

## **Great Haddon Applications – PCC Position Statement**

### **Response from GHC 6 May 2010**

The text below is reproduced from the PCC Position Statement for completeness. However, no GHC response is made to the Introduction, Summary, Background or Principle of Development/Planning Policy sections (items 1-4 below), as this is factual information.

Sections 5 to 21 represent the topic-based comments received from consultees and the Council's response. We have put this information into tabular form, and have added our responses as appropriate.

Under the Conclusions section at the end of the report, we have also set out our proposed way forward, as agreed in principle with PCC, to move the negotiations on the applications forward.

#### **PCC Position Statement Sections 1-4**

**“Re Development of an urban extension comprising up to 5350 residential dwellings; a district centre (with up to 9200 square metres (99031 sq.ft) retail floor space) and two neighbourhood centres (with up to 2300 square metres (24758 sq.ft) retail floor space) comprising district/neighbourhood retail (A1-A5); community and health (C2, D1); leisure (D2); residential (C3) and commercial (B1) uses. Provision for education facilities (sites for three primary and one secondary school); sports and recreational facilities; site for 5 gypsy and traveller pitches; a range of strategic open spaces including new landscaping, woodland and allotments; and cemetery provision. Associated highway infrastructure (including pedestrian, bridleway and cycle routes), public transport infrastructure and car parking for all uses. Utilities and renewable energy infrastructure; foul and surface water drainage networks (including SuDS and lakes)**

**At Land To The North Of Norman Cross, East Of The A1(M) And West Of London Road (A15), Peterborough.**

**Re Development of up to 65 hectares of employment land (B1, B2 and B8 including provision of a site for a household recycling centre). Associated highway infrastructure (including pedestrian, bridleway and cycle routes), public transport infrastructure and car parking for all uses. Utilities and renewable energy infrastructure, foul and surface water drainage networks (including SuDS and lakes)**

**At Land To The East Of Alwalton Hill, Fletton Parkway, Peterborough**

## **1. Introduction**

I write with reference to the above planning applications currently under consideration. Having now had the opportunity to review the applications, along with the consultation responses and representations received to date, I have compiled a position statement. At this stage, the position statement focuses on land use planning rather than S106 matters, except where there are potential land use implications.

This statement is divided into key topic areas. It sets out the headline issues but does not, in the main, list or detail specific requests for information in relation to the various submission documents. This statement is designed to give a steer on the key issues in order to allow the application topic group meetings to commence. Where necessary, a separate letter(s) will be sent to you setting out specific requests for further information, including requests under Regulation 19 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regs for the Environmental Statement (ES). Those requests will be in line with the overall thrust of the headline points made in this statement.

## **2. Summary of representations and consultation responses (internal and external)**

Please see Appendix 1 for the summary.

A number of the responses received to date from consultees have already been sent to you. I will ensure that other responses I have received also get forwarded on.

## **3. Background**

Although this project has emerged following work over a number of years (as the background technical papers set out) the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has not been engaged from the outset. Furthermore, pre-application discussions have been limited. In particular, a draft copy of the application material was not made available for comment as would be expected. The LPA and consultees were, therefore, only able to offer limited feedback to you at the pre-application stage and a number of key issues remained unresolved at the time of submission. A number of requests for further information/clarification now have to be made.

## **4. Principle of Development and Planning Policy**

Great Haddon is not an allocated site in the Adopted Peterborough Local Plan. It is outside the urban area boundary in the open countryside where there is a presumption against development. As the Regional Spatial Strategy growth targets cannot be delivered within the urban area, the Core Strategy therefore identifies two urban extensions, one of which is Great Haddon.

Objections to the principle of development have been received from CPRE and a number of residents within Yaxley and Haddon. However, given the policy background the principle of development can be supported, but as a future allocation the proposal should be assessed against the emerging Core Strategy which places more emphasis upon the environment, and not the policies of the Local Plan (except where no policy alternative is available). This is to ensure that the development, as a future allocation, meets future needs/standards.

The applications will therefore be considered against the following policy framework. Please note this is not an exhaustive list but sets out the key policies to consider:

### Key Policy Considerations

#### *National Policy*

Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1 'Sustainability and Climate Change'  
PPS3 'Housing'  
PPS4 'Retail'  
PPS9 'Biodiversity and Nature Conservation'  
PPS10 'Waste Management'

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13 'Transport'

PPG16 'Archaeology'  
PPG17 'Open Space'  
PPS22 'Renewable Energy'  
PPG23 'Noise'  
PPS25 'Flood Risk'

#### *Regional Policy*

The Adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (2001-2021) confirms the principle of substantial growth within the Peterborough area. It does not specify or indicate where that growth should occur.

#### *Local Plan*

The site is not allocated for development in the existing Adopted Local Plan. It is located outside of the urban area boundary in the open countryside.

#### *Emerging Core Strategy*

**CS4** identifies Great Haddon (not precise boundaries) as a proposed urban extension. It states that any development should comply with all other policies in the Core Strategy and draws attention to specific matters:

- efficient use of land;
- 15 gypsy/traveller pitches;
- range of employment opportunities;
- provision of retail, leisure, social and cultural facilities without adverse impact upon other centres;
- provision of public spaces including appropriate treatment to the site edge which should be sufficient to alleviate potential pressure on Orton Pit SAC;
- a management strategy to prevent adverse impact upon Orton Pit (as required);
- measures to protect the SAC from potential adverse impacts on air quality; and
- incorporate a design solution to maximise energy efficiency.

**CS6:** Meeting Housing Needs - mix of housing types

**CS7:** Gypsies and Travellers -15 pitches expected as part of Gt Haddon

**CS9:** Environmental Capital - demonstrate what contribution will be made to the Env. Capital agenda over and above that required by Building Control.

**CS10:** Renewable Energy - significant proportion of the energy supply will be expected to be gained from on site and/or decentralised renewable or low-carbon energy sources.

**CS13:** Transport - development should adhere to a number of principles including the promotion of public transport/walking and cycling, reducing number of journeys etc.

**CS14:** Retail - new Centres to be created at Gt Haddon, with the scale of retail floorspace appropriate for the catchment area that the centre will serve.

**CS19:** Green Space and Infrastructure - major development proposals should incorporate opportunities for green infrastructure provision

**CS21:** Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – promotion of biodiversity, avoid demonstrable harm to habitats or species.

The Core Strategy has been approved by the Council and consultation on the submission version ended on 4 March 2010. It is anticipated that it will go through the examination process during autumn 2010.

*Site Allocations DPD*

This document will confirm the precise boundaries of Great Haddon on an OS Map. It has been approved by Cabinet to reach a 'preferred options' stage and is currently out to consultation which expires on 22 April. Adoption is unlikely for 18 months.

There is a risk with progressing the applications in advance of the Core Strategy as the allocation could be found "unsound" by the Inspector at examination. This could be because, for example, the evidence base is insufficient to justify the proposal or to demonstrate its deliverability in terms of infrastructure requirements.

If the applications were to be approved before the adoption of the Core Strategy they would need to be referred to the Government Office for the East of England as departures to the Local Plan. The Secretary of State would then have the option of calling in the applications for his own determination".

## 5. Transport

The transport impacts of the development have been assessed using the Peterborough Transport Model (PTM) but the application was submitted without the results of the modelling. This information has now been received and is currently being assessed. Until the LPA has received comments on the modelling from the relevant highways authorities (PCC, CCC, HA) it cannot give a definite view on the applications.

Should a review of the modelling show that other areas of the highway network require mitigation measures which are directly related to Gt Haddon and have not been proposed in the supporting documentation, the developers would be expected to fully fund and implement the improvements so there is nil detriment to the local highway network.

The HA has issued a holding direction which is in force until 6 April 2010 at which stage the HA will review. A further direction could be issued.

In the meantime, there are a number of key transport issues which require further consideration and discussion:

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
<p><u>A15</u></p> <p>The Local Transport Plan 2 promotes the throttling down of the A15 as an urban public transport corridor, the works at Hempsted being a step towards this. In light of the initial public reaction to Hempsted and the proposals for the bus gate (see below) a Corporate/Member steer will be sought as to whether the Council's objectives should be reviewed.</p> <p>If the Council is of the view that the objectives for the A15 should be reviewed this has a number of knock on implications in terms of the capacity of the surrounding road network i.e. the A15 itself, A1(M), Fletton Parkway and new roads within the development.</p>	<p>GHC wish to be involved in any Member Briefing on this issue, given the commitment already made by the developer (O&amp;H) to public transport priority along the A15 (including the Hempsted bus gate) as part of Hampton</p>	<p>Discuss further with highways and passenger transport</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>If the Council is of the view that the objectives for the A15 should be pursued the bus priority measures for the road (it crosses several development boundaries) would need to be secured as part of the S106 agreement for Great Haddon to ensure their deliverability. Feedback on the role and nature of the A15 will be given as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>			<p>Yes.</p>

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
<p>Huntingdonshire District Council (Hunts DC) wishes to see the A15 retained as a rural road. The section of the A15 adjoining Gt Haddon is managed by CCC.</p>	<p>The A15 is currently one of the key routes for use by traffic from the A1(M) to Peterborough City Centre.</p> <p>The character of the A15 has not been a rural road for some years – it is the key southern gateway and radial route into the city carrying a significant amount of traffic already, and a key public transport priority route (which is borne out by the consented Hampton/ Hempsted junctions and consented development frontage alongside the A15 at Hampton. This is therefore considered to be an unrealistic aspiration.</p> <p>However, if these comments relate to the landscaped character of the route in this location (tree lined and with view over the fens to the south) then this has been taken into account in the design of the DFP where development has been set back from the road by 40m from the edge of the carriageway with existing trees along the road corridor retained and enhanced with supplementary planting.</p>	<p>GHC to provide additional sketches illustrating the relationship of the built form with the A15 and the gateway into the Great Haddon site.</p>		
<p><u>Bus Gate</u></p>				

<p>I have not received any reaction to the article in the Yaxley Gazette, which set out the rationale for the bus gate proposal. If you feel that further engagement with Yaxley residents would be worthwhile, please arrange for that to be set up. Officers from PCC will be able to attend and give factual information on the scheme and set out the Council's long term transport objectives for London Road etc.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, you are aware that substantial objection has been received from residents of Yaxley. In light of this it is the LPAs current position that alternative locations for a bus gate should be explored as well as the implications of removing it entirely. This could have a number of substantial implications for traffic flows on the existing road network and new roads within the development, all of which will need to be examined.</p>	<p>The bus gate was not part of the original proposals for Great Haddon. It was only introduced after public consultation in 2008, when locals requested that some traffic calming/restraint measures be put in place to discourage the use of the A15 into Peterborough city centre by through traffic from the A1(M).</p> <p>We remain committed to delivering public transport priority over the private car (which inevitably means making trips by car more difficult so modal shift is achieved). However, we will look at alternative locations for the bus gate on London Road.</p>	<p>GHC team to discuss further with officers in the context of delivering a strategy which achieves the modal shift PCC and GHC are seeking</p> <p>GHC attendance at the Neighbourhood Liaison Group on 19 April.</p> <p>GHC team to look at alternative locations for the bus gate and report on implications of removing bus gate on Great Haddon traffic flows and modal shift.</p>		
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
<u>Western Peripheral Road/Yaxley By-Pass</u>				
<p>Planning permission has been granted for stages 1-3 of the Western Peripheral Road (WPR) which is a dual carriageway with a design speed of 60mph. The Great Haddon proposal is to introduce measures to reduce speed at the southern extent of the consented section to 40mph and to transform the future section through the proposed Great Haddon development into a 30mph 'central boulevard' (two lanes each way).</p> <p>Please clarify how the reduced speed on the southern extent of the consented section can be achieved.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the design speed of WPR is actually 40mph. However, PCC did not want to implement a speed limit for stage 1-3. There may be the opportunity to revisit this as part of Great Haddon?</p>	<p>GHC team to provide more detailed information to demonstrate how the speed reduction and 'entrance' to Great Haddon can be achieved.</p>	<p>Yes - transport.</p>	

<p>Notwithstanding this, the LPA is of the view that the proposed 'central boulevard' and internal road layout does not deliver a bypass of Yaxley as set out in the original 1993 S106 Agreement for Hampton. This is because the nature of the road has changed significantly; it would serve as the principal access into and out of the development for Gt Haddon residents and would discourage, rather than encourage, through traffic to the north and south of the development area. Through traffic would instead be encouraged to use the parkway system (Fletton Parkway/A1(M)).</p> <p>In addition, Members and the LPA are concerned that the proposed dual carriageway would sever the development area, and it would not provide a pedestrian/cycle friendly link between Gt Haddon and Hampton. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed highway arrangement along the 'central boulevard' and key internal roads would not work in practice, i.e. on-street parking and access to adjoining residential tranches would result in highway safety concerns.</p> <p>In light of the above, it is considered that you should explore and model the option of a single lane carriageway. If agreed as the way forward, a variation to the 1993 Hampton S106 would need to be secured.</p> <p>The knock-on impact of providing a single lane carriageway on the surrounding highway network would need to be fully explored and modelled to determine which highway solution, on balance, is the best option. For example, a single lane carriageway could result in more traffic using the A15 and/or Fletton Parkway and the A1(M) and those concerns may outweigh the current design concerns relating to a dual carriageway severing the development area.</p> <p>You have also stated to me that the boulevard may be essential to the delivery of Gt Haddon itself. If that is the case, this should be clearly demonstrated and the concerns identified above in relation to</p>	<p>Agree with first paragraph, in that the bypass of Yaxley was not designed to also serve development, but was simply designed as a fast route around properties on the western side of London Road to avoid any adverse impact from increased traffic generated by the Hampton development. The A1(M)/Parkway system will be the quickest route from the south for those travelling into the centre of Peterborough.</p> <p>We do not agree with the view expressed that the central boulevard will sever the development area or would not work in practice for access. However, we will provide further details to support the proposals.</p> <p>A single carriageway link is not an option because of the projected demand to travel by car on the new road, and we do not therefore propose to model this option. However, the details of the road to be provided will demonstrate how a high capacity route can be well integrated into the</p>	<p>GHC team to provide further details of the central boulevard design, including a strategy for on-stree parking, connections with secondary and tertiary streets and access to the district centre.</p> <p>In addition, we will provide further information on the need for an urban dual carriageway through the site from a capacity perspective.</p>	<p>Yes – transport.</p>	

severance, on-street parking and access to the adjoining development tranches will require further explanation (also see Urban Design/Layout section).	development area and work well for local access and the district centre as well as through traffic.			
<u>Great North Road (old A1)</u>				
The proposal to use the old A1 as part of the highway network serving Gt Haddon is welcomed. It is an existing piece of infrastructure that is under utilised and it is reasonable for it to accommodate more traffic.	Noted.			
The LPA also welcomes the proposal to restrict HGV access to Junction 1 of Fletton Parkway; this will help to protect residential amenity and highway safety.	Noted.			
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
Concerns have been raised by residents, in particular those from Haddon village and living along the old A1 that the road will become over used and give rise to safety issues and impact on their general amenity. Please could you therefore clarify how many more vehicle trips will occur on this road as a result of the development so the impact can be conveyed more clearly to residents.	Noted.	PBA to provide details of vehicle trips to PCC.	Yes - transport.	
A detailed design of the road running through the proposed employment area has been submitted as a separate planning application and will be considered in the context of the wider proposals for Gt Haddon.	Noted.			
<u>A1(M)</u>				
The submission documents state that the development does not result in the need for any works to junctions 16/17 of the A1(M) and that works to junction 17 (part signalisation) are secured via the planning permission for Alwalton Hill. The HA will comment on these conclusions further once it has assessed the modelling but Alwalton Hill cannot be relied upon for delivering the upgrade of junction 17 as there is no committed timescale for these works. If the modelling shows that improvements are required to junction 17 as a direct result of vehicular traffic from Gt Haddon, the developer would be expected to fully fund and implement them in accordance	Noted.  Presumably there is a trigger for the works set out in the Alwalton Hill s106? It is expected that a combined 'trigger' for the works will be agreed for Great Haddon Employment Area and Alwalton Hill.			Yes.

with the Guidance on Transport Assessment 2007.				
---	--	--	--	--

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
<u>Fletton Parkway</u>				
<p>The Transport Assessment (TA) acknowledges that Fletton Parkway Junctions 1 to 2 is near but not over capacity.</p> <p>The initial view of the Council's Highways Department is that Great Haddon will, on its own, trigger the need for the widening of Junctions 1 to 2 and I understand that you do not dispute that issue.</p>	<p>The modelling indicates that in 2011 with consented development, but without Great Haddon the Fletton Parkway between 1 and 2 is at or slightly over theoretical capacity. This is further exacerbated when considering future year scenarios (2026) without the Great Haddon development traffic, but including growth and other development related traffic. Therefore the need for the FP enhancements is demonstrated irrespective of whether Great Haddon comes forward. These works are required to facilitate the growth identified in Peterborough as a whole and not just Great Haddon.</p> <p>Further discussion with PCC is therefore required on this topic.</p>	<p>PBA have responded in writing to PCC re: content of the PTM, and will also follow up by issuing a technical note covering (in more detail) this trigger issue – albeit this has already been set out in the TA.</p> <p><i>We seek formal clarification from PCC that it accepts our approach of using the PTM as the baseline for assessment (ie. not putting the PTM to one side and assessing GH only).</i></p>	<p>Yes – Transport. PBA to arrange individual transport meetings to address (close out) issues raised by the respective authorities. A combined Topic Group meeting with everyone to (hopefully) will then confirm what has been agreed with everyone.</p>	<p>Yes (% contribution)</p>
<p>However your position is that consented growth (i.e. schemes with extant planning permission) has already given rise to the need to widen the parkway without factoring in the Gt Haddon development, and you will therefore look to provide a pro rata S106 contribution towards any widening scheme.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>			<p>Yes.</p>
<p>In light of this, please confirm which extant planning permissions</p>		<p>PBA have issued letter</p>		

have been factored into the modelling to enable you to come to the conclusion that it is the wider consented growth that has given rise to the widening of the Parkway.		confirming this issue.		
There is currently no funding available from the Council for the widening. If the widening is needed and cannot be funded by the Council, and the developers position remains that it will provide a contribution only, then should planning permission be granted the commencement of development on site may need to be deferred (or a specific trigger point agreed) until the infrastructure is provided. This is a significant issue that will clearly require further discussion.	Agree further discussion required on this issue – it has impacts not only for Great Haddon but also for the delivery of the Core Strategy.	<b>Priority discussion needed.</b> The PTM shows that Fletton Widening is shown to be triggered in 2011 without GH, with even further work required in 2026 still without GH.	Yes – transport	Yes.
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
Please see comments under Ecology section below with regard to the impact of any widening scheme.		<b>Priority discussion needed.</b>		
Subject to comments from the HA, you may also be requested to set out in more detail the impact on junctions 1-4 of the Parkway.	Unclear why HA would comment on a non-trunk road. Follow up with HA on this required.		Yes - transport	
<u>Park &amp; Ride</u>				
Passenger Transport has advised that a site should be safeguarded within the employment area for a Park and Ride in accordance with the emerging Local Transport Plan 3. If this is to be progressed political support is required as it would have wider impacts, particularly on how parking/transport within the city centre is approached. It would also need to stack up financially.	Not proposed as is not required for Great Haddon and is of little benefit to our scheme.  Noted. Follow up discussion needed.	PCC to follow up internally	Yes – transport	Yes
This approach could also impact upon the current objective to make the A15 a public transport corridor.	Critical issue – would have been beneficial to have clear PCC views earlier in the process.	PCC to follow up internally		
- A corporate/political steer is required as to what priority should be given to this request when weighed against other S106 priorities.	Critical issue – would have been beneficial to have clear PCC views earlier in the process.	PCC to follow up internally		Yes

<u>Other Matters</u>				
Links between the two parts of the proposed development (i.e. the Core Area and the employment area) for people walking/cycling are considered to be poor and need to be improved.	Disagree – we have provided links both on-street (Gt North Road) and off street through the open space areas. We would not propose a strategic ped/cycle link through the existing woodland area even if these areas were included in the application areas.	Discuss as part of Design Review?		
Options for creating walking/cycling links with Hampton should be explored (i.e., a footway along the WRP).	Noted. Subject to ecological input, this is something we are considering further in the context of the Green Wheel realignment and relationship with the southern part of the SAC	GHC to consider further.	Yes – Ecology	
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
Clarification in respect of the bus routes is required as the information submitted is inconsistent.	Noted.	DLA/PBA to check.		
Detailed travel measures in the Travel Plan need to be given. Please refer to the comments from the PCC Passenger Transport Team for further details.	The Travel Plan submitted for the site included a number of hard and soft measures which are shown on the appended document.	Letter response to PCC Passenger Transport and confirming TP contents measures set out to date and addressing their comments. If necessary arrange a meeting and agree further TP measures.	Yes – Transport	Yes – level of provision subject to other s106 requirements (e.g. P&R site)
The Design & Access Statement states that there will be a significant modal shift away from private cars. There is little numerical evidence to suggest this will be the case. It is considered that the Travel Plan as submitted will not encourage the sustainable movement of people. Travel Plan targets need to be robust and clearly set out and linked to the phasing of the development. The	The Travel Plan submitted for the site included mode shift targets which are shown on the appended document.	Development phasing to be agreed.	Yes - Transport	

LPA does recognise, however, that the relocation or removal of the bus gate will exacerbate this and will need to weigh that concern against any benefits that may be associated with a change to the current bus gate proposals.				
No mention of construction traffic has been made in the TA. Modelling the effects of this should be carried out so that the impact is identified at the outline planning application stage and mitigation measures proposed.	The construction aspects have been covered in the ES chapters. These would not be modelled. They will be assessed further and managed by the Construction Management Plan and Traffic Management Strategy to be developed – presumably there will be a condition in this respect. This will link to the development phasing which will need to be defined in greater detail and agreed.	Development phasing to be agreed and if considered necessary at this stage an outline construction management plan can be developed?	Yes - transport	

## 6. Rights of Way

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
The proposal would result in the diversion of four rights of way. The principle of diverting two of these routes is considered to be acceptable.	Noted.	No action required		
The proposal is to divert the Green Wheel from its current alignment adjacent to Haddon Lake through a new underpass under the proposed Western Peripheral Road. The reason for this is to minimise the ecological impacts. Concerns about the proposal have been expressed by the Council's Rights of Way Officer and the Peterborough Local Access Forum. The ecological arguments for the diversion are not supported by either the Council's Wildlife Officer or NE. The LPA is therefore of the view that the current proposal should be reviewed.	Noted. This is something that merits further discussion.	GHC to look at proposals for retaining the current alignment along the eastern section of the proposed diversion, with a smaller section of diversion to cross the Lode.	Yes – Ecology initially as part of wider access discussions	
Notwithstanding the above, additional information is required in respect of the proposed underpass design in order that its	PCC to clarify what additional information is required over		Yes – Landscape/	

acceptability/suitability can be assessed.	and above that provided in the DAS		Highways	
The Council's Rights of Way Officer and the Local Assess Forum have also expressed concern about the proposed diversion of bridleway 1 through the employment area (it is an historic allocation with a wide route) and the nature of the diversion route.	A detailed design of the road running through the proposed employment area which includes details of the proposed bridleway 1 diversion has been submitted as a separate planning application and any conclusions from this will be considered in the context of the wider proposals for Gt Haddon.	PCC to provide feedback on the detailed proposals which will come forward through consultaion on the road application.	Yes – Landscape/OS	

## 7. Ecology

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
NE broadly supports the scope and detail of the ES. It welcomes the measures proposed for the surface water drainage system and supports the high proportion of green infrastructure designed into the new development. It also supports the mitigation proposals in relation to hedgerows, scrub, bare ground, brownfield land and aquatic habitats and the outline proposals set out in the Biodiversity and Great Crested Newt Strategies.	Noted.			
However, it also considers that the impact of the development on the special interest features of the Orton Pit SSSI/SAC have not been fully investigated and inadequate mitigation is proposed and is therefore objecting at this stage. The Council's Wildlife Officer and the Wildlife Trust have also objected on a number of issues:	Noted.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The most significant ecological concern is the potential impact of the development, particularly the resulting recreation pressures, on Orton Pit.</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mitigation measures being put forward, a mix of fencing and</li> </ul>	Noted.	GHC agree to discuss further	Yes – Ecology	

the relocation of the Green Wheel route, are considered inadequate. Experience at Hampton has shown the limitations of the use of fencing. Additional/alternative mitigation will need to be explored with you and secured as part of these planning applications.		with NE/PCC as part of meeting NE (29 April) and subsequent topic group discussion		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In your view a management strategy for Orton Pit, including an 'access strategy', should not?? be agreed outside the scope of these applications. Given the potential which this development has to impact on Orton Pit it is considered essential that the principles are agreed as part of these applications.</li> </ul>	Noted but needs further discussion with O&H as managers of the Reserve.	Initial meeting and site visit held with NE and O & H to inform discussion at 29 April meeting with NE.	Yes – Ecology	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These concerns are amplified because of the proposed mitigation measures and by the exclusion of Two Pond Coppice and Chambers Dole (not within the applicant's ownership) from the application area. Both of these woodland areas have the potential to help mitigate recreational pressure on Orton Pit. Unless it can be demonstrated that these areas are not required to successfully mitigate the impact on Orton Pit they should form part of the development.</li> </ul>	Already demonstrated in ES that these areas of woodland are not required for mitigation of impact.		Yes – Ecology	
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed buffer (35m) to the employment area is also considered to be inadequate to protect the SSSI/SAC. Further assessment is required (see NE's comments in respect of shading etc.).</li> </ul>	Disagree that 35m is inadequate, but will provide further info to support this.	Additional topographic survey of the SAC boundary currently being undertaken to inform further detailed shadow analysis work which will be submitted to PCC and NE prior to Topic Group meeting to be arranged in May.	Yes - Ecology	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further detail is required in respect of the areas of new habitat to ensure that they could deliver the ecological benefits outlined. In a number of areas this is questioned as there are potentially conflicting objectives such as unlimited public access into them.</li> </ul>	PCC to clarify additional detail required with LDA	LDA to consider implications and provide additional clarification if required following Topic Group meeting on 29 April.	Yes - Ecology	
The location of the proposed gypsy and traveller site next to Two	This reasoning applies to the	DLA will provide an	Yes –	

<p>Pond Coppice/Chambers Dole is considered inappropriate due to proximity to ecological areas of interest. Please put forward alternative locations for discussion which should be assessed against the criteria set out in Circular 1/2006. (Please see separate section on gypsies/travellers.)</p>	<p>vast majority of this site.</p> <p>Interesting to note that PCC have raised concerns about impacts of access into these woodlands in this context, but but also appear to be seeking to promote access to these woodlands from other perspectives.</p>	<p>assessment of the proposed site against Circular 1/2006.</p>	<p>Community? Landscape?</p>	
<p>Additional information is required in respect of the proposed routing of the utilities, particularly the foul drainage, to ensure that there would be no adverse ecological impacts.</p>	<p>We understand this relates to the proposed routing of the foul drainage along the WPR</p>	<p>PBA to clarify routing proposals</p>		
<p>If the transport modelling (see Transport Section above) concludes that the widening of Fletton Parkway is required between Jnts 1 and 2, the impacts of this on Orton Pit SSSI/SAC will need to be assessed in the ES and adequately mitigated before planning permission could be granted.</p>	<p>The modelling shows that the widening of FP is already required and thus is a City-wide/Core Strategy issue for PCC.</p> <p>The modelling indicates that in 2011 with consented development, but without Great Haddon the FP between 1 and 2 is at or slightly over theoretical capacity. This is further exacerbated when considering future year scenarios (2026) without the Great Haddon development traffic, but including growth and other development related traffic.</p> <p>Therefore the need for the FP enhancements is demonstrated irrespective of whether Great Haddon comes</p>	<p><b>Priority discussion needed.</b> PCC responsibility – request confirmation of their proposed action.</p>	<p>Yes – Transport and Ecology</p>	

	forward. These works are required to facilitate the growth identified in Peterborough as a whole and not just Great Haddon.			
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
In addition to the above, further information is required in respect of the following:-				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of the proposed surface water drainage strategy on Beeby's Lake;</li> </ul>	Noted. Water level changes have been considered in the ES. Nothing different is proposed (in terms of use) to that already consented for Hampton Development.	PBA/LDA to provide clarification		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of habitats and species have not been adequately surveyed to inform the baseline assessment. These will need to be undertaken to properly inform the ES e.g. Otters, aquatic invertebrate surveys on Stanground Lode and other water courses</li> </ul>	All surveys have been done in line with the agreed Scoping Opinion which was also agreed with NE and EA.	Initial consultation carried out with EA and awaiting further response on survey requests.  PBA/LDA to discuss additional survey requirements with NE/EA and provide if reasonably justified.	Yes – Ecology	
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional information is required in respect of the potential construction/operational effects of the development on species such as otters/bats and breeding birds through noise disturbance etc.</li> </ul>	Noted. The ES does assess noise disturbance impacts on birds. There is very little data on bats and otters and noise. Otters regularly pass beneath very busy roads.	Further clarification will be sought from NE/PCC at topic group and further information provided if required.	Yes - Ecology	
Even with adequate mitigation measures the proposal is likely to have a significant adverse impact upon breeding birds in terms of habitat loss and disturbance. It will be for the LPA to assess this impact and weigh it against all other planning considerations.	Noted and agree.			

<p>To conclude, in NE's view the applications currently fail to comply with the EIA Regulations and would fail an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations because of the impact of the development on Orton Pit SSSI/SAC. This is an issue that must be addressed. As you are aware the Local Planning Authority could not grant planning permission until an Appropriate Assessment had been passed.</p>	<p>Noted. Agree it is vital to ensure the proposal will pass an Appropriate Assessment.</p>	<p>Clarify reasons why application is not compliant with the EIA Regulations and agree key issues for AA..</p>	<p>Yes - Ecology</p>	
--	---	--	----------------------	--

## 8. Landscaping

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
<p>Hunts DC has raised a number of concerns about the proposal, particularly in respect of the nature of the A15 and the set back of development fronting it. It is also concerned that Yaxley should be retained as a village and not become part of the development (the layout currently proposes additional housing in close proximity). The LPA is of the view that the buffer along the southern section of the A15 approaching Yaxley (Tranches OS33, 35 and part of OS27) should be increased and low density housing proposed for the adjoining housing tranches.</p>	<p>We do not propose to increase the 30m set back from the A15. However, we will provide further information to demonstrate this set back and how the density of housing proposed will not have a detrimental effect on the character of the A15.</p>	<p>DLA/LDA to provide additional illustrative material on the A15 frontage.</p>	<p>Yes – Landscape/OS</p>	
<p>The development excludes Two Pond Coppice and Chambers Dole. The proposal is to erect fencing to retain the status quo. This approach is considered inadequate and alternative mitigation measures should be explored. As set out above this woodland is important because of its potential to absorb recreation pressure from Orton Pit SSSI/SAC and the role it can play in developing a site-wide access strategy.</p>	<p>Disagree (see comments under Ecology above).</p> <p>The proposals have been discussed with the woodland owners who have not raised any significant objection.</p> <p>PCC to clarify what additional measures they are seeking based on the fact that these woodlands will remain in third party ownership.</p>		<p>Yes – Landscape/OS</p>	
<p>New community woodland is proposed. This should be relocated adjacent to Jones's Covert to ensure it can play a key role in the mitigation of impacts upon Orton Pit.</p>	<p>Disagree - Relocation of woodland will give rise to greater potential risk of</p>		<p>Yes – Ecology/Landscape/OS</p>	

	unauthorised access to Jones Covert within the SAC and will not allow through routes as part of the overall green infrastructure strategy.			
Trees identified for retention in the submission material will be subject to a condition if planning permission is issued requiring their retention.	Noted and agreed, although suggest that the identified trees are subject to survey and review prior to the relevant phase of development given the long term (20 year) delivery period of this scheme and the relatively poor and declining condition of many trees.			
Further consideration needs to be given to the links from Great Haddon to the wider countryside access networks and neighbouring residential areas, such as the links with Yaxley, Hampton Leys and the Great Fen Project. A composite plan showing Gt Haddon set within its surroundings and showing external links would be helpful.	Such links are indicated in the DFP and other plans for Great Haddon. However, the wider context is already set out in the Green Grid Strategy, thus Great Haddon will link with the wider networks already in place or proposed through the GG Strategy	DLA/LDA to explore with PCC the production of a composite plan which shows Great Haddon in the context of the Green Grid proposals.		

## 9. Open Space

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
The proposal to provide approximately 119 ha of open space is welcomed.	Noted.			
Please see the comment above regarding Two Pond Coppice/Chambers Dole.	Noted.		Yes – Landscape/OS	
Although the overall amount of open space greatly exceeds the requirements of the Local Plan (still the most relevant policy in this respect because the emerging Core Strategy does not set new standards) clarification is sought as to the nature of the space proposed to ensure that there is an adequate range, as set out in Appendix 7 of the Local Plan. The Local Plan specifically excludes structural planting, existing woodland and areas of open water in its open space calculations. Therefore the remainder of the space proposed for Gt Haddon (119 ha) must meet the Local Plan standards. There is no specific mention, either in the submission material or the draft S106 Heads of Terms of play areas, allotments and ball games areas and therefore it is unclear whether the standard can be met. A large proportion of the proposed open space is classed as amenity open space resulting in a significantly reduced area for the other types of open space listed in Appendix 7. Given the lifetime of the development, the LPA agrees that the details of each open space can be fixed as part of the Ecological Management Plans and Development Briefs. However, clarification is sought at this stage that sufficient land has been set aside on the parameter plans to accommodate the range of open space required.	All standards can be met (see Table on page 498 of ES).	DLA to provide explanatory note.	Yes – Landscape/OS	Yes
In addition to the above, specific trigger points will need to be set out in the S106 to ensure that the types of open space are provided at the right time and it is distributed appropriately across the proposed neighbourhoods to suit the needs of the community.	Suggest this will be set out in the Development Brief for each area, and thus location and timing should be conditioned rather than s106			

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
<p>The current proposal includes a piece of open space (Tranche OS25) as an extension to Yaxley cemetery. The results of the ground testing need to be reviewed to establish whether the site is, in principle, suitable. This proposal does not meet the Council's requirements because it will serve Yaxley residents and a S106 contribution in lieu of on site provision will be sought. This will be one of a number of issues that merit cross-border discussion.</p>	<p>PCC to advise on result of ground testing submitted by applicant.</p> <p>The ability to deliver cross-border provision (eg cemetery) is an issue of principle which we have set out from the start of this project, and reflects what happens on the ground in practice in terms of the delivery of services etc. We will resist attempts by PCC and others to ignore the opportunities and realities of cross border provision at its boundary.</p>		<p>Yes – Community/ Health/ Education</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>English Heritage has expressed concern about the inclusion of sports pitches within the landscape buffer to the SAM (please see Archaeology below). The LPA is of the view that if the pitches comprise only a grassed pitch with goal posts and no other development (parking, changing rooms etc.) this will ensure the retention of the setting of the SAM. However, in light of the objection from English Heritage, this issue will need to be discussed further between PCC, EH and the Great Haddon Consortium.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Suggest this can be conditioned.</p>	<p>Yes – Landscape/OS</p>	
<p>English Heritage has also stated that informal pitches in this location would not satisfy the requirements of Sport England in respect of the overall sporting provision required for the site, although it is noted that Sport England has not raised the location of these pitches as a specific issue.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>		<p>Yes – Landscape/OS</p>	

## 10. Archaeology

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
See point above regarding English Heritage's objection to pitches within the buffer zone and pitch provision.	See above.		Yes – Landscape/OS	
Since EH gave its initial pre-application advice a French burial ground has been discovered in the north east corner of the site (Time Team excavation). The full extent of this has not yet been established and it could extend into the buffer zone and the area where the pitches are indicated. Further assessment at this stage is therefore required. I will endeavour to get the Time Team results sent to you so that you can make an informed response to this issue.	PCC to provide results to GHC asap.	Separate meeting between CGMS and PCC/CCC (and possibly EH) to be set up	Yes – Landscape/OS	
English Heritage has also advised that the ES does not provide sufficient detail on the nature of the archaeological assessment carried out to date and that further detail should be provided.	PCC have confirmed EH was sent a copy of the ES Appendices.	CGMS to clarify from EH what additional detail is required.	Yes – Landscape/OS	

## 11. Ground Conditions

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
The site is primarily Greenfield with little previous development. As such it is largely free from contamination. There are some potential 'hotspots' of contamination where remediation will be required. It is considered that this can be dealt with via planning conditions on any permission and as such the submission of further information/clarification is not required at this stage.	Noted.	None.		

## 12. Drainage

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
<p>The Environment Agency (EA) has objected and the LPA supports the issues raised in its objection letter. As the applications are coming forward ahead of the Core Strategy and its associated evidence base the Environment Agency has advised that a Water Cycle Strategy (WCS) and Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) need to be submitted as part of these applications.</p>	<p>In preconsultation/scoping with the EA, they mentioned the SFRA/WCS, acknowledged that PCC were in the process of preparing this and confirmed to us, that in the absence of the SFRA/WSC we should use the Nene Strategic Model (which is what we did) in order to align with the other work being done by PCC.</p> <p>It is the Local Authority's responsibility to undertake the WCS/SFRA.</p>	<p>Respond formally to EA letter(s).</p> <p>Await PCC work – WCS/SFRA [WCS since published].</p> <p>Arrange meeting with EA.</p>	<p>Yes – Surface Water and Drainage</p>	
<p>The Council is currently preparing a Level 2 SFRA and a WCS as part of its evidence base for the Core Strategy. In light of this, the EA has suggested that the developer wait until these strategies are available and use them to inform their proposals. These strategies should be available within 2-3 months. The LPA recognises, however, that applicants have to make submissions based on the most up to date information available at the time.</p>	<p>The applicants' team have fed considerable information into the Council's SFRA and WCS, and thus are aware of the main issues relating to these city-wide studies.</p> <p>However, all surveys and information supplied with the applications are in line with the agreed Scoping Opinion which was also agreed with NE and EA.</p>	<p>It is therefore considered that the applications do not require a WCS or SFRA to allow proper consideration and determination of the applications.</p>	<p>Yes – Surface Water and Drainage</p>	

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
In addition, the Environment Agency has raised the following key points:-				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Flood Risk Assessment does not comply with the requirements set out in Annex E paragraph E3 of Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'.</li> </ul>	We do not have clarification from the EA what elements they think we do not comply with – Annex, para E3 is a long list of requirements. Checking this it would appear the items not covered are Sequential Test and the WCS/SFRA which are the responsibility of the LPA.	Respond formally to EA letter(s). Await PCC work – WCS/SFRA.	Yes – Surface Water and Drainage	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It appears that some development is proposed in flood zones 2 and 3. This needs to be justified and the sequential/exception tests followed as appropriate.</li> </ul>	PBA to check – it is not the intention to build in flood zone.		Yes – Surface Water and Drainage	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Calculations are required to allow verification of the conclusions of the FRA and surface water drainage strategy.</li> </ul>	PBA can extract specific information from the FRA report and summarise for ease of reference.	Extract and summarise information from FRA report.	Yes – Surface Water and Drainage	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration needs to be given to long term management and maintenance. Written confirmation should be provided by Anglian Water and PCC that they are willing to undertake this management and maintenance.</li> </ul>	Noted.		Yes – Surface Water and Drainage	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional information is required in respect of foul drainage to enable an assessment of the acceptability/impact of the proposal. There are capacity issues with the local sewers and Flag Fen Wastewater Treatment Works.</li> </ul>	This difference of opinion between AWS/EA needs to be resolved and we will assist. AWS have confirmed in their response that there is capacity for the development, albeit ultimately reinforcement/improvement works are required at the	If required PBA can prepare an interim design solution to deal with development built in phases until the full STW reinforcement works are complete. The interim solution could be a mixture of maximising any available capacity on the network now	Yes – Surface Water and Drainage	

	STW. A suitable condition should be a satisfactory way of dealing with this matter.	and temporary on site treatment. [This work is currently on hold pending letter from AW to PCC confirming their intention to deliver works required]		
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It has become clear that there are substantial capacity issues with Flag Fen Wastewater Treatment Works. The EA has advised that the actual discharge from Flag Fen may already significantly exceed the EA's consented Dry Weather Flow. There is currently no identified investment plan to bring about appropriate capacity. The Water Framework Directive makes no provision for deterioration in water quality status and PPS23 gives LPAs the authority to refuse planning permission where pollution may arise. Until adequate infrastructure is provided to meet the needs of the development and protect water quality the EA will continue to object to Gt Haddon.</li> </ul>	<p>AWS as the Water Authority are obliged to accommodate this development. They have confirmed that they will have capacity for GH.</p> <p>This difference of opinion between AWS/EA needs to be resolved and we will assist to see this is done.</p>		Yes – Surface Water and Drainage	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solutions, both temporary and permanent, will therefore need to be worked up with the EA and AW to investigate options for providing capacity, and their impacts assessed. The EA has suggested a water company might be able to confirm options in the short term. In addition, once the Council's Water Cycle Strategy is complete, a Waste Water Working Group (WWWG) will be set up to help resolve Flag Fen capacity issues.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. This difference of opinion between AWS/EA needs to be resolved and we will assist to see this is done.</p>	<p>If required PBA can prepare an interim design solution to deal with development built in phases until the full STW reinforcement works are complete. The interim solution could be a mixture of maximising any available capacity on the network now and temporary on site treatment.</p> <p>[This work is currently on hold following emergency meeting between EA/AW and pending letter from AW to PCC confirming their intention to deliver works required]</p>	Yes – Surface Water and Drainage	
If this issue is not adequately resolved there is a question about	Noted. This difference of	See above.	Yes – if issue	

whether planning permission for Gt Haddon should be granted. If a temporary solution is agreed as a way forward then this will need to be implemented before commencement of development on site. This is therefore a key issue that needs resolved as soon as possible and may require a substantial piece of work to be carried out in the immediate future to support the applications. As you are aware, if approval is recommended contrary to EA advice the applications must be referred to the Secretary of State who will decide whether to call them in for his own determination.	opinion between AWS/EA needs to be resolved and we will assist to see this is done.  We understand that AWS/EA recently held an emergency meeting and AWS are preparing a response (solution) to be issued in the next two weeks.	If required, PBA can prepare an interim design solution to deal with development built in phases until the full STW reinforcement works are complete. The interim solution could be a mixture of maximising any available capacity on the network now and temporary on site treatment.	continues.	
--	---	--	------------	--

### 13. Gypsy & Traveller Site

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
The application proposes a site for 5 Gypsy and Traveller pitches. The emerging Core Strategy requires 15 pitches. As such the application fails to comply with policy.	Noted (see third point below).	See below.		
As stated previously, the proposed site is not considered suitable because of its relationship to the existing woodland and areas of habitat creation. Alternative sites within the development area should be put forward. Accompanying the site(s) choice should be an assessment against Government guidelines on pitch selection contained in Circular 1/2006 to show why it is suitable.	This reasoning applies to the vast majority of this site.	DLA will provide an assessment of the proposed site against Circular 1/2006.	Yes – Community? Landscape?	
The LPA will also be willing to discuss with you off site provision and a S106 contribution in lieu of adequate on site provision.	Noted.	Discuss with client group as part of s106 negotiations		Yes

### 14. Retail

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
The application seeks permission for 9200 square metres retail floor space (A1 to A5) in the district centre and 3200 square meters of retail floor space (A1 to A5) in the neighbourhood centres.			If necessary, could form part of	

<p>The Council's Retail Assessment prepared as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy concludes that Great Haddon could support a supermarket of between 1890 and 3780 square metres (net).</p> <p>A Retail Impact Assessment (RIA) has been submitted with the application. It was, however, prepared before the publication of PPS4 in December 2009 although the application was not submitted until this time. In light of the new PPS, which brings a number of changes to how retail proposals are assessed, it is considered that the assessment should be updated.</p>	<p>Agree.</p>	<p>Applicant to update RIA in light of PPS4.</p>	<p>Community, Health, Education Topic Meetings</p>	
<p>At this stage the LPA has concerns about the amount of retail floor space proposed and the potential impact upon other centres including the city centre, the Orton Centre and other local centres. The LPA is of the view that the retail provision should serve the needs of the residents and not cater for a wider catchment area.</p> <p>Further, more detailed, feedback will be issued in respect of the RIA in due course from the Council's retail expert.</p>	<p>The RIA demonstrates that there is no unacceptable impact on other centres. It is recognised, however, that the Great Haddon centre is likely to serve some of the immediately surrounding villages who at present have to travel further afield for services and facilities. This should not be seen as a negative aspect of the proposals.</p>	<p>GHC to await feedback from Drivas Jonas before responding further.</p>		

## 15. Noise

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
<p>Environmental Health has advised that the methodology used to assess the noise implications is acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>			
<p>Additional information/clarification is required in respect of:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How noise from the rifle range has been calculated (further consideration is appropriate in light of the objection received)</li> </ul>	<p>Rifle range was part of the assessment – extracted info can be provided. Not identified as an issue.</p>	<p>Extract info from our work can be provided.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed Combined Heat and Power Plant, given the</li> </ul>	<p>Assessed in the ES. We understood the comment to</p>	<p>PCC to clarify.</p>		

relationship between the district centre and neighbouring housing blocks.	be more in relation to space/layout/landtake?			
Environmental Health has advised that noise should not have any significant impact upon the future layout of the site although development should front key noise sources like the A15 to create a noise barrier.	Noted.			

## 16. Air Quality (Human)

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
Environmental Health has advised that the methodology which has been used to assess air quality is acceptable.	Noted.			
Further information/clarification is required in respect of the following:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of the CHP plant and proposed stack height. This should be shown on the framework plan in order that the conclusions set out in the ES can be reviewed;</li> </ul>	Noted.	We can provide additional information in relation to potential space/layout/landtake if required		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If there are any significant changes to the transport routes i.e. relocation/ removal of the bus gate, the air quality impacts will need to be reviewed</li> </ul>	Noted and agreed.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An assessment of the routes into the city centre to ensure that no Air Quality Action Zones are created will need to be carried out.</li> </ul>	Agreed, we can cross check.			

## 17. Education/Community Facilities

The proposal to provide three primary schools and one secondary school is welcomed. A 'community hub' located as part of the district centre for local services e.g. health, community groups and to provide a community meeting venue is also proposed.

Whilst this is a S106 issue, it is important to note that the provision of high quality community facilities provided early on in the development programme is one of the key priorities for the Council. Detailed discussions/negotiation will need to take place to ensure that this objective is met.

Children's Services has advised that adequate school places should be provided to meet the requirement of the development. Experience at Hampton has shown that there is a high demand for places, both primary and secondary.

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
<i>Primary/Neighbourhood Provision</i>				
The provision of three 2 form of entry primary schools including early years provision is in principle acceptable but open space should be included around these to allow for possible expansion if required. The parameter plan indicates open space adjacent to two of the school sites which should allow sufficient expansion. The impact this will have on the framework plan needs to be explored.	Our education assessment work indicates that further expansion is not required to meet the long term needs of the development. However, we are willing to discuss ways in which future flexibility can be built into the proposals provided that there is no added cost to the applicants.	Further discussion required.		Yes
The Neighbourhood Officer and the PCT have advised that some community provision should be provided adjacent to the primary schools/two local centres. This is likely to comprise office space which could be shared and used for outreach functions, and a meeting room. Sufficient land should be made available at this stage and shown on the Framework Plan. It is noted that the land use budget sets aside space for community uses within the local centres. This will need to be secured through the S106 discussions.	Community provision is provided within each neighbourhood centre (see land use budget).	Timing and provision to be negotiated through s106.		Yes

<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
<i>Secondary/District Provision</i>				
The proposal comprises an 8.97 hectare site for a secondary school which would accommodate 8 forms of entry and a sixth form. Children's Services have raised concerns about the adequacy of this provision (it would not allow surplus accommodation), particularly in terms of land take, given their experience with Hampton.	Our education assessment work indicates that further expansion is not required to meet the long term needs of the development. However, we are willing to discuss ways in which future flexibility can be built into the proposals provided that there is no added cost to the applicants.			Yes
Children's Services are also reviewing the requirement for special school provision on the site. An update on this will be given as soon as possible.		Await update from PCC before responding further.		
Cultural Services has advised that the scheme should include provision for a four court sports hall and a 40 station gym (in addition to any school provision).	Noted. Some evidence of the requirement/details of the gym provision would be helpful?	Further discussion required.		
Neighbourhood Services are seeking the provision of community space in terms of offices and meeting places/community hall.	Proposed in DFP and land use budget.	Further discussion required.		Yes
Cultural Services and Neighbourhood Services have advised that it would be appropriate to co-locate community facilities with the secondary school in the interests of efficient management and running costs. It is envisaged at this stage that the four court sports hall would form part of the school buildings but the gym and community hall/office space would be adjacent buildings.		Further discussion required.		Yes
It is not considered that the above requirements could be accommodated within the land take (8.97 ha) indicated. Therefore it is requested that the parcel of land adjoining the secondary school site currently allocated for residential development (Tranche R23), is incorporated into the school site and used to provide the main		Further discussion required.		Yes

community facilities for the development. This would allow a potential land swap with the current proposal to provide a community hub on Tranche CU1.				
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
In addition to the above requirements, PCC Education has requested that open space should be located adjacent to the secondary school site to allow for additional future expansion if shown to be necessary. This issue will need to be explored with you in more detail as clearly it will impact on land take and the Framework Plan.	The location of the secondary school relative to the District Centre, Town Common and community facilities has been carefully thought out and designed.  Our education assessment work indicates that further expansion is not required to meet the long term needs of the development.	The applicants are not therefore willing to reserve any additional land for possible future expansion.		Yes
Cambridgeshire County Council has requested a larger secondary school site to accommodate children from Yaxley. This issue will also need to be explored with you.	This does not meet the terms of the s106 Circular tests in terms of meeting the needs of the development.  In pre-applications discussions we were advised that as all Hunts children from the local area had secondary school places, CCC had no reason or inclination to allocate funds to a Great Haddon school.	The applicants are not therefore willing to reserve any additional land for possible future expansion.		Yes
The County has also raised the issue of a new or enhanced library serving Gt Haddon and Yaxley. The Joint Service Centre (JSC) will provide new library facilities which will cater for Hampton and Gt Haddon residents, so this is an issue that will require further discussion.	Await PCC view on the appropriateness of this request, given PCC's stance on other cross border facilities (eg cemetery provision).			Yes.
Overall, it is considered that partnership working between authorities to achieve optimum service provision will be necessary.	Agree strongly, and would urge the authorities to prioritise			

	their cross border activities.			
--	--------------------------------	--	--	--

## 18. Energy

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
An Energy Strategy has been submitted with the applications. This looks into a number of solutions for energy supply and increasing efficiency, which is welcomed.				
In accordance with the steer from the Cabinet Policy Forum in January 2010, Members have asked the LPA to pursue a Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 across the development area in relation to the fabric of any future homes that are built. This is to prevent improvement work in the future needing to be carried out to improve efficiency. You will therefore be required to clearly set out in additional submission material how this will be achieved. The cost of doing that will be picked up in the S106 discussions.	<p>If a commitment is to be made to achieving Code Level 4 for all of Great Haddon, this will be set out in the s106 and will therefore be a requirement for all subsequent REM applications.</p> <p>it is therefore not necessary at outline application stage to set out how this will be achieved, especially as this is likely to vary from phase to phase over the years of the development to 2016.</p>		Yes - Sustainability	Yes
In the wider sense, the LPA is seeking this development to make a significant contribution to the city's environmental capital aspirations in accordance with policies CS9 and CS10 of the emerging Core Strategy, which may mean that, overall, Gt Haddon achieves higher standards than that required by Code 4. The LPA recognises that there needs to be a degree of flexibility in the proposals put forward for renewable energy and energy efficiency, because of the lifetime of the development and advancing technologies. However, the actual commitments at this stage do not appear strong and a lot of the proposals would fall to third party house builders to deliver. Clarification is therefore required in respect of what is being offered by the applicants at this stage.	See comments above. The draft Sustainability Statement sets out the package of measures which are feasible at Great Haddon and from which those responsible for implementing the scheme are likely to select in order to deliver the Code Level required.	A final Sustainability Statement will be prepared and submitted for Great Haddon once the s106 negotiations have concluded. This will set out the commitment to the sustainability targets made for Great Haddon.	Yes - Sustainability	Yes
It is understood that a gas fired Combined Heat and Power Plant (CHP) in the district centre is proposed. No details of this have	The Energy Strategy gives details relating to the CHP, its	We can give more information in relation to		

however been provided as part of the applications. It is not shown on the framework plan. Further assessment is required to ensure that it could actually be delivered and to clarify whether there are any associated land use implications i.e. on the form of the district centre or its relationship to adjacent residential areas.	<p>general size, output, phasing, budget costs, CO2 savings, etc.</p> <p>The energy infrastructure will to be subject to a separate detailed application and further detailed design when the scheme is progressed in more detail and the thermal loadings are better understood, as well as agreeing a definitive phasing plan. The energy strategy is an overarching document produced in support of the outline application, to show what is feasible and what can be achieved.</p>	space/layout/landtake for the CHP if required?		
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
There are also a number of inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the report e.g. it relies on different phasing information from that set out in the Planning Statement and assumes a different percentage of affordable housing (30%). These need to be addressed as they impact on the predicted CO2 savings. Furthermore it is not clear how the savings have been calculated.	The energy work was completed based on the information available at that time – the scheme proposals did change slightly thereafter and this was acknowledged in the report. As the change was negligible, it does not change the strategy.	Not proposing any further work. Will be covered at the detailed design after outline planning stage. We do need to have an agreed phasing.		

## 19. Sustainability

<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
The draft Sustainability Strategy, similar to the Energy Strategy, sets out a range of options/targets, which will help achieve a more sustainable development. The LPA agrees that environmental sustainability is best achieved by pursuing a range of options and	Agreed.		Yes – session with PCC and potentially also Atlas to be	yes

setting overall targets and that being too prescriptive early on would be counter productive.			programmed.	
<p>Nethertheless, the proposals are not very bold or visionary and it is unclear what firm commitments are being made at this stage.</p> <p>Overall, the proposals need to be firmed up and innovative measures put forward. Clarity should be provided around what is being proposed and when, and who will be responsible for its delivery.</p>	<p>Perhaps PCC could make reference to another UK project of this scale where more “bold and visionary” proposals have been put forward at outline application stage?</p> <p>See comments regarding commitments in Energy section above.</p> <p>Linked also to S106 requirements and negotiations.</p>	Final Sustainability Strategy will be issued once s106 negotiations are finalised.		yes

## 20. Householder Recycling Centre

PCC Comment	GHC Response	Action	Discuss as part of topic group	S106 issue?
<p>The developer is proposing a site of between 1 and 1.5 hectares for a Householder Recycling Centre. The Council’s Waste Management Section is seeking a site of 2.5 hectares, although one that is fully serviced with drainage and landscaping would mean that less than 2.5 hectares would be required.</p> <p>The city currently has one HRC at Dogsthorpe which is leased. Dogsthorpe is being used well in excess of its design capacity (designed for 14,000 tonnes and received 27,000 last year) and is not a long term option for the Council. The Council has resolved to provide 2 HRCs for the city, one to the north to replace Dogsthorpe and one to the south to cater for the new growth. This is set out in the Council’s Long Term Waste Strategy which has been approved by Cabinet. This is a key priority for the Council.</p> <p>A further corporate/political steer will be taken to ascertain what priority should be given to this facility when weighed against other</p>	Noted. Await further response for PCC.			Yes.

S106 requests.				
----------------	--	--	--	--

## **21. Urban Design/Layout**

<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
<p>As set out in the Transport Section, it is requested that you explore the option of providing a single carriageway road through the development in place of the central boulevard. The impact of this on the overall layout will need to be explored.</p> <p>Should it be decided that the road should be retained as a dual carriageway, the developer will need to provide sufficient detail to demonstrate that the boulevard does not sever the development and that on street car parking and access arrangements for adjoining housing tranches will work. An illustrative cross-section has been submitted but this is not dimensioned or supported by other material or examples so the nature of the route is still unclear.</p>	<p>As explained at our meeting, capacity requirements for the central boulevard mean that a single carriageway option is not feasible.</p>	<p>DLA/PBA to provide additional detail for the central boulevard as requested.</p>		
<p>Given Inspire East's comments and the comments raised in terms of the co-location of facilities around the secondary school, it seems logical to relocate the frontage of the district centre onto the central boulevard and develop DC3 and DC6 as a housing tranche which could then front on to a housing development on Tranche CU1.</p>	<p>We do not propose to make changes to the DFP at this stage along the lines suggested, as the design and co-location of uses has been carefully considered in the master planning of the new community.</p> <p>However, we are happy to explore the locational issues you raise further as part of the Design Review session.</p>	<p>This can be discussed further at the Inspire East Design Review on 12 May 2010.</p>		
<p>Please provide additional details to demonstrate that the district centre could work in the form indicated, given the proposals for a supermarket with associated car parking and a CHP plant. The LPA also queries the desirability of the proposed phasing concept for the district centre by anchoring key users at either end and infilling at a later stage.</p>		<p>DLA to provide additional illustrative material regarding the district centre as requested.</p> <p>The phasing issue raised can be discussed further at the</p>		

<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
It is unclear how the 'Town Square' within the district centre will work and whether, given its scale, will provide a successful and safe focal point/meeting place for pedestrians given the proposal to route buses through it.		<p>Inspire East Design Review on 12 May 2010.</p> <p>DLA/PBA to provide additional illustrative material regarding the Town Square/bus route as requested.</p> <p>This can also be discussed further at the Inspire East Design Review on 12 May 2010.</p>		
Overall, more detailed analysis of the district centre setting out how it will work in practice is required.	<p>Other than the specific queries set out above, it is considered that the level of detail set out in the DAS is appropriate for consideration of an outline application.</p> <p>Further detail will come forward as part of the Development Brief for the district centre should outline consent be granted.</p>			
The LPA considers that the Framework Plan should be amended to allow for greater separation between housing tranches and the A15	<p>See comments under section 8 above.</p> <p>We do not propose to increase the 30m set back from the A15. However, we will provide further information to demonstrate this set back and how the density of housing proposed will not have a detrimental effect on the character of the A15.</p>	DLA/LDA to provide additional illustrative material on the A15 frontage.	Yes – Landscape/OS	
Given the concerns expressed by Hunts DC and Yaxley residents	Disagree. Our master	This can be discussed further		

over the coalescence of Yaxley with Gt Haddon, the LPA is of the view that housing tranches R36 and 37 should either be removed from the current location and relocated or repositioned so they form development tranches which front onto the 'bypass' road, similar to Tranche R20.	planning approach to the relationship with Yaxley was supported by the Inspire East Design Review Panel, and there are important master planning and Secured by Design reasons for the current layout.	at the Inspire East Design Review on 12 May 2010.		
<b>PCC Comment</b>	<b>GHC Response</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Discuss as part of topic group</b>	<b>S106 issue?</b>
As set out above, please reallocate Tranche R23 from residential to community/school use. In turn, this could allow Tranche CU1 to be changed from community to housing.	See comments above.			
Pedestrian/cycle access to and from Yaxley via the Town Common is not legible and should be set out more clearly, perhaps through the use of more detailed illustrations. The Yaxley 'bypass' separates the town common and it needs to be set out how safe and convenient access to and from the development across the 'bypass' and Town Common can be achieved.	Agree.	DLA/PBA to provide further illustrative material in this regard.  This can be discussed further at the Inspire East Design Review on 12 May 2010.		

## PCC Conclusions

There are a number of key planning issues which will need to be resolved before the applications could be determined. These issues relate to the key infrastructure requirements of the development i.e. highways, drainage, community facilities and to its ecological impacts, particularly in respect of Orton Pit SSSI/SAC.

A substantial amount of clarification, additional information and discussion will need to take place to enable further progress.

## GHC Response

Given the number of comments made and the need to move forward with discussions in a meaningful and ordered manner to ensure all aspects of each issue (and interrelated issues) are adequately discussed, we have agreed with PCC to set up a series of Topic Group meetings, the agenda for which will be based around the issues raised in sections 5 to 21 above.

At present, the following Topic Groups are envisaged:

Group	Required Attendees – LPA/Consultees (Possible Attendees)	Attendees – Applicants’ Team (Possible Attendees)
<b>Transport</b> <b>Individual meetings (as necessary) with key stakeholders first and then a combined topic group meeting.</b>	PCC Planning/Delivery Manager PCC Highways PCC Passenger Transport Highways Agency HDC Highways CCC Highways Atkins? AECOM	David Lock Associates (DLA) Peter Brett Associates (PBA)
<b>Ecology</b>	PCC Planning/Delivery Manager PCC Wildlife Officer Natural England (Environment Agency) (O&H Hampton as SAC Reserve Managers)	David Lock Associates (DLA) LDA Design – Landscape (LDA) LDA Design – Ecology (LDA/BSG)
<b>Landscape, Open Space and Archaeology *</b> * suggest separate initial meeting on Archaeology with EH, PCC Archaeology and CCC to discuss matters of	PCC Planning/Delivery Manager PCC Rights of Way Officer PCC Landscape/Environment Officer HDC Landscape Officer	David Lock Associates (DLA) LDA Design – Landscape (LDA) CGMS Archaeology (CGMS)

principle raised in consultation response. If wider issues raised which relate to landscape, then include in Topic Group	(PCC Policy Officer) (PCC Archaeology)	(Peter Brett Associates (PBA))
<b>Flooding, Surface Water and Drainage</b>	PCC Planning/Delivery Manager PCC Wildlife Officer Environment Agency  (PCC Policy Officer) (Anglian Water)	David Lock Associates (DLA) Peter Brett Associates (PBA) LDA Design – Landscape (LDA) LDA Design – Ecology (BSG)
<b>Community, Health, Education **</b>  ** It is envisaged that this topic group will discuss those issues relating to the location of provision and master planning of these elements. Level and delivery of provision will take part as part of the s106 discussions	PCC Planning/Delivery Manager PCC Neighbourhood Services PCC Cultural Services CCC Education	David Lock Associates (DLA) EFM Limited (Education) (EFM)
<b>Sustainability ***</b>  *** It is envisaged that this topic group will discuss those issues relating to the strategy, location of provision and master planning of these elements. Level and delivery mechanisms for provision will take part as part of the s106 discussions	PCC Planning/Delivery Manager PCC Policy Officer  Others?	David Lock Associates (DLA) Peter Brett Associates (PBA) LDA Design – Landscape (LDA)

Appendix 1 – PCC summary of representations and consultation responses (internal and external)

Representations - Public

To date some 494 individual letters of representation have been received. The majority have been submitted by residents of Yaxley.

1 letter expresses support for the application the others raise the following concerns/issues and objections:-

- Against the principle of development/loss of farmland - brownfield sites should be used first
- Visual impact.
- Yaxley will cease to be a village.
- An adequate buffer between the two villages should be provided
- Question need for additional commercial development
- Question the proposed number of jobs specified.
- Object to the proposed bus gate north of Yaxley- convenience, time, additional CO2 emissions, bus services along the A15 are infrequent
- Proposal does not deliver a Yaxley Bypass
- Additional traffic impacts and highway safety concerns
- A15 at Norman Cross will not be able to accommodate additional traffic
- Proximity of the school site to the A15 – will safe routes be provided?
- Traffic impacts on Farcet (people will cut through Farcet rather than use the bypass road)
- Changes to the Great North Road, especially new junctions and link to employment area (and the Parkway beyond), in terms of highway safety and amenity impacts
- Impact on Haddon and other surrounding villages in terms of additional traffic and highway safety
- Loss of natural habitat, impact on species
- Need to ensure sufficient provision for education
- Need to ensure sufficient provision for health care
- Object to inclusion of provision for gypsy/travellers. Site location has not been adequately assessed (under Circular 1/2006)
- Proposal is not visionary in terms of its sustainability proposals
- Lack of consultation
- Houses likely to be of a poor quality
- Noise/smells from the proposed householder recycling centre
- Loss of property value
- Hampton is not yet finished, many commitments outstanding. Permission should not be given until it is
- Impact on existing business particularly the petrol filling station at Yaxley
- Additional noise, dirt and pollution

The majority of Yaxley residents who have commented on the application have objected to the proposed bus gate north of the village.

In addition two petitions have been submitted. One has 73 signatures and objects to the proposed gypsy and traveller site. Haddon residents are objecting to its proposed location.

The other comprises a letter with two questions. This first question asks people if they agree with the principle of development and the other whether they support the proposed bus gate. 1286 people have objected to the principle of development and 1310 to the bus gate.

A "facebook" internet campaign has also been set up against the proposed bus gate. This has over 900 members.

*Cambridge Shooting Association*- Shooting range lies on the south side of the A15. Concerned about noise impacts on the new development, safety and security. The association is of the view that residential development should not be permitted within 1 mile of the range.

*DPP on behalf of Tesco at Serpentine Green*- The amount of retail floor space proposed is more than required to meet local needs to Gt Haddon residents. Additional demand should be provided for by existing centres.

*Anglia Regional Co-operative Society* on behalf of the Co-operative food store in Yaxley.

Objection based upon transport and infrastructure grounds. Require clarity/understanding of the traffic rerouting which might have implications for servicing their Food Store in Yaxley. As soon as some clarity can be provided on this they have confirmed that their objection will be withdrawn.

*Gateway Partnership (Alwalton Hill)* - The application should not be determined until agreement has been reached by themselves, O & H and PCC regarding access to the site.

*Peterborough Friends of the Earth*- Scheme is poorly considered in terms of its green objectives; there is an over-reliance on the S106 to deliver. Contrary to the transport hierarchy. Public transport provision is insufficient, as are walking/cycling links. Too little affordable housing proposed (15%); concern about potential ecological impacts including impact on the central woodland which is out side of the application site.

#### *Councillor*

Response received from Councillor Seaton:

- Need to avoid making the mistakes of Hampton
- Community infrastructure needs to be delivered as required and be adequate
- Need to ensure buffer to the SSSI is adequate

Councillor Scott has orally expressed concerns about the proposed Central Boulevard/Western Peripheral Road (WPR) running through the development. An article has also appeared in the Peterborough Evening Telegraph setting out her view.

#### *Consultations - Internal*

*Access Officer*- Levels/location of dwelling should enable level access (not exceeding 1 in 15 or steeper).

*Archaeology*- Recommends further assessment prior to determination. This could result in the need for an expansion of the buffer zone to the SAM. Supports the exclusion of pitches from this buffer zone (see English Heritage response).

*Community Protection Team (Environmental Health)* - Conclusions of ground conditions assessment noted. Conditions recommended. Further consideration should be given to potential noise implications. Further clarification is required in respect of air quality. A Code of Practice to ensure adequate control during the construction period is recommended.

*Drainage* - No comments received to date. Comments will be made as soon as possible.

*Education* - Adequate provision is required to meet the needs arising from the development. Need to ensure that the allocated sites are of sufficient size with room for expansion. There is a shortfall in provision at Hampton.

*Neighbourhood Officer* – Community facilities (office space) should be co-located with each neighbourhood centre and a larger community facility/hall should be co-located with the secondary school and other community facilities.

*Culture and Leisure* – Main facilities should be co-located with the secondary school and include a 40 station gym and a four court sports hall. Swimming pool provision is not requested but a financial contribution towards an off-site swimming pool is likely to be made through the S106 negotiations.

*PCT* - Main facilities are due to be provided within the Joint Service Centre (JSC) at Hampton. Outreach facilities only are required in Gt Haddon. If the JSC does not provide sufficient PCT facilities, then more extensive facilities may be required at Gt Haddon.

*Landscape Officer* - Additional information required to enable further detailed comment. A Woodland Management plan needs to be provided. Re-positioning of the community woodland should be explored.

*Landscape Architect* - Well considered proposal, some points of detail need further consideration.

*Natural Networks* - Concerned about the exclusion of Chambers Dole Woodland from the application and potential adverse impacts on Orton Pit SAC through additional recreational pressure. Recommend that the Green Wheel stays on its current alignment. Insufficient detail has been provided to show how Great Haddon would connect to Beeby's Country Park and the Great Fen area.

*Rights of Way Officer* - Concerned by the proposal to divert the Green Wheel and the design of the proposed underpass. Diversion of bridle way 1 needs to be discussed further to ensure that its historic integrity is protected.

*Transport and Engineering* - Modelling work being assessed, additional feedback to follow. The off-site highway works for Alwalton Hill cannot be relied on. The Council has no proposals to widen junctions 1-2 of Fletton Parkway. Measures are not sufficiently robust to ensure modal shift. Would support the inclusion of a Park and Ride within the northern part of the development. Not all homes would be within 400 metres of a bus stop.

*Waste Management* - Site for the HRC is smaller than requested. Need to ensure sufficient size.

*Wildlife Officer* - Objects to the application. Considers the EIA to be inadequate in a number of areas including in relation to the potential impacts on Orton Pit SAC/SSSI. As such of the view that the application would fail a Habitat Regulations Assessment.

#### Consultations - External

*Anglian Water*- Has assets close to or crossing the site. The development could not be supported from the current supply network which does not have capacity. Foul drainage can be accommodated within the existing system.

*British Horse Society*- Concerned that proposal would not assist the development of the Green Wheel. Any underpass should permit the public to traverse the road without having to dismount (approximately 14ft clearance height). Crossing should be light controlled and of sufficient width to avoid conflict with other road users.

*Cambridge County Council (CCC)* – Report is being presented to Growth and Env. Policy Development Group to inform a Cabinet Meeting on 27 April. Final response to be issued after 27 April Cabinet Meeting. CCC is concerned about traffic impact on the County Council's road network; considers that a strategic plan for education is needed and requests a larger secondary school site to cater for children from Yaxley; requests that connections from the development into the wider countryside should be clarified. Overall it requires further partnership working to achieve optimum service provision. It is also concerned about the lack of integration between the employment area and the core development area.

Detailed comments on the Transport Assessment in the form of a separate note are still to be issued.

*CPRE Cambridge & Peterborough*- Object to the development of this Greenfield site when it has not yet been accepted in the Core Strategy. Brownfield land should be developed before Greenfield.

*East of England Regional Assembly*- Proposal appears to be broadly in accordance with Regional policy. Some concern about potential impacts of car journeys and impact upon Orton Pit SAC.

*English Heritage* - Notwithstanding pre-application advice, concerned about potential impact upon the Scheduled Ancient Monument from the inclusion of sports pitches within the buffer zone. The ES does not provide sufficient detail on the amount of archaeological assessment that has been undertaken.

*Environmental Agency*- Object to the application. A significant amount of further information is required to address strategic issues to demonstrate that the site can be adequately drained and that there is no adverse impact from flooding.

*Environmental Capital Partnership (ECP)* - Pleased to see the visions/aims but concerned too many are conditional. Over reliance on the S106 to deliver the aim in the Sustainability Statement. Should learn lessons from Hampton and take opportunities to hard wire and have a more sustainable transport strategy.

*Farset Parish Council*-Strongly object to the closing of the A15 to through traffic as this would direct traffic through Farset.

*Government Office for the East of England (Go East)*- No comments as the applications may come before the SoS for consideration.

*Hampton Parish Council Steering Group* - No comments received.

*Highways Agency*- Holding objection pending consideration of modelling information. Clarification required in respect of a number of the assumptions made. Cannot treat Alwalton Hill as committed development. Travel Plan required for more than 5 years given the timescale of the development.

*Huntingdonshire District Council*- Concerned about impact of development on Yaxley (should be retained as a village) and the setting of the A15. This should remain a rural road. Transport impacts being considered further, concerned about the proposed bus gate. It would be beneficial if Yaxley children could attend Gt Haddon schools, need to link to Gt Fen project, need to avoid adverse impact on retail facilities in Yaxley.

*Natural England* - Object to the applications. Concerned about impact of the development on Orton Pit SSSI/SAC.

*Middle Level Commissioners*- It is noted that the proposal would provide sustainable water level/flood risk management systems. It should not, therefore, detrimentally affect the Commissioners' system.

*Peterborough Civic Society*- The master plan is well considered but further thought needs to be given to the 'place' which would be created to give it a distinct identity. Agree with the Design Review Panel's comments regarding the orientation of the district centre. Disappointed that the scheme does not include a Park and Ride. Links to other areas/settlements are also poor. Concerned by the affordable housing offer (15%). Need to ensure adequate social facilities including community use of schools and a place for worship. Disappointed that the energy proposals are not clearer/firmer.

*Peterborough Environment City Trust (PECT)*- Although some positive aspects, too many proposals are listed as being 'subject to S106 negotiation', ambiguous terms are also used. A preferred option for renewable energy should be identified as soon as possible. CHP should be a requirement. Making best use of existing infrastructure means business as usual, cycle links are poor. The privately owned woodland should be made publically accessible.

*Peterborough Local Access Forum*- Priority appears to have been given to the car. There is a lack of pedestrian/cycleway connections with Hampton. Concern that the Green Wheel should stay on its current alignment. Any realignment of bridleway 1 (employment site) should protect its historic integrity.

*Police Architect Liaison Officer* - No objections in principle. Further consideration needs to be given to how crime will be designed out of the development.

*Peterborough Play Partnership* - Play spaces need to be designed into the development not bolted on.

*Stilton Parish Council* - Question loss of agricultural land, the need for three schools and the provision of a park and ride. Adequate health facilities should be provided.

*Sport England* - Appears to be a slight shortfall in provision in outdoor playing fields (based on Local Plan standards) but the intention to provide two synthetic pitches would address. All pitches would need to be adequately served by ancillary facilities. Development would generate demand for indoor community facilities such as sports halls (4 courts) and swimming (0.63 of a pool).

*Yaxley Parish Council* - conclude that the proposal would not deliver a bypass of Yaxley as required by the original S106 agreement for the Hampton development. Suggest that the Western Peripheral Road is downgraded and money put back into a bypass for Yaxley. Wish to see a more robust landscaping scheme to protect Yaxley and preserve existing views. Discussion needed to ensure shared access to community facilities and schools. Community health facilities should be put in place at an early stage to provide an integrated cross boundary local health service. Overall, consider the current application should be refused.

*Wildlife Trust* - Concerned about the proposal to fence Chamber's Dole, Two Pond Coppice and leave it unmanaged. An appropriate access strategy is required.



