

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 22 FEBRUARY 2011 AT 1.30PM

		Page No:
1.	Procedure for Speaking	1
2.	List of Persons Wishing to Speak	2
3.	Briefing Update	3
ITEM 5.3	Letter of Objection from Mr D Ladd and Mrs D Harrison	5

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

The total time for speeches from Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives shall not exceed ten minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

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. Objectors.
2. Applicant or agent or supporters.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 22 FEBRUARY 2011 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
5.1	7	10/01622/WCPOP & 10/01644/WCPOP – LAND OFF THORNEY ROAD, EYE, PETERBOROUGH	Mr Duncan Smith and Mr Richard Edwards	Applicant (Larkfleet Homes)
5.3	27	10/01518/FUL – LAND TO THE REAR OF 68 TO 72 THORPE LEA ROAD, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Nick Arculus Mr Phillip Pumphrey Mr William Swann Mr Stephen Lee Mr Simon Smith	Ward Councillor Objector (Local Resident) Objector (Local Resident) Objector (Representative of Thorpe Gate Resident's Association) Representing Applicant (Partner, Development Team for Site)
5.4	45	10/01735/R3FUL – LONGTHORPE PRIMARY SCHOOL, BRADWELL ROAD, NETHERTON, PETERBOROUGH	Mr David Worth	Objector (Local Resident)

BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP COMMITTEE 22 FEBRUARY 2011

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	10/01622/WCPP	Land Off Thorney Road, Eye, Peterborough. Removal of C13 (provision of play area) of planning permission 10/00208/FUL - Construction of 49 dwellings.
	10/01644/WCPP	Land Off Thorney Road, Eye, Peterborough. Removal of condition C20, play area /open space, of planning permission 04/01978/FUL - Residential development comprising 35 dwellings.

No Further Comments

2.	10/00966/FUL	98 Dogsthorpe Road, Peterborough, PE1 3AQ. External canopy.
----	--------------	--

No Further Comments

3.	10/01518/FUL	Land To The Rear Of 68 To 72 Thorpe Lea Road, Peterborough, PE3 6BZ. New vehicular access to serve future proposal for 32 dwellings on adjoining land.
----	--------------	---

Correction to the Report

1. Page 40, recommendation – a Section 106 is not required as the provision of compensatory open space can be secured by condition (see condition C11 in the report).

Letters of Objection

One further letter of objection received from a local resident raising the following planning issues

- there is no plan or layout drawing of the 32 dwellings – the committee are being asked by the Developer to carry out an impossible task in agreeing to an approach road when they have no detailed and firm plans from the developer for what will be built on the end of it
- the council should ask the developer to raise the road by 0.5m so that it will provide a flood barrier for existing home owners in both parts of Thorpe Lea Road and Lea Gardens
- the proposal is contrary to the Council's on policies and regulations
- Will increase traffic congestion in the area
- Developer has release a plan of the housing to residents that shows: housing adjacent River Lane in conflict with the public footpath and limitations on vehicular access, that there would be a loss of privacy of those homes in Thorpe Lea Road as the land on which they will sit is 1 – 3.5 m higher and because of the small space between the existing and proposed dwellings (see attached sketch plan), little parking / garaging is shown and as each house may have 3 cars, they may have to park on the approach road.

An additional letter has been received from the occupiers at 68 Thorpe Lea Rd following the publication of the committee report. The letter has been reproduced in Appendix 1.

Cllr S Dalton

There has been significant public objection to the application on the basis that until we have an application for the proposed housing development, we don't know what this road is serving. I would like to see PCC grant an extension to the 'grant of easement deed', giving the developer time to resubmit the road and housing development as one planning application. This would give the option of a full and fair debate rather than us second guessing the not yet submitted housing application.

Thorpe Road is a busy road. Turning right on to Thorpe Road from Thorpe Lea Road at rush hour can take an age. If the housing development is 32 houses and each house has at least 1 car, this could increase the traffic at that junction considerably. A junction improvement may need to be sought, but this is unknown largely until we see the housing scheme.

River Lane's junction with Thorpe Road is extremely dangerous, and therefore if this application is permitted, I would like to see a condition that prevents this road linking to River Lane.

I believe this application should be postponed until the developer is ready to submit both applications so we know the full extent of the development's impact.

Officer Comment

It is not within the scope of the Committee's control to renew the easement deed and the matter is not a material planning consideration. It is not appropriate or necessary to apply a condition preventing the proposed road from linking to River Lane as no link is possible without the grant of planning permission for such a link to be created.

4.	10/01735/R3FUL	Longthorpe Primary School, Bradwell Road, Netherton Peterborough. New classroom block and plant room, new entrance canopy, extension to classroom and demolish two classrooms.
----	----------------	---

Cllr S Dalton

As you have read, the fencing part of this application has been removed. Fencing is not usually part of the planning process, but as the land has been used by residents for 35 years as common communal land, I would like to see a condition relating to fencing that may be erected in the future. I would like additional fencing to go through the planning process for review and discussion. It is a hugely controversial issue for residents and would change the environment.

Officer Comment

It is not possible to apply the suggested condition retrospectively to existing use as they can only relate to the proposed development. In the event of a future application for fencing off the dual use playing field, the application will be brought to the Committee for determination.

Mr D Ladd and Mrs D Harrison
 68 Thorpe Lea Road
 Peterborough
 PE3 6BZ

20th February 2011

Re planning application 10/01518/FUL

P & EP Committee 22 February 2011 item 5.3

Dear Sir/Madam

This is a letter disputing the planning summary document from case officer Mike Roberts which recommended approval by the P & EP committee for the planning application.

The case officer's document shows unwarranted bias towards the applicant by including statements that are immaterial to the Application but are designed to influence the committees' thinking. In particular it states

"Railworld want to develop its site to raise funds towards the expansion plans that it has for its provision of facilities for the general public to enjoy which includes its proposals to provide an exhibition centre on the south bank of the river"

This statement is irrelevant and unproven. There is no covenant by Railworld to undertake such tasks and equally the money raised could be used for other purposes, such as paying their executives a bonus.

By including, such a statement serious questions exist about the validity of the overall decision to recommend the Application. As it

Fails to justify why this application is considered in isolation from the main development.

The pure and simple question as to why a road should be built that goes to nowhere is not answered. There is no certainty that any development will take place on the Railworld site so, why build a road?

Railworld's track record of broken promises is exemplary. In recent times, it had a bridge built across the river Nene, part funded by the council, that connected the north and south side of their site. A condition of this council funding was that it would be available for public access. Today it is gated and locked.

This bridge across the was built to allow a proposed plan by Railworld to enhance the brownfield site as a tourist attraction. An enhancement that never happened. If Railworld managed to con the council in to building a bridge, they have now managed to pull the wool over the eyes of the case officer as regards a road.

Yet, despite there being no development approved on the Railworld site, the case officer argues that

In considering this application, it would be unreasonable to require the development to take into account other development, such as the redevelopment of the hospital) that are not yet the subject of a planning application.

This is just so illogical and favourable to the Applicant that it is an error of judgement. This road development is being justified by some unknown event (the development of the Railworld site), yet some other unknown event (the development of the hospital site) can be ignored.

Fails to state that the application breaches planning policy LT3.

This requires open space lost by development is replaced on an equivalent basis. This application does not because

- a) The space granted into public use is smaller than that lost and
- b) The space granted back into public use is already public open space

Instead, we have another an erroneous statement that

part of the identified area is already in public open space use, but owned by Railworld and as such it would be entitled to restrict such use in the future.

The case officer has zero knowledge that Railworld can restrict such use, and actually it cannot because the land has been in public use for so many years that Railworld would not be able to deny public access.

Fails to address the flood risk

The case officer's logic is severely flawed as regards following PPS25.

- a) It cannot bring about wider sustainability because the development for the Railworld site is unknown. How can the case officer know about something that does not exist?
- b) There may well be reasonably alternative access routes, we don't know because we don't know what will be built on the Railworld site
- c) The case officer argues that because the new road is connected to an existing road that has an "approach" that is at flood risk then it should be allowed. This is arguing that two wrongs make a right and so is invalid.

As such there is no sequential test and the case officer's opinion is in error.

Fails to address the amenity impact

The case officer argues that this road is acceptable to the residents because

relationships where roads flank onto the flank boundaries of residential properties, are common within the city area and as such it has been established that these relationships can be acceptable.

Is incorrect as that argument applies to city areas, but here we are dealing with houses that back on to undeveloped river flood plain, not inner city Peterborough.

Finally, it should be brought to your attention that planning permission for the conversion of a large single residency Victorian house at 31 Thorpe Lea Road into several flats was rejected by the planning authorities on the basis of traffic impact.

Yet the development of a road to provide access for 32 Executive homes has not been deemed so. Seems to indicate that the case officer's current opinion is incorrect.

Please do Peterborough a favour and reject this proposal.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Doreen Harrison
Mr D Ladd