

At a meeting of THORNEY PARISH COUNCIL held at the Bedford Hall, Tank Yard,
Thorney on Tuesday 22 May 2007 at 7.30 p.m.

PRESENT

Chair: Councillor D. J Buddle

Councillors: R Bevington, P.A. Rowe, M. Amps-Woodward, P. Murphy,
G. A .Kilham, C. Evans, R.M. Harlock, J.E.G. Bartlett, E. Gee,
Ian Mitchell (Keir Residential), Robbie Doughty and Neil Osborn (planning
consultants)
Mr. P Gear Peterborough City Council Planning Officer

36 members of the public present.

1. Apologies
W VanDriessche, Ms. M Herdman
2. Planning
2.1 Current Planning Applications
07/00248 Gas House, Gas Lane Thorney – demolition and erection 5 dwellings –
it was agreed that the application need not go before committee. However, the Council
would like to know the reason why the developer wishes to demolish Gas House.
Councillor Bartlett took no part in this discussion
07/00586 17 Northside, Thorney - creation new farm access - no objection

The Chairman introduced the planning application 06/02002/FUL East Side of Station
Road – to build 78 dwellings – and why a full public meeting had been called to
discuss the application.

Although present Councillors Amps-Woodward, Kilham, Gee and Harlock took no
part in any discussion in the following item because of a prejudicial interest. The
Chairman explained this before the meeting was adjourned and open for public
discussion.

Mr. Mitchell introduced himself and his colleagues and outlined what he would
present. Councillor Bevington explained the broader context of the development. He
explained it was important to get Station Road proposals into broader context as the
development opens up opportunities for other areas of land to the east (Thorney Parish
Council allotments and the Peterborough City Council site) by providing the element
of access. This application was, therefore, critical to the development of Thorney
With the opening of the bypass Peterborough City Council has decided Thorney
would be the first area to have a “planning for real” approach applied. The “preferred
option” core document should be published by October 2007. Thorney Parish Council
had been notified today (22 May) that this process would start. This would be a
masterplan for the future of Thorney. Mr. Osborn explained the local plan was
published in 2005 but this has now been replaced by the local development
framework. This means a new approach to the development plans now has to take
place.

Mr. Mitchell did not want to wait for the “planning for real” exercise but wanted the
applicaton determined before that outcome.

Councillor Bartlett asked if it was the developers intention to also build on Thorney Parish Council allotments, Peterborough City Council field and Searles land. Mr. Mitchell said there was no intention of this at the present time but would not rule it out for the future. However, it could well be determined by the “planning for real” process.

Councillor Bartlett said Peterborough City Council were not offering their land for sale at present – Mr. Mitchell expanded on this with the involvement of “Opportunity Peterborough”

Councillor Bartlett asked if allowance had been made for access to the other land east of the development. Mr. Doughty showed the access on the proposed plan.

Peterborough City Council did not insist on this access.

Councillor Bevington asked the following questions: the responses are in italics.

Do people think village needs to grow – is this the ideal area for growth.

Loss of industrial site, loss of jobs – *Mr. Osborn said it was likely that businesses would relocate and that the site was not ideal for industry. Most workers were from outside Thorney.* However, Councillor Rowe said that Bridge Engineering employed all local people.

Thorney should not become a residential enclave. Market – who is it thought will be the potential purchasers of this housing. *Mr. Mitchell said there would be 30% affordable housing – the market other than this was unknown but experience suggests many local people would purchase.*

Councillor Murphy asked about Residential Care – *Mr. Mitchell said there was no provision for this in the scheme*

Proximity to new by-pass – is this a good location for housing – what measures to reduce noise. *Mr. Doughty explained survey of noise at Eye. Some bunding is shown on the plans. More information will be collated concerning noise.*

There were concerns from Mrs. Gordon and Mr. Ladds that noise from PPG would result in Enforcement by the Environment Officer if the owners of the proposed houses complained of this. Mrs. Gordon highlighted the recent problem with the garage in Church Street .

Adjacent to other industry – is this a good location for housing – industrial is often noisy and thereby at odds with residential. *Mr. Mitchell said some protection to the site would be provided but if residents did complain the decision would be with Peterborough City Council.*

Flood risk – what is Environmental Agency’s view on this development – what measures are to be taken to reduce risk – will this have any affect on neighbouring properties. *Mr. Doughty explained the measures to be taken and the flood risk assessment.*

Site does not impact on existing open space

Density – why urban density in a rural location – denser does of course equal less land usage. *The proposals follow Government guidelines*

Height of buildings- why build above a two storey limit which is typical height of dwellings in village. Village Design Statement (VDS) – has this been taken into account when planning site layout, elevating houses/flats above 2 storeys and selecting materials. There was a strong preference that 2 storeys are the limit. Materials should be in context to the rest of the village. *Mr. Mitchell said they would take this point away for future plans. Materials will also be taken into account and be sympathetic to the rest of the village.*

Context - how well do proposals fit into their physical context (this is difficult to assess as there are no drawings or a model showing proposals in relationship to the surrounding area) – could be viewed as off-the-peg houses just being dropped onto the site.

Traffic – effect on Station Road and safety – should a roundabout at site entry/exit junction be considered – this would also serve to slow traffic on Station Road. *Mr. Doughty said the traffic assessment indicated that a roundabout was not necessary. However, he would look at this again for possible inclusion.*

Parking – what is the total parking allocation for the site. *Mr. Doughty said the design was working on 200% off street parking.*

Phasing – what would programme be for development – all at once or in stages over what period of time. *One phase that would probably take 2 years to complete.*

Have the Medical practice or nursery/playgroup facilities been consulted. *Mr. Michell said they would investigate this.*

Benefits to village – 106 monies or can a direct benefit be agreed between Parish and Developer. *Affordable housing, possible financial contribution to school and they would look at medical centre and nurseries. However, the developer is open to negotiation.*

Councillor Bartlett still very concerned about the developers long term aims concerning land around the proposed site. *Mr. Mitchell explained he wished to keep his options open but the “planning for real” exercise would determine which land would be developed.*

Councillor Bartlett was not convinced and said that he had been told that there were suggestions that the Duke of Bedford School could be replaced. *Mr. Osborn explained that a scheme at Werrington involved a new primary school and that it was Peterborough City Council’s intention to have a rolling program of school renovation and at some time the Duke of Bedford will be refurbished in some way.*

Mr. Shelton asked about affordable housing and what was to stop migrant workers taking occupation. *Mr. Mitchell said that as developers they do not have control over tenants but clauses can be written into a contract during development to determine where the tenants come from under the section 106 agreement. The Residential Care Landlord always controls a percentage of the open market value.*

Mr. Cave said there was already in existence a wish list of requirements from Section 106 contributions. He went on to explain that some time ago the Head of Planning

indicated that the allotments and Peterborough City Council land could be included in development. He thought we could be misled by the “planning for real” exercise. *Mr. Mitchell said that Peterborough City Council had a policy that developments greater than 30 units should be discouraged and that development should not be at the detriment to employment. Under their criterion the present application was unlikely to be passed by Peterborough City Council. He explained the basis of the current application but from the feedback he had already received from Thorney Parish Council and Peterborough City Council realised that the application as it stood was not acceptable. Mr. Mitchell explained what the Planning Co-operative did and the possibility of future consultation. He said with hindsight this process should have been started 3 years ago.*

In answer to a question the Chairman said the details of the SWOP analysis had still to be compiled but the overall reaction was that the respondents were not opposed to some village development.

A question was asked that if the number of houses on the development were reduced would this allow some industrial units to remain. *Three homes on the proposed plan were outside the village envelope and Peterborough City Council have asked for these to be removed.*

Mr. Mitchell asked if the scale of the development was acceptable. Councillor Bevington said that the less number of homes the better as we did not know what was to come in the future. Chairman said SWOT survey indicated the need for some development.

Mrs. Reed made the point that her existing home was overshadowed by the proposal and Mr. Mitchell said that individual complaints would be looked at with a view to resolution.

As far as the Consultants knew there was no restriction concerning building near telephone transmitter masts.

The next meeting will be held on 11 June 2007

The meeting closed at 9.50 pm