

At a meeting of THORNEY PARISH COUNCIL held at the Council Chamber, Tank Yard,  
Thorney on Monday 23 June 2008 at 7.00 p.m.

PRESENT

Chair: Councillor D. J Buddle

Councillors: J E G. Bartlett, R Bevington, P. Murphy, M. Amps-Woodward,  
and Ms. S Knight

1. Apologies and Declaration of Interests  
Apologies from C Evans. No declarations of interest

2. Planning

**Core Strategy**

1. Question validity of Thorney's upgrading to a 'Key Service Centre' from ' Limited Rural Growth' in light of imminent decline in retail provision (newsagents, Sprigeons, fish shop), threatened reduction in public transport services and uncertainty about future of Post Office. Thorney Parish Council believe Thorney should be kept as a Limited Rural Growth Village. Thorney is separated and isolated from Peterborough by distance with limited and declining retail and commercail services, inadequate transport systems and with an ageing and clearly deteriorating service systems, is not suitable for a development site

2. Express concern that Thorney cannot be distinguished from Eye/Eye Green in respect of new dwelling allocation when they are separate parishes.

3. Express concern that the Parish Council learnt from Peter Heath- Brown that the 700 new dwelling allocation for Eye/Eye Green and Thorney did not represent a fixed upper limit.

4. Express concern that if land (privately or PCC owned) in Thorney is offered for development it may well be granted planning permission which could easily lead to far greater growth of the village than indicated in the Core Strategy.

5. Express concern that emphasis appears to be on new dwellings for Eye/Eye Green and Thorney with no reference to mixed-use or commercial/industrial development.

6. Question why rural areas are not 'zoned' for development i.e. why isn't it that development sites would only be considered if they incorporate a mix of uses such as new dwellings, affordable housing, housing provision for the elderly, commercial, light industrial etc. Why this insistence on housing when jobs/employment are also a major element of the overall PCC development plan. Typical models elsewhere in Bretton and Orton

7. Why are there no incentives being put in place by PCC to enhance the possibilities of some small scale industrial/commercial growth to provide jobs in rural communities.

8. Express concern that there is no real evidence in the document that the infrastructure of Thorney has been properly investigated. We are aware that developers as a condition of a project being approved are obliged to ensure that the infrastructure has to be upgraded to suit. However if development takes place on a scale way beyond the capabilities of the existing infrastructure it could mean that the whole village turns into a 'building site' with, for example, extension works to the school and medical centre, revisions to and re-laying of

sewers, greater traffic flow on poorly maintained roads, parking provision, etc. There is no mention of recreation facilities other than many miles away from Thorney

9. There is no real mention in the strategy of any assessment of the increase in traffic generated by local development. This will have both an immediate effect on the local environment and on the broader road systems with greater numbers of people commuting to work. The A47 west of Thorney is already an inadequate road – consultation with Highways Agency is critical.

10. Express concern that the views of Thorney's residents may not be adequately considered in the scramble by PCC to achieve the housing/job allocation dictated to them by Central Government. Thorney is currently in the process with PCC of developing a Community Plan through the Neighbourhood Investment procedures. As part of this process a questionnaire has been issued to all parishioners. It is clear from the initial feedback from the questionnaire completed by parishioners that some small scale development is acceptable to the majority of those who replied. We seek an assurance that the views of the parishioners will be given proper and full consideration in any final decision making regarding the way in which the village should develop.

11. We accept that Thorney should share in the development that is going to take place over the next 15 years. Our concern is that this is proportional to the scale and character of the existing village and that it can be accommodated with the minimum of upheaval to the existing infrastructure.

12. Larger communities need greater and more ruthless policing. Many, many parishioners already consider Thorney to be inadequately policed and we question how greater provision can be made to deal with the current situation and how this would be dealt with in the event of growth.

13. It seems that the Core Strategy is the beginning of a process that still has some way to go before becoming a comprehensive document that allows a Parish Council or an individual resident to fully understand the impact it may have on their local community.

Site Specific Allocations when issued may help in providing a clearer picture but they will by no means complete it and it would be helpful to know how other issues e.g infrastructure, public transportation, sewerage, policing etc. will be specifically addressed. Will a complete survey of Thorney's infrastructure and the services it receives be carried out, in conjunction with Thorney Parish Council, to assess what would be needed in the event of anything other than small-scale development of the village and will this form part of the final document.

We trust that the wishes of the parish as being expressed through the Community Planning exercise currently being carried out with PCC will also have an integral part to play in any decision making process regarding the village and that the Parish Council will be consulted about any decisions before they are finalised.

Both ward Councillors to be asked when this topic is discussed Thorney Parish Council wish you to vote against development in Thorney beyond what the village can accommodate.

## 2.1 Planning Applications outcome

Planning Applications Passed/Refused/withdrawn/before committee

## 2.2 Current Planning Applications

08/00464 Development Borrow Pit, The Causeway – landscape and other works – no objections butt query if there will be public access for walking/cycleway or is it private and closed. Where will access to the site come from?

08/00705 Barsby Cooked Meat, Nothey Road – amended scheme for 2 industrial units, retrospective – no objections

08/00608 53 Wisbech Road – new gates and wall – no objections

08/00658 Lordship End, French Drove – extension to workshop – no objection

The next full meeting will be held on 14 July 2008. Community Planning meeting 30 June, Core Strategy meeting 23 June. The meeting closed at 9.38 pm