listened to. Over 1000 people opposed to growth outside the current village envelope wrote to the council. Need employment in the village, not outside the village. Concerned about size of proposed housing developments for Eye as employment site not now included;
- Cllr Over – Developments are not sustainable as people have to work and shop outside villages because no employment development for rural areas. No evidence that more houses are needed or wanted. Little infrastructure at the moment so wouldn't cope with more people. This area will lose valuable agricultural land and countryside if housing developments take place;
- Eye Junior Youth Club - Concern that no consideration given for impact on local doctors, youth clubs, schools and amenities etc which are already oversubscribed;
- *Planning Policy Manager - Parish Councils can provide land for cemeteries; 3 sites for a city council cemetery proposed in the Castor and Ailsworth area currently open for consultation;*
- *Re Core Strategy – sites proposed in the document were due to full Council voting on that level of development in the rural area so officers are now obliged to find the sites to meet the agreed development level;*
- Helpston Parish Council – Must ensure that the government Inspector receives correct information from officers in the first instance when considering sites.

The clerk was requested to note that no favourable comments to support the Site Allocations Document were forthcoming.

Central and North Neighbourhood Council, held 21 September 2010:

The Policy and Strategy Manager gave a presentation on the Site Allocations Document and made the following points:

- The Site Allocations document affected other areas more than this neighbourhood area, given that no sites in this area had been put forward for development given the existing density of development.
- In the future, the Policy and Strategy Manager was interested in how Planning could work with the Neighbourhood Council and elected Members to help make the much needed regeneration and tidying up of the area happen.

During discussion, the following points were noted:

- Residents had been trying to find out from the Planning department what regeneration meant for the Council, as so far Millfield and New England had received no assistance. Residents do not feel that this attitude would change quickly, though there was a lot to be said for the area, if it was cleaned up.
- Residents queried the ongoing use of a car park in Bamber Street which was not heavily utilised, and sought clarification as to what stage the use as a car park could be abandoned and the site used for something else. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that it was not impossible to add new sites to the Site Allocations document at this time, though it was difficult.
- The brownland site near Matalan was not included in the Site Allocations document as it was already allocated as land suitable for development for general employment uses; the Site Allocations document was about allocating new sites with no current status whatsoever.
- Cllr Khan queried what would need to happen to have the relocation of the bus depot become a top priority. The Policy and Strategy Manager advised that it was not a case of priority, but the need to offer the business a viable site to move them to.

When taking regeneration opportunities into consideration, it was agreed that young people would be involved in the process.

Peterborough North Area Committee, held 22 September 2010

The Principal Strategic Planning Officer introduced the item advising that the map showed the latest proposed sites allocated for development over the next 15 years. This area had mainly mixed use development with some residential. Gypsy and Traveller sites were removed apart from the transit site at Norwood lane.

Comments, questions and responses included:

- Cllr John Fox – concern over Werrington centre re housing – how many and where? *Don't know yet as just proposals, maybe 100 homes for that centre;*
- Cllr Lane – a development north of Werrington? *No longer required as Norwood and Greater Haddon used for the large residential development in the core strategy;*
- Cllr S Day – Traveller transit site no longer at Norwood? – *Possibly still the preferred site but can investigate;*
- Housing allocations on the sites, what numbers overall? – *one is Lincoln Road approx 60-70, Itter Crescent approx 25, Honey Hill School approx 50.*
- Not many houses for this area in the overall city development? - *Over 1000 houses in Norwood development for this area;*
- D Hedges – some areas will receive lots of S106 funding others very little. *S106 has to be linked to the development so if no development little justification for S106;*
- Cllr Thacker – why Norwood for the transit site as Travellers have stated they would not occupy it? – *was proposed as best site. If you feel is not right site, can raise this at Council, in the public consultation and to planning inspector. Not finalised yet.*

ACTION: provide information on whether Norwood is still the preferred location for Traveller Transit Site.

Ortons with Hampton Neighbourhood Council, held 23 September 2010:

Peter Heath-Brown, Planning Policy Manager PCC, explained that the Site Allocations Document was made up of a series of planning documents and detailed the developments over the next fifteen years. The purpose of the document was to identify land suitable for housing, employment or other forms of development. Planning permission would still need to be sought and areas identified for development would appear on local searches when purchasing a new house.

The document had not yet reached the formal public consultation stage, but was being exhibited at all Neighbourhood Councils during September in order to gather comments before going to Full Council Meeting in December, where the feedback from Neighbourhood Councils would be given. The document would then go to the Secretary of State for consideration and public consultation.

The following responses were provided to questions raised by attendees:

- The figure for the number of houses to be built was derived from the overall scale of growth for the area, natural domestic migration, large number of teenagers in area who will eventually need housing;
- Members of the Planning Team along with Councillors are spending a lot of time with developers so that the lessons learned from Hampton regarding community facilities would be taken forward for the Great Haddon project;
- The Site Allocations Document was not just about houses, it also included projects for employment for the new residents;

The following comments and feedback regarding the document were noted and would be considered in future stages of the consultation process:

- PCC must ensure that leisure and community facilities are built to compliment any new large and existing developments, such as Great Haddon;
- Road and transport networks must be in place to support new developments;
- Can any contracts with developers have a clause whereby the building of community facilities will be completed before residential/employment building;
- Any new developments must have sufficient space for car parking and storage for multiple waste and recycling bins;

Attendees were advised to write any further comments on the feedback form attached to the agenda, and pass to Council Officers at the end of the meeting.

Peterborough West Neighbourhood Council, held 29 September 2010:

Gemma Wildman introduced the proposed developments in the neighbourhood area giving timescales for the approval of the Site Allocation Document and further information including:

- Current draft document incorporates consultation and responses received earlier this year. Will be further opportunity for public consultation next year;
- Proposals included regeneration of the Bretton district centre and site of former Bretton Woods School and Ravensthorpe local centre redevelopment.
- Netherton Grange allotments already awarded planning permission.
- Possible housing development on the former Freeman's site.

Comments, questions and responses included:

- Cllr Fletcher – why build housing on Freeman's site, it is an industrial centre;
- Glennis Bentley – losing allotments for housing again, Ravensthorpe is deficient in allotment sites but the document reduces allotments again;

- What about the existing hospital site? – *will be dealt with in city centre action plan, a separate document;*
- How were sites identified? – *landowners, developers, community were all invited to put forward development sites;*
- Bretton Centre – what is happening to it? – *there is a boundary for the centre and this is confirmed in the document (similar to other centres such as Werrington and Millfield), could include housing in redevelopments;*
- Cllr Dalton – old hospital site plan is coming to a future meeting hopefully to be held near the site;
- When plans go forward for housing, what about school, health and transport provision, Bretton Woods was closed down? – *will be dealt with when planning applications for sites come in and could include S106 funding;*
- Ray Cave – who will pay for cost of demolishing Freemans buildings, £4m?;
- Dearleap Residents Association – housing was planned for Bretton Woods site years ago but nothing happened following Bretton 2010, why would it happen now? – *This is a 15 year plan so would expect development in that time.*

This page is intentionally left blank