

**GREAT HADDON PLANNING APPLICATIONS – DRAFT COUNTY COUNCIL
RESPONSE**

To: Cabinet

Date: 16th November 2010

From: Acting Executive Director: Environment Services

Electoral division(s): The planning applications are within Peterborough but adjacent to Norman Cross Electoral Division, Cambridgeshire.

Forward Plan ref: Not applicable **Key decision:** No

Purpose: To inform Cabinet of the Great Haddon planning applications in Peterborough and make Cabinet aware of their potential impacts on villages within Cambridgeshire.

Recommendation: Cabinet is invited to:

- a) consider and agree the draft consultation response as set out in Appendix A, for the development at Great Haddon; and
- b) Delegate to the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning in consultation with the Acting Executive Director, Environment Services, the authority to make any minor changes to the draft consultation response.

<i>Officer contact:</i>	<i>Member contact</i>
Name: Joseph Whelan Post: Head of New Communities Email: Joseph.whelan@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Tel: (01223) 699867	Name: Cllr Roy Pegram Portfolio: Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning Email: Roy.pegram@cambridgeshire.gov.uk Tel: (01223) 699173

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Great Haddon is a proposed development for up to 5,350 new homes and 65 hectares of employment land to the south west of Peterborough. It lies on the border with Cambridgeshire near the village of Yaxley. The housing proposed for the south of the development adjoins the A15 which is a highway the County Council has responsibility for. The promoter, David Lock Associates, is working on behalf of a joint venture between O&H Properties, Marlborough Group and Barrett Strategic.

- 1.2 Two outline planning applications have been submitted for Great Haddon:

09/01368/OUT (Residential Application) consists of:

- Up to 5,350 dwellings
- Household Waste Recycling Centre
- District Centre (including Supermarket)
- 3 Primary Schools and 1 Secondary School
- Sport and recreation facilities
- 5 Traveller Pitches
- Associated highway infrastructure

09/01369/OUT (Employment Land Application) consists of:

- 65 hectares of employment land
- Associated highways infrastructure

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 The outline planning applications were submitted to Peterborough City Council in December 2009.
- 2.2 Great Haddon is currently not part of the Peterborough Local Plan, but is included as part of their submitted Core Strategy. Therefore, in the view of Peterborough Officers, the principle of development is supported, but at present, there is no adopted policy to help promote Great Haddon. The public examination for the Peterborough Core Strategy was held between 28th September 2010 and 15th October 2010. The County Council was represented in relation to a number of matters that relate to development and its impact on Cambridgeshire. The Inspector's Report is not expected until next year. Peterborough City Council is therefore keen to wait for the adoption of their Core Strategy before they consider determining the applications.
- 2.3 County Officers have a number of significant concerns with the applications which have been discussed with Peterborough Officers. However, a formal Cabinet endorsed response has not yet been submitted.
- 2.4 The following sections of this report sets down the key areas of concern the County Council has with the applications and Appendix A contains the proposed consultation response.

Transport

- 2.5 The applications are considered to be unclear and there are serious concerns about some elements of the transport proposals. The Highways Agency has imposed an

Article 14 Holding Direction on both applications which means that the Planning Authority cannot determine the applications until these Directions are removed. The County Council also has a holding objection on both applications. It is recommended that the objection is maintained until transport matters affecting the County's highway network have been satisfactorily addressed.

Countryside Access/Rights of Way

- 2.6 It is considered that the Great Haddon development proposals need to identify connections from the development into the wider countryside access networks and the Great Fen area (mostly in Cambridgeshire). This has not happened, and therefore it is recommended that the County Council objects to the residential application until appropriate provision for countryside access is identified.

Library and Lifelong Learning

- 2.7 The Great Haddon applications provide very little detail of how library and lifelong learning service provision will be met for the new residents. If no provision is going to be made, given the proximity of Yaxley Library, the County Council is concerned about Great Haddon residents placing significant pressures on this facility. Until details emerge about how the developer plans to make provision for libraries and lifelong learning, it is recommended that the County Council objects to the residential application.

Archaeology

- 2.8 The County Council has some comments for Peterborough City Council to consider, but no significant concerns. It is therefore recommended that no objections should be made.

Education

- 2.9 It is recommended that the County Council should not lodge an objection to the residential application on education grounds although there are some significant concerns about its impact. Therefore, education comments within Appendix A are limited. The reasoning for this proposed position is described in the remainder of this section.

Existing Catchment of Stanground College

- 2.11 At present, almost 50% of secondary school aged children living in Yaxley and Farcet attend Stanground College, Peterborough, as it is the designated catchment school. Peterborough City Council receives Government education formulaic funding on an annual basis for the Cambridgeshire children educated at Stanground College. Children from Yaxley and Farcet are entitled to free transport to Stanground College on the grounds of road safety. The transport costs are borne by the County Council.

Impact of Great Haddon Proposals

- 2.12 For children living in Yaxley, a new secondary school in Great Haddon would be closer to them than Stanground College and it would be within walking and cycling distance. Therefore, logically, it would make sense for the children to attend their nearest secondary school.

- 2.13 However, under planning legislation, the Great Haddon developers are required only to provide a school which will be large enough to serve their development and not the wider local need. County Education Officers have requested that the new secondary site is made large enough to accommodate children living in Yaxley, but given the current legal position, this is not a formal objection that can be made although Peterborough City Council Officers are aware of this request.
- 2.14 It is therefore recommended that the County Council should not object to the application on education grounds. However as part of this consultation response, the County Council is formally requesting that the site (land parcel) for new secondary school at Great Haddon should be made large enough to allow it to provide accommodation to cater for children living in Yaxley, who would otherwise attend Stanground College should provision be possible.

Work on Secondary School Pressures within Peterborough

- 2.15 This position is driven by the growth that is projected in Peterborough, and as a result, County Officers are concerned that Cambridgeshire children may be denied school places at Stanground College which will have increased numbers of children in its catchment who live in Peterborough. Therefore, outside of the Great Haddon application, County Officers have been working closely with Peterborough Officers through the summer to agree to a wider study of demographic projections and to consider education provision across Peterborough. Discussions between Members from both authorities have also taken place and these continue.
- 2.16 In response to a request from local Members, County Officers have begun work on an options appraisal for securing provision for these children for the medium and long-term. Pending the outcome of this work, Stanground College will remain the designated catchment school for Yaxley and Farcet. Although not part of the formal consultation response, Cabinet is also asked to agree that the letter enclosing the formal consultation response sets out in the strongest terms the County Council's frustration that the secondary school at Great Haddon cannot be developed in a more flexible manner and that as a result, children may not be able to attend the most appropriate secondary school. Further discussions on this issue are taking place with Peterborough City

3. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

Resources and Performance

- 3.1 There are significant implications for the County Council in relation to highways which may result in 'rat-running' on the local roads near Yaxley and congestion as a result of poor junction design etc, all of which would potentially mean additional highway maintenance costs for the County Council. The County Council has a holding objection on both applications and will not remove this until it is satisfied that all of the transport and highway concerns it has raised, have been adequately addressed.
- 3.2 Cabinet Members are also asked to note the resources implication in terms of Yaxley children continuing to be bussed to Stanground, but also the potential cost of seeking to acquire land at Great Haddon in order to build a larger secondary school.
- 3.3 There is also a possibility that this application may end up at appeal. The costs of representation at a Planning Inquiry will need to be funded by the County Council.

Statutory Requirements and Partnership Working

- 3.4 Relevant to Great Haddon, the County Council has statutory responsibilities for highway maintenance, Education and Libraries. The applications currently threaten the ability of the County Council to ensure its statutory duties are carried through, particularly in terms of highways and libraries. Therefore the report recommends that the County Council objects.
- 3.5 The County Council has been working closely with Peterborough City Council and Huntingdonshire District Council in relation to this application. Further work between County Officers and Peterborough Officers on secondary education is necessary in order to establish the medium to long-term requirements of secondary school aged children living in the Cambridgeshire villages of Yaxley, Farcet and Elton.

Climate Change

- 3.6 There are no significant implications in this section.

Access and Inclusion

- 3.7 There are no significant implications in this section.

Engagement and Consultation

- 3.8 Lead and Local Members have been briefed on this application. A paper has been presented to Growth and Environment PDG Members discussed the applications in March 2010.

Source Documents	Location
Great Haddon Planning Applications	New Communities, 2 nd Floor A Wing, Castle Court

APPENDIX 1

Great Haddon Applications – Draft Consultation Response

Proposal: An urban extension comprising up to 5350 residential dwellings with a district centre, two neighbourhood centres, provision for education facilities, sport and recreational facilities, 5 gypsy and traveller pitches, strategic open space, cemetery provision and associated infrastructure (09/01368/OUT), and:

Up to 65 ha of employment land and associated infrastructure (09/01369/OUT)

Location: LAND TO THE NORTH OF NORMAN CROSS, EAST OF A1(M) AND WEST OF A15 LONDON ROAD, PETERBOROUGH

Application No: 09/01368/OUT & 09/01369/OUT

1. Transport

- 1.1 The County Council has reviewed the Transport Assessment (TA) and Travel Plan (TP) which were submitted in support of both applications. The County Council wrote to Peterborough City Council on the 23rd March 2010 to advise that it had a number of transport related concerns and as such was objecting to both planning applications.
- 1.2 The matters raised in our letter of the 23rd March included;
1. Concerns regarding the assessment of impact on Yaxley and Farcet;
 2. Lack of information regarding traffic movements at the proposed A15 junctions;
 3. Concerns regarding the proximity of the A15 junctions to each other and the lack of traffic modelling to support the junction proposals;
 4. Lack of information regarding construction traffic;
 5. Lack of information regarding walking and cycling connections;
 6. Lack of information regarding Public Transport proposals: particularly proposed bus routes, infrastructure provision and viability assessment;
 7. Concerns regarding the likely effectiveness of the Travel Plan and its mode share targets;
 8. Lack of information relating to development phasing;
Concern about the proposal for a bus gate on the A15 and the lack of information to support its provision, and
 10. Lack of information to support the design of the Central Boulevard as a dual carriageway. It is vital that the role and design of this boulevard is compatible and consistent with the planning permission issued for the Hampton development. The County Council is very concerned that this road is proposed as a dual carriageway.
- 1.3 The County Council subsequently wrote separate letters to Peter Brett Associates (PBA) on the 3rd May 2010 regarding the TA and TP respectively.
- 1.4 These letters expanded on the matters described above. These letters also raise the following key points;

1. The County Council's uncertainty regarding the assumptions behind the 2026 "Do Minimum" traffic model is flagged on page 4 of the TA letter (see below);
 2. Confusion regarding proposals for A1 Junction 16: the TA text describes that its circulatory carriageway would remain without signals, whilst a drawing showing the part-signalisation of J16 and the Great North Road junction is included within the TA, and
 3. Confusion regarding the significant drop in traffic flows at J16 and on the A15 ie. comparing the 2026 "Do Minimum" and "Do Something" traffic models.
-
- 1.5 The County Council received a letter from PBA, dated 25th May 2010, in response to the 3rd May letters. However, PBA's letter does not provide sufficient detail to enable the County Council to withdraw any of its concerns as outlined in its original letter of the 23rd March or subsequent letters of the 3rd May.
 - 1.6 The County Council has also received a copy of PBA's letters to Peterborough City Council dated 20th July 2010 and 27th August 2010. Our position on the 20th July letter has been provided to you via email dated 23rd August 2010: the matters described within the 27th August letter were subsequently discussed with PBA at our meeting on the 3rd September 2010.
 - 1.7 Returning to the assumptions behind the 2026 "Do Minimum" model (as mentioned above), the County Council is now aware that PBA have assumed the provision of both LTP2 measures and the widening of Fletton Parkway (Junctions 1 to 2) in their 2026 "Do Minimum" and "Do Something" modelling. The County Council considers that there must be considerable doubt as to whether these measures will be provided (particularly the Fletton Parkway widening). As discussed with PBA at length at the 3rd September meeting, the County Council requires that the 2026 "Do Minimum without LTP2 and FP J1-J2" and "Do Something without LTP2 and FP J1-J2" scenarios are tested: this information is required to enable the County Council to establish the impact of development on the A1 Junctions 16 and 17, and on the A15 (including the impact on Yaxley) in the event that the LTP2 measures and Fletton Parkway widening schemes do not come forward. The provision of this information is considered to be a fundamental part of the TA and has been requested from PBA: however to date this information has not been provided to us.
 - 1.8 Moving forward, the County Council requires the following information from PBA, in addition to the information already provided, in order that the County Council can complete its assessment of the transport matters associated with the two planning applications;
 1. Phasing: The TA presently considers only the complete residential and commercial developments. The TA should be expanded to consider interim stages of development. In particular, the impact of development prior to the introduction of the LTP2 / Fletton Parkway widening must be established.
 2. A1 Junction 17: Full details of the 2026 Do Minimum and Do Something options, for both with / without LTP2 and FP widening scenarios, should be provided.
 3. A1 Junction 16: The County Council has received a VISSIM model for the J16 / Great North Road. The 2026 options with LTP2 and FP widening have been assessed. The County Council regards the assessment of J16 / Great North Road as being incomplete and requires the 2026 without LTP2 and FP widening options to be tested.

4. Proposed A15 junctions: Assessment of these junctions for the 2026 without LTP2 and FP widening options to be provided.
 5. Busgate: detailed justification of the need and location for the busgate should be provided.
 6. Connectivity: detailed feedback has been provided by County Council officers regarding walking, cycling and Rights Of Way requirements. PBA should demonstrate that this information has been incorporated into the revised “movements” plan.
- 1.9 The comments outlined above should not be regarded as being exhaustive and it is likely that further information and analysis will be required, depending on the outcome of the County Council’s assessment of the information received and further information requested.
- 1.10 **For the avoidance of doubt, the County Council is maintaining its objection to both planning applications and will continue to do so until transport matters affecting its highway network have been resolved to the County Council’s satisfaction.**

2. Countryside Access/Rights of Way

- 2.1 The County Council considers that the Great Haddon development proposal needs to identify connections from the development into the wider countryside access networks and to the Great Fen area (mostly in Cambridgeshire). This has not happened.
- 2.1 **Therefore the County Council objects to the residential application. The developer needs to make appropriate provision towards rights of way, either through physical works or a S106 contribution.**

3. The Yaxley Community Hub

- 3.1 The provision of library and lifelong learning services in Yaxley are provided through a purpose built and freestanding community hub. In addition to library borrowing, the public services that are accessed through this building include internet access, audio visual media and reading group activities for children.
- 3.2 The Great Haddon planning application provides very little detail of how library and lifelong services provision will be met for the residents of Great Haddon. The service provision within this area is also compounded by the interim and uncertain future provision of these services within the nearby settlement of Hampton.
- 3.3 Hampton currently has an ‘interim library’ located within the health centre at the town shopping centre, and it is understood that Peterborough Officers are considering the future of this interim facility and whether it can accommodate the demand from Great Haddon. It is also understood that the ability to provide the permanent library through the Hampton S106 covenant has lapsed.
- 3.4 If no provision is going to be made at Great Haddon or Hampton, given the proximity of Yaxley community hub to Great Haddon, the County Council is concerned about Great Haddon residents placing pressure on the Yaxley facility. The Yaxley Hub serves a population of just over 7,000. It would not be equipped to deal with a potential additional population of over 13,000 from Great Haddon.

3.5 Until satisfactory details emerge about how the developer plans to make provision for libraries and lifelong learning, the County Council objects to the residential application.

4.0 Archaeology

4.1 There have been several discussions on the historic environment impacts of the Great Haddon development that have involved representatives of the developers, English Heritage, Peterborough City Council and Cambridgeshire County Council. The County Council has been keen to see the Scheduled Monument made part of the new settlement, whilst at the same time ensuring it is protected.

4.2 The County Council does not have any archaeology objections to either application, but has the following comments to make:

4.3 The need for a buffer zone to limit development up to the monument boundary and to protect what's left of its setting. Current discussions had tentatively agreed on 100m. Currently, Peterborough City Council is reconsidering the buffer area in light of the Channel 4's Time Team results.

4.4 The County Council would support the need for further archaeological work outside the buffer area, but feel that such remains could be best dealt with by the excavation programme that will accompany the development in any case.

4.4 To ensure that the development does not isolate the monument and create a dead zone for dumping waste or for anti-social behaviour. It is far preferable for the development to face onto the monument.

4.5 To ensure that the land use in the buffer zone is sympathetic to the monument and serves to protect any archaeological remains within it, the definition of 'green space' can be variable and include some activities. However, it is strongly advised that uses within the buffer area are restricted to informal kick about play areas or open parkland, which will avoid unacceptable loss to the setting of the monument and also to any remains below ground.

4.6 Public access is important, and developers have agreed in principle that the S106 for the site include a provision for interpretation, management and possibly access to the site. The developers have been supportive of the possibility of some recognition of the presence of a French war grave here, something that a representative of the French Government has suggested they would be interested in.

5.0 Education

5.1 The County Council accepts that the developers cannot be expected to provide a larger secondary school site in order to accommodate school children from Cambridgeshire. Further partnership work is currently underway in order to assess the medium to longer term secondary school requirements of Peterborough and the Cambridgeshire villages of Yaxley, Farcet and Elton. However, in terms of the Great Haddon applications, the County Council does not wish to submit any objections based on education grounds but remains extremely disappointed that a better way of providing for both Peterborough and Cambridgeshire children can't be found as a result of this development.