

Gloucester Centre Site OLPC PCC HE WSP & Residents Meeting Notes Long version

Contents

Contents.....	1
Notes taken at meeting called by OLPC.....	2
Homes England (HE) Role:.....	2
Peterborough City Council Role	2
Building for Life 12 role	3
Feedback on WSP letter in response to OLPC letter to Savills	3
Q1 Traffic Congestion:	3
Q1 Sustainable travel.....	4
Q2 & Q3 Road Specification	5
Q3 Construction Traffic: CTMP Construction Traffic Management Proposal	5
Q3 Demolition Arisings	5
Q3 Construction and Excavation Arisings and Construction waste and Resource efficiency	5
Q4 Traffic Generation and Survey	5
Q4 Traffic or Trips generated.....	6
Q5 Traffic Noise and Traffic Pollution	7
Q6 Trees & Biodiversity	7
Q6 Biodiversity & Bats	8
Q6 Hedgerows	9
Q7 Site layout Density and Character	9
Q8 Design and Appearance	9
Q9 Road Access.....	9
Q10 Local Development Plan	9
Q10 Buildings for Life 12.....	9
Q11 Public Consultation	9
Q12 Build Quality in the context of Climate Emergency	10

Notes taken at meeting called by OLPC

Meeting: Peterborough City Council (PCC) Town and Country Planning (T&CP) Chief Planning Officer (CPO), Land Agent: Savills, Designer: WSP and Land Owner: Homes England (HE).

In attendance: Orton Longueville Parish Council (OLPC), Ward Councilor, 3 resident representatives and Residents. Meeting prompted by letter from OLPC to Savills and their reply.

Introduction by PCC to the parties involved

Questions were asked and answered

These notes record as much as possible of the discussion,

Further questions arise from those answers

There is a short version of this set of notes

Homes England (HE) Role:

HE is a Government Agent on behalf of the MHCLG Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

HE's remit is to:

- Acquire surplus assets: Government Land and Buildings
- 'De-risk the sites': remove all the complications, on behalf of the developers,
- P.S. (to assure their profits can be maintained)
- Carry out all the surveys to support an outline planning application to PCC T&CP Applications
- HE submit Outline Planning (OP) Application
- P.S. (acquiring any added value for the Government purse: potentially a better situation than the developer making all the profits, but potentially eroding the quality of the development, in order to maintain the developer profit margins for stakeholders)
- Retain leasehold ownership of the land, not sold to the developer, but to the purchasers of the houses. Do purchasers get Freehold of the building and their plot?
- P.S. (potentially overcomes the recent fiasco of annual doubling of land rent, and potential estate agents being sued for bad advice)
- Dispose of the land to developers by tender process
- P.S. (maximum price obtainable for land, increases income for Government and encourages the developer to reduce the quality of the development to maintain maximum profit).
- The Tender process includes the housing development proposal so HE vets the detailed plans and outline plan at tender stage, as the tender sets out these rules.
- HE retain a right to comment on the proposal, to maintain minimum standards.
- HE retains an interest in the land

The successful Developer submits Reserved Matters (after the outline application) to the T&CP or Full Planning Application for a new or revised scheme.

Outline Planning (OP):

- **Principle of development of the land, Building use, Numbers of units, Ecology, Transportation,**

OP fixes principles that cannot be unchanged without a new Full Planning (FP) application

Reserved Matters (RM) after OP process includes:

- **Design, Appearance, Site layout, Landscape, Health Safety and Welfare, etc.**

However if any details normally held back as RM is added to the OP application they will be included in any OP approval and they will not form part of the remaining RM process.

If details are included in the OP application there will be no further chance to challenge them at a RM stage.

If however a full planning (FP) application is submitted then all issues are addressed in the one and only submission.

The differences between OP+RM and OP+FP were regarded as too detailed and not worth going into in this meeting.

Planning Consent is in the control of PCC as normal.

HE do not replace any of the PCC T&CP role.

Peterborough City Council Role

PCC T&CP are restricted to apply/or demand compliance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Guidance, and Localism Act and to apply Local Plan precedents to all applications.

Their hands are tied to some extent.

- Highways standards are part of that.
- 2 cars per home is part of national policy
- It went to 1 for a while and caused chaos, in Hampton for example
- Reducing to 1 only works well on an intense urban area well served by frequent, well-connected and convenient public transport.
- You might assume that 2 cars per home allows for an average where some elderly for example have stopped using cars and others mature families with young adults living at home may have many more cars.
- Developments require 20 m between living room windows of garden to garden and frontage to frontage layouts is part of national standards.

Building for Life 12 role

Is there a risk of the Developer changing their mind and eroding their design quality after these stages of scrutiny

- Part of the defence is the need to comply with Buildings for Life 12
- Under NPPF the scheme will be subject to complying with Buildings for Life edition 12
- <http://builtforlifehomes.org/go/building-for-life-12>
- **BfL12 is designed to help local communities become more involved in design conversations and in shaping development proposals.**
- Its 12 questions provide a structure for discussions between local communities, the local planning authority, the developer and other stakeholders, to ensure that the design of new homes and their neighbourhood are as attractive, functional and sustainable as possible.
- **Warning: It is not a design standard but a guide for interaction**
- **Complying with it means very little, engaging with its intentions means more**
- **So far the discussions show signs of not following the spirit of the BfL12**
- This process will be assessed by the 'planning specialist'.
- And he hopes not to decrease the value of the project
- P.S. (defensive talk on behalf of the developer and Government Purse)

Local Plan was up for review on 10th and to be vote in 24th July 2019 See more on the PCC website

Feedback on WSP letter in response to OLPC letter to Savills

The initial comments were made by June Bull of OLPC

These notes are expected to be seen by all parties attending the meeting and in the OP RH or FP applications, so addresses some issues not site specific.

Q1 Traffic Congestion:

- Transport Assessment (TA):
- Can the residents see the details because the numbers do not make any sense
- And more importantly they ignore the numbers of redirected traffic from industrial estate to residential estate and the junction's capacities to accommodate these new numbers.
- They need to communicate on all of the estate road junctions entering Shrewsbury Avenue and Oundle Road
 - Royston Avenue/Oundle road junction in particular
 - All roads other than cal-de-sac are part of 6 rat runs identified
- Surveys See Q4
- The survey has not identified the 6 rat runs to and from Shrewsbury Avenue and Oundle road through the residential streets surrounding the Gloucester Centre development site
- Oundle road is congested by traffic from the dual carriageway Parkways, using the slip road to enter Oundle road and travel in either direction but predominantly to travel west towards the Office Estate near the EofE Showground about 2 miles away and when Shows are on, to the Showground and towards Orton Southgate Industrial Estate.
- This traffic backs up onto the Parkway and beyond the next junction with Thorpe Parkway
- The whole route from this junction towards the Lynch Wood Business Park backs up with near stationery traffic
- A journey from this residential estate, past the Nene Park Academy, turnings for Mately Primary School and Ormiston Meadows Academy, Orton Wistow Primary to the Lynch Wood Business Park, a distance of 2 miles can and regularly does take one hour to complete.
- **The 'some queuing recorded in short busts in the AM peak hour' in the WSP report is a serious misrepresentation of reality.**
- Traffic also backs up along Oundle Road towards the Shrewsbury Avenue 'signalised junction'.
- Traffic also backs up along Shrewsbury Avenue at both ends making exiting from the estate into this main roads difficult, time consuming and hazardous.
- Stationery traffic is more hazardous to motorcyclists due to their inadequately checked or indicated and often frustrated manouvres into their line of travel.
- Residents with drives onto estate roads leading to the main roads experience backing up and desperate rat-runners not courteously or worse refusing to let them enter the estate roads from their drive.
- Cars using Shrewsbury Avenue and Oundle Road to go to the Lynch Wood Business Park know of the regular backing up of this route so they divert through all the residential rat-runs through our estate to overtake cars in these queues.
- Through extensive door-to-door survey of residents we have identified 6 rat-runs, covering all the roads except the cul-de-sacs, through the estate trying to make up time and overtake a few or a dozen cars as best.
- These rat-runners are so desperate to jump traffic that they race through the estate as fast as feasible and some too fast losing control, and are known to mount pavements and impact parked vehicles.
- A serious accident with young or elderly is waiting happen.

- It is a sorry state of affairs, that serious accidents have to happen before traffic calming measures can be taken seriously.
- In the world of Health and Safety, 'near misses' are recorded and treated as importantly as 'hits'.
- **"Congestion is only experienced in the rush hours"**, that is when it is expected and that is what the road infrastructure needs to cater for.
- **'Negligible impact of the existing junctions and roads'** is another gross misrepresentation of reality.
- What you say to planners, who do not know, to get a planning permission is one thing
- What you say to us, who live this nightmare everyday, is another, sadly this fails miserably.
- On top of all this you wish to add minimum 200 more cars from the Gloucester Centre Site residential development to join the rat-runners through the existing surrounding residential estate to the main roads.
- Local Plan shows:
 - 74 homes are proposed on the former British Sugar site
 - 139 homes proposed for a site south of the Oundle Road.
 - This makes a total of 313 new homes within a short distance.
 - Add more from the Showground development site
- Oundle road will become stationery in both directions not just one direction as at present.
- The slip road from Oundle road up to the parkway will be overloaded and more accidents will happen when frustrated drivers race without adequate warnings directly into lane 1 and worse still directly into lane 2.
- By distributing the traffic through the residential streets will alleviate the traffic flows by temporarily adding to the congestion within the residential streets, forcing residents to leave earlier, but it will all rejoin the congestion at the main roads at the same time.
- But all that traffic is still trying to do the same time-specific school runs and work runs, during the same rush hour using the same estate and main roads.
- WSP need to do a better more comprehensive survey and realistic analysis of the proposed changes from existing to proposed loadings firstly on the estate roads and secondly on the junctions, thirdly with all of these new vehicles from anticipated sites before and after the changes.

Historic note:

- Morpeth Close was a close and gated, the gate was eventually removed enabling one start of the rat runs to occur

Bluelight services:

- The link between Wainman Road and the proposed housing development may be maintained for blue-light emergency services only.

Q1 Sustainable travel

- **An assumption was made about the level of use of sustainable travel by the City Engineers or designers but this is over optimistic in relation to cycling.**
- Peterborough is quite rightly proud of its Green Wheel
- However it only partially serves the cycling community and remains under used by a larger number of potential users for some very real considerations
- Green wheel suffers from 'a buckled wheel rim, twisted, buckled, broken or missing spokes and no hub'
- In part it is indirect, some places contorted, difficult to manoeuvre for some bicycles and some cyclists, hence it can be slow and discourages use
- It is missing at critical points: if the road narrows the cycle lane does not narrow, it disappears, the bicycles do not disappear.
- It is hidden (more importantly not visible or seen as a viable alternative by car drivers),
- It is in some places unsafe, perceived or otherwise, and as the batteries fade increasingly unmarked by PV cat's eyes, without reflectors.
- Until the cycleways are significantly improved EU city style, Dutch in particular, Peterborians will not get out of their cars to use them.
- Our city centre is pedestrianised but cyclists are prevented from using the main shopping street, hence 'no hub' but it has a dedicated vehicle routes through the town centre.
- Cyclists have to divert to the inner ring road to get anywhere.
- Until bikes are not seen as a threat to pedestrians by some vocal councilors, but given better or at least equal provision at the hub, as pedestrians and vehicles, nothing changes.
-
- The development as shown at the last public display does little to improve or extend or link into the existing cycle network.
- In-part it maintains the status quo, maintains the existing amenity by nominally rerouting the existing footpath/cycleway through the site.
- The plan suggests a segregation of the cycles from pedestrians, that will bring it up to equal specification as many parts of the cycle network; this is to be commended.
- But a new footpath that serves no desire line, links the footpath/cycleway to the dead end road and then discharges into the verge does little to improve connections

- The scheme has eroded one of the cycleways/footpath routes to a single pathway and a highway, thereby reducing this existing amenity.
- This footpath is likely to become a 'hoho car park' (half-on half-off), forcing wide prams, wheelchairs and mobility scooters on to the road
- School children and other cyclists will have to contend with road vehicles.
- All the proposed roads through the proposed development have dual footpaths following the city road specification, a potential improvement on single paths, but many are not serving any desire lines.
- We await the formal issue for the latest layout to see how any of this improves.

Q2 & Q3 Road Specification

- Q3 response says '**Neighbourhood play will be in accordance with Policy and will not be compromised by the street layout**'.
- If that is the case, then Policy needs changing, designers need to get better than this.
- PP12 best fit seems to be moving away from 'shared same surface cul-de-sacs' due to public perception of them being 'unsafe' possibly because some pedestrians, drivers and riders are unsafe user of them.
- New schemes tend to have short cul-de-sacs, if any
- This scheme is indicative and does not represent 'Developers approach'
- **NB: Residents to Check the OP, RM or FP applications in due course**
- All this compliance with national and local standards leaves the development with little public play areas for children within eyeshot of parents, leaving the only overlooked place for play is on the wide street outside the houses.
- No attempt has been made to create safe neighbourhoods for children's safe play or elderly exercise.
- Instead traffic is the priority without concession; 'easy for traffic', does not equate to 'safe for children, adults and elderly pedestrians and cyclists'.
- The latest site plan (not yet published) fills the site with buildings leaving a strip of un-built land against the parkway boundary for nature, SuDS and play, but well away from most parental observation.

Q3 Construction Traffic: CTMP Construction Traffic Management Proposal

- The issue of which route do the demolition, construction and waste vehicles use to access the site needs to be addressed: residential roads or industrial roads, and maintaining the chosen access route, at which point does the change over occur, if at all.
- What measures will be adopted to keep the residential streets free from clay subsoil from truck and car wheels

Q3 Demolition Arisings

- We suggest the ICE Demolition Protocol and WRAP guidance documents should be engaged with to consider which materials can be saved, recycled or reused.

Q3 Construction and Excavation Arisings and Construction waste and Resource efficiency

- We suggest the Site Waste Management Plan Checklists are engaged with, to minimize waste to landfill and maximize use of material exchanges
- [GBE SWMP Workshop](#)
- [EastEx Material Exchange](#)
- [Enviromate](#)
- [Recipro](#)
- [NISP](#) National Industry Symbiosis Programme
- NISP Network (membership group and connection workshops)

Q4 Traffic Generation and Survey

- The Traffic surveys were taken a year ago so do not reflect the current or future situations
 - 28th June 2018 (not a school holiday but approaching other's holiday period)
 - 7-10 am and 4-7 pm
- At Sugarbeet Office junction with Oundle road
 - This is remote from the Gloucester centre development site and the residential estate surrounding it
 - The survey does not reflect the additional traffic to and from both residential homes and retail shopping proposed for that site.
- The surveys only included junctions between 3 residential streets and Shrewsbury Avenue.
- The surveys did not include any exits from our residential streets into Oundle Road
- The survey has not identified the 6 rat runs to and from Shrewsbury Avenue and Oundle road through the residential streets surrounding the Gloucester Centre development site
- Oundle road is congested by traffic from the dual carriage way Parkways, using the slip road to enter Oundle road and travel in either direction but predominantly to travel west towards the Office Estate near the EofE

Showground about 2 miles away and when Shows are on, to the Showground and towards Orton Southgate Industrial Estate.

- This traffic backs up onto the parkway and beyond the next junction with Thorpe Parkway
- The whole route from this junction towards the Office estate backs up with near stationary traffic
- A journey from this residential estate to the office estate a distance of 2 miles can and regularly does take one hour to complete.
- **The 'some queuing recorded in short bursts in the AM peak hour' in the WSP report is a serious misrepresentation of reality.**
- Traffic also backs up along Oundle Road towards the Shrewsbury Avenue 'signalised junction'.
- Traffic also backs up along Shrewsbury Avenue at both ends making exiting from the estate into this main roads difficult, time consuming and hazardous.
- Stationery traffic is more hazardous to motorcyclists due to their inadequately checked or indicated and often frustrated manouvres into their line of travel.
- Residents with drives onto estate roads leading to the main roads experience backing up and desperate rat-runners not courteously or worse refusing to let them enter the estate roads from their drive.
- Cars using Shrewsbury Avenue and Oundle Road to go to the Office Estate know of the regular backing up of this route so they divert through all the residential rat-runs through our estate to overtake cars in these queues.
- Through extensive door-to-door survey of residents we have identified 6 rat-runs, covering all the roads except the cul-de-sacs, through the estate trying to make up time and overtake a few or a dozen cars as best.
- These rat-runners are so desperate to jump traffic that they race through the estate as fast as feasible and some too fast and lose control, and are know to mount pavements and impact parked vehicles.
- A serious accident with young or elderly is waiting happen.
- It is a sorry state of affairs, that serious accidents have to happen before traffic calming measures can be take seriously.
- In the world of Health and Safety, 'near misses' are recorded and treated as importantly as 'hits'.
- **"Congestion is only experienced in the rush hours"**, that is when it is expected and that is what the road infrastructure needs to cater for.
- **'Negligible impact of the existing junctions and roads'** is another gross misrepresentation of reality.
- What you say to planners, who do not know, to get a planning permission is one thing
- What you say top us, who live this nightmare everyday, is another; sadly this statement fails miserably.
- On top of all this you wish to add minimum 200 more cars from the Gloucester Centre Site residential development to join the rat-runners through the existing surrounding residential estate to the main roads.
- PCC want to add more from the Showground development site
- PCC want to add more still from another site off Oundle road.
- Oundle road will become stationery in both directions, not just one.
- The slip road from Oundle road up to the parkway will be overloaded and more accidents will happen when frustrated drivers race without adequate warnings directly into lane 1 and worse still directly into lane 2.
- By distributing the traffic through the residential streets will alleviate the traffic flows by temporarily adding to the congestion within the residential streets, forcing resident to leave earlier, but it will all rejoin the congestion at the main roads at the same time.
- But all that traffic is still trying to do the time-specific school runs and work runs, during the same rush hour using the same estate and main roads.
- WSP need to do a better more comprehensive survey and realistic analysis of the proposed changes from existing to proposed loadings firstly on the estate roads and secondly on the junctions, with all of these new vehicles before and after the changes.

Q4 Traffic or Trips generated

- The WSP letter refers to **'the important point for the existing residents will be the number of additional vehicles on the local road network'** then provides data unrelated to residents concerns.
- The residents are concerned about three issues:
 - the number of additional cars coming from Gloucester Centre Site through the existing residential streets
 - the numbers of cars from the new and existing residential streets joining the surrounding main roads at peak times
 - the additional cars from new residential sites in the vicinity adding to Oundle road congestion in both directions
- I would also suggest WSP mathematical models and metrics are flawed
- We have done our own count and find 517 residences directly affected by this development.
- 750 recorded in the WSP letter just helps to reduce the % of change and appear less for the planning submission.
- Existing car parking provision:
 - Approximately 140 including some dedicated small van/bus/ambulance/FM vehicles,

- Additionally 20 on street parking within the curtilage of the site and extending into Morpeth Close, and on verges.
- But none of these come through the residential streets since they are instructed to use the Industrial estate.
- The proposed development of 100 homes will generate 200-500 cars.
- The numbers of vehicles from the proposed residential development, entering and passing through the existing residential streets increases from 0 to 200-500 overnight transforming the character of these otherwise quiet streets and adding to the rat-runners hogging the roads and causing chaos in rush hours.

Q5 Traffic Noise and Traffic Pollution

- It should be noted that the changes in routing of traffic from the Industrial estate to the residential estate will significantly change the noise levels from 0 cars to 200-500 cars
- **'Negligable magnitude' is a gross understatement and misrepresents the reality of the proposal**
- It should be noted that the existing residential building on the site have been acoustically treated with mechanical ventilation to mitigate against traffic noise from the Parkway.
- Will an acoustic fence/wall be added along this side of the site?
- Will the proposed residential development be subject to the same standards, if not why not?
- Passivhaus energy standards if applied here will offer suitable levels of acoustic separation, air tightness, with mechanical ventilation, triple glazing and thick thermal insulation, potentially providing significant acoustic insulation too. See Q12

Q6 Trees & Biodiversity

- The decision to build hard up to the south west site boundary will clear a significant part of the trees, hedges and bush line;
- Whilst they offer little acoustic barrier they offer a significant psychological acoustic barrier to the traffic and noise on the parkways and slip roads.
- The Tree, hedges and bush line may offer traffic pollution absorption, mitigation.
- **The Public Exhibition said there was nothing of merit worth preserving**
- 30 trees on the site are mature and over 40 years old, they are the backbone of the biodiversity on this site.
- One Lime tree is known to support a bat population foraging for food at the north end of the site
- One conical tree forms the focal point and makes a great view onto the site from the industrial estate link road from the south and can continue to do so.
- There are two more of the same species trees in close proximity
- 4 Cherry trees demarcate a pedestrian route and vista into the site from the north
- Numerous Silver Birch form a copse on the western side of the site on a raised bank, it is a popular site for picnics and wedding photographs
- All of the 30 trees deserve saving and discussions were underway with the PCC Tree Preservation Officer (TPO)
- But the PCC and the representative for the development said trees are 'unlikely to be retained'.
- This contradicts:
 - WSP statement that bat boxes will be attached to mature trees.
 - BfL12 ambitions
 - "No net loss of Biodiversity" National Planning Policy and Local Policy and commitments
 - Q6 WSP response statement **'It is recommendedthat further consideration is given...'**
- Is this an example of 'De-risking the site'? It seems to be adding risk.
- **A TPO is unlikely to be set across the site, because the trees are not good enough.**
 - They are not seen as pristine examples of their species, so no TPO
 - That is the worst excuse imaginable, perhaps from a lumberjack but not from a representative of the council responsible for the maintenance, enhancement and reinforcement of the environment in which we all live, nor from the design professions
 - They are not past their sell by date, many are to the untrained eye (the public and local residents) magnificent and add so much history and biodiversity to the site for so many, human and nature alike.
- **Not good enough for what?**
 - The trees in and particularly around this estate are one of the reasons sighted by many of the residents for wanting to move here and wanting to stay here; they give an impression of being in the countryside.
 - Some have said if the trees go they are leaving.
 - In the same way that some buildings with no merit are saved because of the role they play in reinforcing an urban scene, surely trees can be saved just because they are part of the appearance of the site and the surrounding estate and have been for so long.
- The Tree-line between the residential and industrial site needs to be preserved:
 - It offers a visual barrier in spring summer and autumn, between residential and industrial
 - It creates a delightful tree-lined tunnel for pedestrians and cyclists
 - It reinforces our connection with nature, significantly enhancing wellbeing

- It plays an important part of a bat flight path.
- See 10 BfL12
- Some of the comments made by WSP and PCC T&CP CPO spoke on behalf of and in favour of development and gave the impression that as long as we/they stay within the rules we/they can do anything they want: example:
 - None of the trees are A1 examples of their species and therefore not being added to Tree Preservation Order TPO register.
 - Fell all the trees on the site rather than get a skilled Landscape Architects and Estate Architect who can work around them and save as many as possible adding some ready made history, biodiversity and great natural character to a otherwise featureless tarmac-heavy new estate.
 - This attitude of A1ness smacks of:
 - Arian race mentality from Nazi Germany,
 - Or if you're not at Crufts you need to be put down, (there is such a thing as Scruffts where less pristine animals are loved as much if not more as their pedigree friends)
 - You're not Miss World so there is no place for you here (American school culture?).
 - An attitude that has found its way into magazine culture putting people's looks down for the sake of magazine sales and
 - Giving permission to trolls to do the same in social media where it is destroying young lives.
 - You should all feel ashamed of yourselves, we feel ashamed for all of you.

Q6 Biodiversity & Bats

- **The Public Exhibition said there was nothing of merit worth preserving**
- But bats are a protected species, protected by unlimited fines and imprisonment for any wrong doing
- The WSP letter admits to numbers of bat roosts in the buildings to be demolished
 - (not specific, nor number of maternity roots, nor population size).
- So this is where 'De-risking' the site comes into play again.
- Get a Natural England licence and do what others would be fined or jailed for
- You should all feel ashamed of yourselves, we feel ashamed for all of you.
- **So demolish the bat habitats and build a compensatory permanent bat roost structure appropriately located in the site**
- **'Compensatory'**: how many roosts and what population size?
- Without survey evidence, 2 maternity roosts are suggested, without mention of winter hibernation roosts
- The WSP letter suggested two species of bat that require crevices and flying space so the bat roost provided needs both crevices and flying space or it will be incompatible with the species found and declared so far.
- Hanging 4 (numbers not justified yet) bat boxes that are incompatible with the two species, in old trees, that you plan to fell, will not provide compatible habitat.
- How **'permanent'** is permanent? 50/60 years normal, 100/125 years long term?
- What will it be made of? Durable construction? Masonry and/or Durable species Timber? NB. No Preservatives allowed.
- **'Appropriately located'** would mean in the vicinity of the existing roosts, trees and ponds to ensure take up.
- Placing them near a SuDS settlement pond may provide a source of insects for foraging, if it is planted with favourable species of plants to encourage insects, more tasty than the moths of the Lime Trees
- Placing them next to footpath and cycleway is unlikely to be well away from street lighting.
- For the bats safety it is essential to be well away from street lighting to avoid predation.
- PV cats eyes (with reflectors) is probably a good choice for this vicinity.
- **'Installed before demolition commences'**
- This presumptuously assumes that the bats will decide to move to it rather than stay put or leave the area altogether.
- The timing of the roost construction and/or installation should occur between summer roosting and winter hibernating, or visa versa, after they have left for the season, to ensure they are not disturbed.
- Ideally it should be installed at least 6 ideally 12 months before demolition to offer an alternative that if designed well, could be occupied in advance of the demolition and in the best of circumstances allows bats to leave and occupy by choice.
- Some of the existing buildings have been unoccupied for 20 years and hoping the bats will move on easily after potentially 20 years of occupation is very optimistic.
- **If the bats do not adopt the new roost should the fines apply? We think so.**
- The proposed Bat roost could be a well-designed multiple-occupancy construction that also accommodates birds and other wild life from the site, but only if they are compatible with the bats.
- We will hold the development to these requirements **"no net loss if Biodiversity"**, but 'different biodiversity' should not be seen as an alternative.
- Cutting down 30 mature trees and hedgerows is not going to help.

- **“Habitats found on the site were deemed to be of negligible conservation interest and of site value only”**
- **‘Negligible Conservation Interest’** seems to be not in the spirit with:
 - BfL12 ambitions
 - “No net loss of Biodiversity” National Planning Policy and Local Policy and commitments
 - Q6 WSP response statement **‘It is recommendedthat further consideration is given...’**
- **‘Site value only’** is good enough for the residents

Q6 Hedgerows

- **“The tree lines that currently provide a barrier between the site and the Parkway and the industrial estate are likely to be retained”**
- ‘Likely’ is not strong enough, we want assurances.
- The hedge rows along the A1260 Parkway will be completely removed in the scheme shown in the Public exhibition
- The car parking for the Social Housing is inadequate in numbers, inadequate in dimensions and inadequate in driving geometry; the current layout does not work and all of the trees and shrubs to the site boundary will be removed to fit it all in.

Q7 Site layout Density and Character

- The scheme makes no provision for outdoor space for health and wellbeing for the Social housing occupants
- We look forward to a revised competent plan.
- Cul-de-sac layout are old hat, it appears, due to shared same materials same level surface being disliked by residents
- Overlooked children’s play is not part of current planning policy, even though desired by families
- Further comments about BfL12 in Q10
- Based on figures given in Q4: 100 new homes and 516 existing, is a significantly larger 20% than your **small proportion of 11%** and from 0 to 200-500 more cars through our streets is not **negligible additional impact**.

Q8 Design and Appearance

- PCC has dictated this will be housing, maximum 100 units and 30% Social Housing
- The developer’s hands are tied, between competitive tender for land, fiduciary rules, habitually high profit margins for shareholders, woefully inadequate building regulation and bad performing buildings.
- There is no choice it would seem.
- But something must be done about the traffic expectations caused by this large number of homes and re-rooting of all the traffic flows into already congested residential streets.

Q9 Road Access

- **“Negligible impact on Morpeth Close” is a gross misrepresentation of the truth**
- Shame on you, from 14 cars to 214-514 cars is not negligible in anybody’s books, do some real maths.
- This is a single lane road most times of the day due to short drives, small front gardens and higher levels of on street parking.

Q10 Local Development Plan

- Can you provide accurate figures on dwellings per hectare of the surround estate for comparison?
- It is intended that ‘Access’ will be part of the OP application and not RM so it needs to be resolved in the first proposed submission
- **Local resident need to resist the closing of Wainman road to the new development as robustly as possible.**
- The Peterborough Parking standards and National Planning Policy says 2 cars per home despite reality.

Q10 Buildings for Life 12

- See separate File

Q11 Public Consultation

- Newspapers do not work
- Leaflet dropping at every house does, we highly recommend it
- Many residents confirmed they never got a leaflet
- **‘All feedback has been included in a Statement of Community Involvement’**
- I would hardly call the Exhibition **‘Involvement’**,
- ‘attendance by representatives’? Yes,
- ‘willing to admit prior knowledge’? No

- How has this affected the scheme?
- No revised scheme has been offered yet.
- We await the revised scheme

Q12 Build Quality in the context of Climate Emergency

- We notice that PCC is not signed up, to the dismay of Peterborough Environment City Trust (PECT)
- UK “net zero” 2050 target is very demanding far from enough, in the remaining time available, delayed by Government meddling in GreenDeal and Eco, and setting, then dropping then resetting Net Zero Carbon Targets.
- Demolishing 40+ year old buildings will not help to control embodied carbon, energy and water
- Building Regulations are widely acknowledged as woefully inadequate to meet any targets.
- Germany’s Passivhaus, Switzerland’s Energie, UK’s AECB Carbon Lite are appropriate standards to demand for all future development.
- Good Homes Alliance Overheating risk tool launched this week
- Fabric-First and eco-bling last
- All this is Reserved Matters.

Brian Murphy of 91 Oakleigh Drive
01733 238148 07973 281024

BrianSpecMan@icloud.com

[Rev A00 19/07/19](#) [Rev A01 20/07/19](#)