

Gloucester Centre Site Public Exhibition Notes

Contents

Contents.....	1
Other files related to this Development.....	3
Notes on cold calling residents in their homes with flyer (15 th – 21 st June 2019)	3
Residents email feedback.....	3
Parish Council Presentation.....	3
Public Exhibition Notes	3
Notes following a Public Exhibition of the planning proposals (held on 25 th April 2019).....	4
Previous 'Public Consultation'	4
Previous Petition:	4
Outline Planning Applications:	4
Public Consultation:	4
Public Consultation Stakeholders:	4
Proposal details:	5
Historic information:	5
Pathways between Caldervale Road or Shrewsbury Avenue and subway under the A1260.....	6
Traffic Calming Measures:	6
Resident's views	6
Proposal:.....	7
Demolition and Construction issues:	7
Construction Access / transport:	7
Demolition, Waste and Resource Efficiency:	7
Cycleway and Footpaths.....	8
Phasing and Zoning:	8
Wellbeing Health and Safety	8
Residential Planning Zone	8
Missed opportunities:	8
Missing or misinformation:	8
Proposal Positives:	9
Proposal: Negatives.....	9
Current considerations:.....	9
Observations:.....	9
Environment & Biodiversity:	9
Impact on local social services facilities.....	9
Generally:.....	10
Houses:.....	10
Terraces:.....	10
Affordable Housing	10
Highways	11

Congestion on surrounding roads:.....11

Road Noise:11

Weakness of design.....11

Alternatives:11

Other alternatives.....12

Summary.....13

Other files related to this Development

Notes on cold calling residents in their homes with flyer (15th – 21st June 2019)

15 pages so far

including from Facebook page comments

(increasing numbers of residents since flyer drops, 111 total)

NB: Decanted to separate file and emails added there

Residents email feedback

Now decanted to separate file

Parish Council Presentation

Now decanted to separate file

Public Exhibition Notes

Now in separate file

Notes following a Public Exhibition of the planning proposals (held on 25th April 2019)

- This exhibition relates to an outline planning permission only, which is in preparation now.
- Exhibited 1.2 miles from the site (better than the first second exhibition) at Herlington Community Centre
- Feedback is required by 3rd May 2019 by email Rachael.morey@saville.com

Previous 'Public Consultation'

- Apparently this is the 2nd Public exhibition about the site (we have now heard it was the 3rd)
- Deviously the previous exhibition was held at South Grove Community Centre, Woodston, 2 miles from the site and the residents affected were not informed
- A resident found out about it and informed others
- It showed 123 homes despite the Local Plan allocation of 'up to 100 homes'

Previous Petition:

- Following a previous public exhibition there was a petition 13th December 2018
- <https://www.peterborough.gov.uk/council/petitions/development-of-gloucester-centre/>
- Requested maximum 50 units, 506 signatures
- PCC response:
- <https://pcc-live.storage.googleapis.com/upload/www.peterborough.gov.uk/council/petitions/GloucesterCentre-ResponseFromServiceArea.pdf?inline=true>
- Brushed off due to there being no formal application yet
- Even reducing the unit numbers from 123 to 100 or even to 50 will not solve the primary concern about the site

Outline Planning Applications:

- They may be carried out by estate agents, land agents, land-owners, surveyors, with some guidance from road and services engineers but limited advice from Architects, Landscape Architects, and rarely with prior public consultation with existing communities.
- They become something of a mathematical exercise to prove access viability and development density is possible to appease the T&C Planners.
- They become a test case to find the best or worst possible scenarios to build slack into a budget to pay LA fees and still maximize profits.
- They are often a means to add value to land before selling on at a profit with little effort and no consideration of adding value to the community.
- Anything that is established by the outline planning application, in the wrong hands could become a barrier to imagination and intelligent and socially responsible design as the scheme develops to a full application.
- Whilst BREEAM does not normally apply and EcoHomes and Code for Sustainable Homes are both gone Home Quality Mark could apply here.
- Zero Carbon Hub and The Buildings Hub design guidance addressing Performance Gap and Future proofing all development and housing in particular needs some consideration

Public Consultation:

- They are avoided by most developers who are interested simple life, make a big profit for shareholders and business, building their standard housing to achieve it, no vested interest beyond completion, no incentive in doing the right thing by the exiting or future community
- Could include presentations and invite questions and offer answers, but can be unruly and are avoided by developers and their agents
- Public exhibitions: avoid direct discussion between the proposer and the community
- Public engagement without sufficient handouts is very unhelpful to the community attendees
- The information pack that has been provided by Savills raises far more questions than answers and is very limited on detailed information.
- Public engagement with a short deadline for comments is also unhelpful

Public Consultation Stakeholders:

- Residents of the below listed roads whose properties back onto the site,
- Other residents along the existing and any new 'rat-runs' Newcastle Drive, Nansicles, Thornleigh Drive, Sherringham Way and Royston Avenue through the surrounding estate to:
 - Shrewsbury Avenue at 3 points and
 - Oundle road at 3 points
- Commercial and social businesses in Wainman Road
- Social businesses making use of the cycle/pedestrian route to car parking spaces across the industrial estate
- Public delivering children to the social businesses (Creche, sports, martial arts)
- Residential Estate road users: Residents, Public, School children and Industrial Estate users
- Industrial Estate road users: Industrial Estate businesses and deliveries, residents

- Delivery services, couriers, internet couriers, public services and utilities, emergency services, taxi services
- Cycleway users to NW, SW and SE (residents, workers, public and schoolchildren)
- Pedestrian footpath users to NW, SW and SE (residents, workers, public and school children)
- Biodiversity using ground, buildings, trees, tree lines and hedgerows surrounding and leading to and from the site.
In particular:
 - Bats inhabiting N corner of the site as a foraging area
 - Bats using the bat flight path or commuting habitats to SE along the cycleway
 - Foxes that roam and forage throughout the estate streets and gardens
 - (others yet to be discovered by a proper survey or advised by residents)
- Local councilors
- Occupants and Staff at Gloucester Centre site

Proposal details:

- Site reference: Emerging Local Plan LP37.26 (HHM001H)
 - Client: Homes England (a Government Department)
 - Proposer: Savills (UK) Limited Cambridge (Land Agents)
 - Consultant: WSP (Multi-discipline design consultancy)
 - Site area: 3.23 hectares, roughly rectangular, length orientated NW to SE
 - Site bounded by:
 - A1260 dual carriageway to SW,
 - Wainman road industrial estate, whose road leads to the site's South end
 - Morpeth Close that leads to the site SE corner
 - Cycleway to NW, SW and SE (part of 'Green Wheel' which leads to the National Cycle Network)
 - Pedestrian footpath to NW, SW and SE
 - Morpeth Close to the SE, that leads to Oakleigh Drive to the NE, leads to Basil Green to the SW; and leads to Thornleigh Drive to the N, which leads to Caldervale to the N
 - North West corner also backed on my Edenfield
 - Existing owner: NHS/Homes England?
 - Existing Occupier: NHS and other businesses occupying buildings not used by NHS.
 - Existing use:
 - Gloucester Centre, a special needs and secure residential home of single storey buildings, consisting of;
 - a central hub building surrounded by
 - clusters of houses joined by communal rooms with resident support functions and
 - with additional facilities management buildings.
 - Other buildings, part of the original NHS facility, now occupied by other businesses
- 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.

Historic information:

- The road infrastructure put in nearly sixty years ago struggles to cope with current traffic levels, let alone with another potentially 200-300 plus cars.
- Oakleigh Drive and Newcastle Drive are generous in width and have been a loop bus route off Shrewsbury Avenue in the past
- Oakleigh Drive has generous hammerhead for vehicle turning
~~○ (presumably before Morpeth close was added?)~~
- Morpeth close is a narrower width but has a generous hammerhead for vehicle turning
 - The 7 properties here have a shallow frontage accommodating maximum 2 cars (one using what would have been front lawn)
 - Forcing additional cars and visitors to park on the highway effectively making this a single lane to cope with two directional traffic and serving another 200-300 or more cars morning and evening and service vehicles all day
 - ~~○ (presumably before Wainman Road connected to the Site and/or Morpeth close was extended to join Wainman Road?)~~
- The previous Planning Application for the existing development of the Site was reliant upon access from **one, other or both** Wainman Road Industrial Estate and Residential estate using Oakleigh drive via Morpeth Close.
- ~~• We need to establish this information (from previous planning application information) as it may help defend the claim we want that access route via Wainman Road to be maintained.~~
- Residents have been informed that car-using staff, at Gloucester Centre, are instructed to use Wainman Road to access and exit the site.
- It may be argued that as a business use the site should be reached via an industrial estate rather than via a residential street.

- ~~Changing this to a housing site may provide an argument for access to and from this site be rerouted via residential streets, without consideration of the ramifications~~
- It has not gone unnoticed that the same vehicle and occupant starts their journey as a resident and ends it as a business staff member, or visa versa.

Pathways between Caldervale Road or Shrewsbury Avenue and subway under the A1260

- Is the long standing and well used main connection linking both sides of the parkway (A1260):
 - Light industrial area, residential areas, the Orton villages
 - Schools, Nurseries and University, sports facilities, social enterprises,
 - Herlington Centre, Orton Shopping Centre, Oakleigh Drive Shops, Co-Op in Oundle Road
 - Nene Parks, Orton Mere, open spaces and woodland
 - Bus routes in Shrewsbury Avenue, and Oundle Road,
 - The Gordon Arms and Botolph Pub/green. Ramblewood,
- It is well used by young and old, cyclists, runners and walkers; for getting to and from work, schools, recreation; with prams, with children, families or dog walking, etc.
- Pathway and cycleway presumed to belong to the PCC.
- Currently the affordable housing scheme shows there is no room for a cycleway to Caldervale Road and inadequate space for car parking; so the segregation of pedestrians, cycles and motorized traffic falls down at this point, where on-street parking will be inevitable.
- We should remember that verges are for landscape, health and wellbeing, carparks are for parking cars, roads are for driving, cycleways for bicycles and footpaths are for people with/out buggies and dogs, not car parking half on half off road and pavement.
- By turning this significant pathway into a road you significantly increase the possibility of there being accidents
- Peterborough is well known for its many safe walkways and cycle paths.

Traffic Calming Measures:

Over the last 20 years Parish Council meetings have presented various traffic calming measure schemes,

- Some schemes are current and proposed for Oakleigh Drive & Newcastle Drive area,
- Suggested by Peterborough City Councillors,
- Supported by Peterborough City Council
- Proposed because the roads were too dangerous, too much traffic, cars going too fast
- Residents of Royston Avenue/Sherringham Way complaining the estate being used as a rat run
- A high proportion of elderly residents and the chance of an accident far higher.

Proposed previously included:

- Speed bumps on Oakleigh Drive & Newcastle Drive
- Oakleigh Drive/Newcastle Drive being made into a one way system
- Heavy traffic banned from the estate
- Double yellow lines outside the shops in Oakleigh Drive stretching for nearly 100m,
- Stopping local older residents from parking nearby (Councillor Graham Casey)

Despite all these concerns:

- The traffic calming measures never materialised
- Have all those concerns now evaporated?
- There is now a proposal to add 200-300 or more cars per day through these residential streets
- Are PCC willing to overlook all this when money is to be made selling land.
- Shrewsbury Avenue and Oundle Road are gridlocked at least twice a day and this will make things so much worse.
- Housing is being built all around Peterborough especially the Hamptons and further afield where there is space to design suitable infrastructure to support numbers of housing and the inevitable cars; plus schools, retail, etc. to serve them.

Resident's views

- People who lived here as children have returned as adults to live in what was remembered as a safe and quiet place where people stayed long term.
- It is a safe & relatively noise free area to live especially for young families & the elderly.
- As the population as aged and moved to special care homes or higher places; younger families have move in to replace them.
- Many residents are devastated that all this is about to change for the worse.
- **Peterborough City Council/NHS/Savills/Homes England** want to make money selling off land and developers want to make profits for faceless faraway shareholders.
- ~~The idea that Morpeth Close, Close may give an idea of what this road was meant to be, will be the only access for the proposed new housing estate.~~
- It will be horrendous for those living here especially on Morpeth, Oakleigh, Newcastle, Nansicles, Thornleigh,

Sherringham and Royston Avenue as the traffic substantially increases.

- Where are the schools, doctors, dentists these new residents are going to access, they are already full.
- This estate will suffer greatly from the current proposal, but we hope it will be changed for the better not the worse.

Proposal:

- 100 residential unit development including 30% Affordable Housing in the form of walk up flats
- Terrace of low rise walk up flats creating a partial acoustic barrier along the SW boundary
- Terraced housing (up to 5 units in terraces)
- Roads and parking serving the above
- Closing of the Wainman Road entry to the site
- Redirecting all site traffic through the residential estate, from a wide new road into a narrower Morpeth Close, on to the wider Oakleigh Drive; increasing peak time loads and adding to the existing 'rat-runs' through the estate and queues at main road junctions.
- Removing most soft landscape and relocating it towards the SW corner
- Sustainable urban drainage system (SuDS) consisting of permeable pavement, attenuation basin pond in the SW
- Proposal to provide a bat roost in the South corner of the site.
- Retaining some trees, but the information is inconsistent and will lead to inadvertent removal of some significant and specimen trees and hedgerows

Demolition and Construction issues:

- Demolition and Construction will be very disruptive and provision must be made for maintaining and from time to time rerouting a safe, mud-free permanent route for cyclists and pedestrians from the underpass to Wainman Road and Morpeth Close and to Oakleigh drive, etc.
- Wholesale clearance of biodiversity within existing buildings, fences, some trees, planting, banking, hedgerows, grass areas and their subsoil
 - Poor stock piling practices usually kills most of the life and bacteria in topsoil
 - Highest part of site is where 'pond' is proposed, raised banks with spring flowers and substantial trees,
 - 1.5-2 m to be removed above and 1-2 m below to make functional pond and SuDS attenuation basin
 - No SuDS sediment forebay will make a permanent pond, naturally inhabited by wildlife, unusable in storm conditions
- In view of the clay subsoil a wheel spinning washing rolling road would be essential to keep the residential roads mud free

Construction Access / transport:

- According to the proposed plan access to this new development will be purely via Morpeth Close.
- What studies / analysis has been undertaken and can these be made public.
- Morpeth Close is a narrow road made for light residential traffic
- Construction will mean large trucks travelling to and from the building site, especially articulated trucks carrying long / large roof trusses, ready mixed concrete trucks, Waste skips, etc.
- Cars parked in Morpeth Close it will be at risk of damage by trucks

Demolition, Waste and Resource Efficiency:

- Consider using the ICE Demolition Protocol before finalizing the proposals and before the demolition commencing
- Consider the Waste Hierarchy before sending all to landfill
- Reclaim and make as much available for reuse or remanufacturing or recycling in preference to landfill
- Demolishing of all buildings, a probable bat roost and assuming a new bat box in a different location will be occupied by the existing colony, adding a bat box close to a newly white illuminated slip road and footpath/cycle way, putting bats at risk of predation.
- Wholesale demolition of the existing single storey special residential buildings well before the end of their useful first life
- "Minor ground improvement works": Grubbing up of most hard landscape roads, pavement, parking, services, drains and foundations and repositioning them
- Disposal of most of the demolition and ground work arisings to ever diminishing landfill and ever increasing landfill gate costs and taxes
- Low percent of demolition arisings as cables and metals will be reclaimed for financial remuneration
- High percentages of inert materials e.g. concrete, tarmac, brick, block, glass could be recycled and used as recycled concrete aggregate, hardcore for building floors, permeable pavement sub bases and bedding to hard paving.
- Many other materials should be considered for reuse or recycling in preference to landfill

Cycleway and Footpaths

- Reclaim and reuse the excavation arisings as permeable sub-base for the rerouted pavements
- Reclaim and reuse the PV cat's eyes
- Reclaim and reuse the Street lighting unless newer, more efficient and daytime auto-off, down light, white light are to be used in their place.
- Consider the best options for lighting adjacent to new bat boxes or retained buildings, trees and hedgerows

Phasing and Zoning:

- It will be essential for this development to address the issue of maintaining a safe mud-free pedestrian and cycleway route through the site throughout all stages of the projects progress

Wellbeing Health and Safety

- Considerate Contractor scheme may be essential to control site staff wolf-whistling and intimidating passersby turning this essential route into a no-go area for some residents
- We would like some assurances that the contractor, constructors and subcontractors will limit on- and off-site pollution and it entering surrounding homes (including elderly residents):
 - Emissions to air, water and soil, and sewer pollution
 - Dust pollution and current health risk campaign
 - Mud pollution on roads, paths and cycleways
 - Wind blown emissions, dust and waste pollution
 - Noise pollution (levels and times)

Residential Planning Zone

- Please can you confirm if this area is zoned as residential or light-industry.
- If not residential has any application been made to make it into a residential zone?
- If so please can this be published.

Missed opportunities:

- Affordable housing at x% below market value remains unaffordable
- There is a nationwide urgent need for strengthening the housing stock of local authority and RSLs
- Peterborough has a shortage of bungalows of 'Lifetime Homes' specification making provisions for disabled or aged population
- This site could be considered for redesigning as: (none of the following have been proposed to the residents)
 - Sheltered housing with warden/special supervision for the elderly population of this estate so they do not have to leave the area to meet their changing needs (this may be welcomed by residents)
 - Multiple occupancy residential possibly for students for Peterborough's University aspirations
 - Co-operative social housing that make real affordability possible
 - Self-build plots (not for large expensive houses like London Road to Yaxley) but for low density larger plot homes, potentially a strong community development down to their shared experience and environmental aspirations, well beyond speculative developer profiteering.
- Engaging robustly with the real biodiversity requirements of the site
 - The current scheme smacks of 'greenwash' (whitewash with a green flavor),
 - Wholesale removal of existing landscape without protecting the existing wildlife
 - Providing bat boxes for a population that has not yet been determined (existence, species, numbers, location, routes) the true requirements need to be established
 - But at least a sum is in the budget for a bat box.
- No attempt to design in an environmental passive approach, considering solar orientation and site layout or future proofing the development against the cost of rising carbon based fuel
- No attempt to discourage the use of cars and encourage use of alternative modes of transport

Missing or misinformation:

- The heavily engineered road layout misses out (nothing indicated or noted) SuDS components including: source control, bioretention (no green, brown or blue roofs), no conveyance (except below hard pavement?), no verges, no swales, no sediment forebay.
- The June 2018 ecological appraisal was deficient, as a competent 2019 bat survey should reveal
- The site and surroundings does 'support significant habitats of conservation interest'.
- Bats, their roosts and environs are protected with a maximum 6 month or unlimited fine for roost disturbed, bats excluded or trapped.
- <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/bats-protection-surveys-and-licences>
- It is believed that a building(s) in the North corner of the site is occupied by bats which frequent a surrounding resident's garden pond and at least one tree on the site and the areas between as foraging grounds, none of which can be disturbed.

Proposal Positives:

- Partial retention of some existing trees and hedgerows that do not impinge on the proposals
 - But existing and proposed planting plans are inconsistent and leave scope for erroneous removal
 - Bat roots **may** exist in at least one tree in the North corner of the site currently shown as retained
 - Any potential purchasers must be made aware of their nature neighbours and their legal obligations in relationship to them and their trees, hedgerows, fences.

Proposal: Negatives

- Adding 200-300 cars to rush hour traffic through residential closes and streets trying to enter Shrewsbury Avenue and Oundle road close to existing rush-hour congested roundabouts and crossings.
- Developers should consider Feng Shui weather they believe in it or not, customers may. 11 of the plots are badly placed with views down the roads opposite.

Current considerations:

- Properties around the existing estate have varying size frontages, some with integral garages (some converted to accommodation) resulting in 1-5 cars (current Google Satellite images) (some vans) on the frontage and 1 or more on the highway.
- Turning permeable front gardens into less- or non-permeable car parking goes against SuDS principles that are being proposed in the new development, but need to be a consideration of all existing developments.
- Frequently congested roads up to corners result in unsighted and quite hazardous corners for pedestrians, cyclists and car users alike especially mornings and evenings.
- Morpeth Close was intended as a cul-de sac, when designed, it is narrow by 2 meters than Oakleigh Drive.
- Car parking on both sides of these roads, unsighted pedestrians and cyclists, numerous pinch points, tee junctions add to the problems, results in a slalom run to negotiate them.
- The generous road width, wide verges, deep frontages mostly without fencing and high shrubs, and inter-visibility in straighter parts encourages faster driving, adding to user risks.
- Occasional car parking on wide paths can result in unsighted cars, pedestrians and cyclists, making negotiating corners more dangerous, speeding along roads and around corners in the wrong lane is commonplace here.
- Residents regularly use Wainman Road as their pedestrian/cyclist-safer exit and entry routes to and from Shrewsbury Avenue, this is viable and practical at most times except in rush hours when delays getting onto the main road causing queues, can occur.
- Industrial vehicles rarely present a congestion problem since many industrial units have large vehicle entry doors and deep frontages with off road parking space, and off-road laybys (also used for night parking)
- Loss of this entry/exit route will make things more dangerous for all residential estate road and footpath users.
- The geometry of the junction between Wainman Road and Morpeth Close encourages turning left towards the Gloucester Centre in preference to Morpeth Close and Oakleigh Drive, despite this, very infrequently lorries including articulated, have been known to turn left, churn up the verges and progress into the residential streets.
- Closing this connection may remove a few rogue drivers, but cause much more inconvenience to all other users.

Observations:

Environment & Biodiversity:

- The area ~~is a fairly quiet area with~~ has well-established trees, grassy areas, hedgerows and shrubs
- This site and surrounds accommodates or supports multiple bird life and small wild animals
 - e.g. birds, rabbits, hedgehogs, squirrels, bats, foxes, insects, etc.
- The Public display information pack mentions Ecology in a very brief paragraph with no detail and appears to brush off any impact.
- Has a study been undertaken and if so can this be made public, if not why not?
- Is the proposed removing or relocating of bats in line with the law and has application been made a Bat migration license?
- Construction and the proposed plan will significantly disrupt this environment, risks removal of well established trees, shrubs and grassy areas which will be replaced by houses, roads and parking spaces and based on other building sites the surrounding area will be severely impacted.
- Peterborough labels itself as 'Environment Capital', this plan completely contradicts this ideology.

Impact on local social services facilities

By building this development as proposed will place a huge additional strain on all the facilities.

- Has the impact of 200 to 400 additional people including (240?) children from 100 homes on local facilities been undertaken?
- If so please can they be publicised?

Medical and Pharmacy practices:

- Limited number of medical practices in the area
- Nene Valley Medical Practice, Orton Bushfield Medical Practice, Botolph Bridge Community Health Centre
- All of which are not in the immediate vicinity and all overloaded.

Dental services:

- Limited number
- Bushfield Private (+NHS)
- Also fairly full

Schools & Nurseries:

- Limited numbers

Generally:

- Peterborough is well served by public transport, footpaths and an extensive cycle network serving town and recreation spaces
- With today's environmental concerns T&C Planning should be striving to discourage car use and encourage the use of the alternatives.
- Some development authorities do restrict car parking on sites to encourage the use of alternative transport
- The over-engineered roads and footpaths enables and encourages the use of cars
- More needs to be done to change reliance upon fossil fuel burning cars
- The rerouting of the cycle way should reclaim the PV Cats eyes and reuse them in the revised route

Houses:

- Existing buildings are single storey (a planning restriction on the current use) the proposal will include 2 and probably 3 storey townhouse homes.
- On the face of it 100 dwellings on this 3.23 hectare site does not look dense compared to the surrounding estate.
- However the plot sizes vary from larger detached at a reasonable density to the small terraced units at much higher density.
- It would be good to get a mathematical analysis of densities of the existing estate and the proposed site from the developer or our own to get a comparison.
- Today there is reliance upon private cars to get about rather than making the most of Peterborough's extensive cycle network or easily accessed public transport. Two person families often have two cars.
- Today with many young adults unable to enter the housing market due to high price of the first ladder rung and the lack of availability of truly affordable housing to rent or buy, they remain at home with parents longer.
- These same young adults often have their own cars, so properties will often have 2 to 4 or more cars
- The proposal plans show two parking space on each plot, tandem beside houses and two abreast in front of terraces, 140 spaces indicated for houses, more for affordable.
- It is not unreasonable to assume a development of 100 dwellings could on average need to accommodate a range of 200-300 cars, possibly more.
- So with 100 units and 200-300 cars this site does feel too dense a development for this site with limited access.

Terraces:

- There are objections within the residents to terraced housing for being out of character with the area, which is predominated by detached and semi detached homes.
- The closest terracing is in the Nene Housing Flats on Shrewsbury Avenue
- The scheme puts a number of terraces positioned at road junctions with car parking on the frontage or at the side nearest the road junction, resulting in poor visibility just where it is needed most.

Affordable Housing

- Some residents are unhappy about flats being added to an estate that does not have flats
- It is understood that affordable homes are an obligation by the T&C Planners
- The affordable housing element of the scheme is the least imaginative and most like an afterthought to appease planners, a most anti-social (for the affordable housing) proposal.
- 30 units have been given the same room as 10 houses; for 30 flats, car parking and recreation space (none indicated)
- There is no landscape or gardens related to or dedicated to the flats providing little health and wellbeing opportunity for the occupants (those that probably need it most).
- The hedge and tree-line between the site and the A1260 have been deleted to make room for car parking.
- If this is an extension of the bat navigation route, this may not be permitted.
- Any remains of the hedges and tree-line will be put at risk by undermining their roots for permeable pavement and car park sub-bases
- 30 units needs 30 (or 60 or more?) car parking spaces which have not been allowed for in the parking area indicated, 20-25 maximum spaces could fit, relying on street parking to meet the shortfall.
- The scheme shows inadequate room to get to let alone turn into the parking spaces.

- The only practical ways to accommodate them is for the whole to be built at first floor level and above making this minimum 3 storey high and requiring lift access for accessibility by all
- No integration within the site, which unusually already mixes very large and very small houses on the same site.
- ZED or Zip car-sharing schemes could be considered to reduce the demand for car parking spaces and the serve these occupiers in a positive way.
- Secure cycle storage provision could also benefit these occupiers.

Highways

- It is noted that the highways specification in the outline scheme is over-engineered, in road and footpath width and provision being two lane roads throughout with two footpaths in almost all locations.
- This appears to go against the trend in reducing vehicular provision, presence, dominance and priority within estates, lending themselves to safer neighbourhood play.
- The proposal make no provision for visitors cars and repair workman vans except more on street parking
- The T junction at Morpeth close suggests a potential link to Wainman road is being contemplated, but not currently shown.
- We seems to be very good at making good roads to rush cars towards pinch points resulting in near grid lock in rush hours

Congestion on surrounding roads:

- Already due to the existing traffic Oundle road and Shrewsbury Avenue are extremely congested,
- Example:
 - Monday 29th May a resident left home at 8.30 to find queues in Royston Avenue from Oundle road all the way up to Dry Leys.
 - Then travelling to Shrewsbury via Oakleigh Drive and Newcastle Drive, found traffic delays at all intersections.
 - In Shrewsbury Avenue there were queues either way, i.e. towards Oundle road and also to Morely Way.
 - With industrial areas on both sides of Shrewsbury Avenue there were articulated trucks parked in Shrewsbury Avenue causing cars to have to cross onto the oncoming traffic to get past.
 - It took 15 mins to travel from Edenfield to Morely Way, according to google maps a 1 mile journey, 4 MPH
- Oundle road and the A1260 off ramp are congested,
 - It is bumper to bumper in peak hours, especially the off ramp to Oundle Road with traffic backing up past the on ramp from Thorpe Road.
 - It takes 1 hour in the mornings, to travel from Bakers lane to Lynchwood Business Park
 - More and more cars are cutting through Oakleigh Drive/Royston avenue to avoid Oundle road
 - An additional 200 to 300 or more cars will only add significant congestion to an already grid-locked area.

Road Noise:

- In terms of noise the A1260 has risen in the past 18 years approximately 400% increase in car numbers.

Weakness of design

The layout appears to have been done with very little regard to sustainable place making.

- Wide roads pavements occupying a high percentage of the site area
- Inadvertently making provision for multiple car ownership by making room for on street parking
- Good visibility for road users enables swift progress
- Multiple loop roads enabling racetrack mentality
- No road hierarchy reducing from main dual lane road with dual footpath diminishing towards single lane with passing spots, to cul-de-sacs with parking off all sides
- "Uncontrolled crossings" No pedestrian priority crossings and priority areas to discourage car speed
- No neighbourhood spaces indicating pedestrian priority and potential safe play
- No integrated safe play areas removing all scope for safe play within eye/ear shot of homes
- The scheme proposed is a City Engineer's dream:
 - (but inadvertently makes the whole unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists)
 - Ample access for waste collection truck and fire engines
 - Wide roads, pedestrian footpaths both sides everywhere, whether a desire-route exists or not
 - Circulatory roads dominating every corner of the site
 - Full width roads right up to site boundaries, no room for nature
 - As if compulsory purchase orders are planned to blast through to other estate road in at least 3 places
 - And one incomplete loop to be completed making room for another 8 townhouses replacing nature or play space

Alternatives:

- Suggestions were made for alternative routes out of the site and these were discussed.

- Access from slip road off the A1260 only serves inbound not outbound traffic
 - 70 MPH to residential road will need considerable traffic calming measure to be successful
 - The over-engineered road layout does little to help
- Three main options:
 - As currently proposed: Close the Wainman Road Industrial Estate entry to the site, maintain the Morpeth Close connection to the site, which forces all entry and exit from the site via Morpeth Close and Oakleigh drive via congested estate roads to Shrewsbury Avenue or Oundle road
 - This is unwelcomed by many residents ~~(we need a survey to establish this)~~
 - Pushing all traffic to the proposed site through the residential streets
 - This will be completely unacceptable during construction with materials, waste, staff and labourer vehicle access considerably increasing traffic in residential streets.
 - Wheelwashing rolling road would be essential to keep the residential roads mud free
 - Widening Morpeth Close below the tree canopy will undermine the roots of the existing trees and put them at risk as well as the bat flight path
 - Existing overhead telephone cables to residential buildings will need to be reconsidered
 - Maintain the Wainman Road Industrial Estate entry to the site, close the Morpeth Close connection to the site, which forces all entry and exit from the site via Wainman Road; it also denies residents the option to use Wainman Road
 - Negotiate right of access through the site, (new estate owners looking to increase income)
 - Adopted road means Highways have some say in this determination
 - Consider a mini-roundabout onto Shrewsbury Avenue to enable access to it in rush hour
 - This is unwelcomed by some residents ~~(we need a survey to establish this)~~
 - Maintain the Wainman Road Industrial Estate entry to the site, maintain the Morpeth Close connection to the site, and share the additional car numbers between both existing routes
 - ⊖ This is unwelcomed by some residents ~~(we need a survey to establish this)~~
 - ⊖ This is welcomed by some residents ~~(we need a survey to establish this)~~
- Fourth alternative:
 - Add an additional route along the line of the existing footpath/cycleway.
 - The tree line is a bat navigation route and should not be diminished or removed, but ideally reinforced/ repaired
 - It has already been broken by one resident removing specimen trees in their garden and trees from the treeline and bat flight path on the ground of making a vehicle access that was used for a short period and then abandoned when they moved home.
 - This alternative was generally considered impractical without destroying and altering other much loved visual and biodiversity amenities
 - ⊖ ~~(we need a survey to establish the level of support or rejection)~~
 - A second entry to Shrewsbury Avenue so close to Wainman Road may be against City Engineer policy or road design guidance.
 - This route terminates at two bus stops that serve the estate and proposed development.
 - Both of the bus stops would need to be relocated well away from the new road entry
 - Accommodating adoptable pedestrian/cycle way and a two lane road to serve both sides at Big Sky and Oakleigh Drive would be impossible without felling some of the tree lines and putting the remainder at risk.
 - Developers would be reluctant to afford this overhead unless part of a 106 agreement (or its replacement)
 - The tree line is a great visual barrier between the residential and industrial buildings in summer, it is predominantly deciduous so the visual barrier is diminished and greatly missed in winter
 - There are two or three tree lines overall 18' or 6 m apart with a 6' or 2 m asphalt cycle and pedestrian route between and trees and bushes and a boundary fences infilling between
 - One line is of more mature tall trees roughly 18"-24" 450-600 mm diameter trunks and some multi-stemmed/multi-trunked
 - They are between 45-60 feet or 15-20 meters high
 - The second line is younger trees roughly 8"-18" 200-450 mm diameter trunks and tall shrub bushes.
 - They are between 15-30 feet or 5-10 meters high
 - There is also a line of street lights between the trees adjacent to the asphalt pavement
 - The overall canopies are over 15-20 m wide
 - The root spread in clay subsoil will be extensive and vary between species but root disturbances should not occur below the full extent of canopy without putting the survival of the trees at risk.
 - ~~As a precaution we should consider seeking a personal or community Tree Preservation Order.~~

Other alternatives

- Close off Morpeth Close and upgrade Wainman Road so access to the site can be from Shrewsbury Avenue
- Access Wainman Road from an off-ramp from Morely Way
 - The new Industrial Estate owners are looking to sell/redevelop the large car parking area on the east side of Wainman Road this could be off-and on-ramps rather than more industrial units.
 - This may be rejected by City Engineer's but could be explored on an 'if you don't ask.....basis'

- Tunnel under the A1260 and access Gloucester road from Stonebridge road.
 - Expensive
 - Complicated geometry to get head room for fire, refuse, removals/delivery trucks
 - Competing with the cycleway/footpath for space
 - Delivering 200-300 cars into a well defined residential road hierarchy with single lanes and passing points is unacceptable
 - Residents of that estate will push back harder

Summary

In summary we do appreciate that there is a need for additional housing, we also appreciate that Savills and the developers are looking to make a reasonable profit, otherwise you would not be in business.

However we do think all involved need to also appreciate that existing residents also have certain rights to maintain their safety, maintaining or a reduction in noise and air pollution, maintaining the environment and value to their properties.

The Council also has a Duty of Care to its existing residents whom will be made less safe by this proposal.

Access to the new development has to be revised and/or reduce the number of properties/cars emanating from this site.

- i.e. remove the apartment block altogether,
- reduce the number of terraced houses by turning them into semi-detached houses
- increase number of detached houses, this would be in-line with the surrounding area.

It is unacceptable to use Morpeth Close with an increase in the number of cars that the proposed new development would bring.

Even with a significant reduction in the number of houses, say 50% and utilising Morpeth Close will still have a significant impact on residents and congestion in the surrounding roads.

We suggest further consultation with relevant council bodies, parish and resident groups should be undertaken long before planning permission should be sought.

Brian Murphy of Oakleigh Drive

01733 238148 07973 281024

BrianSpecMan@icloud.com