

At a meeting of THORNEY PARISH COUNCIL held at the Council Chamber, Tank Yard, Thorney on Monday 17 November 2008 at 7.00 p.m.

PRESENT

Chair: Councillor D. J Buddle

Councillors: J E G. Bartlett, P. Murphy, R.M. Harlock, E. Gee, C Evans, Ms M Herdman, R Bevington

1. Apologies and Declaration of Interests

Apologies for absence from Mrs. C Fuller, M. Amps-Woodward,

Declaration of interests from Councillors Gee and Harlock on Site Specific Allocations Development

The Chairman explained the purpose of meeting was to make general and specific comments on sites proposed in Peterborough City Council Site Allocations – Issues and Options. The deadline for comments 1st December 2008

He gave a brief review of Development Planning Documents issued by Peterborough City Council on 10 October 2008. There were 2 documents: 1. Site Allocations

2. Planning Policies

Site Allocations - shows all the potential sites that have been offered for development in the Peterborough City Council area. There are several categories of site including Housing, Employment, Mixed Use (typically residential and employment but could include leisure, retail and community projects)

Some of each of these has been put forward as potential sites in Thorney listed below. In total this offers 18.06 hectares for residential development.

Although the documents do not give hard and fast rules for density. If 35 units to the hectare are applied this would produce the potential for 632 houses plus whatever content if housing is included in mixed use sites.

Chairman said Thorney Parish Council must challenge status of Thorney as a 'Key Service Centre'. Since the document was produced 2 shops have closed, the fish and chip shop will close shortly, there has been a decline in public transport but Thorney still has all the requirements of a key service centre. He was concerned that the traffic on the A47 would become even more congested and there was a poor bus service.

It was agreed that Thorney Parish Council were unhappy to be categorised as a key service centre.

It was suggested that a total of an extra 200 homes over the next 18 years could be built. Since the year 2000, forty four homes have been built. Any growth must not impact on the conservation area of the village and the VDS must be complied with.

It was agreed that:

1. Thorney should retain its status as rural village
2. Minimise increase in traffic/parking and policing problems within the village.
It was noted that Peterborough City Council wish to remove the village centre speed cameras.
3. Opposed to loss of open space/agricultural land – proposals are in the green belt
4. Prefer use of brownfield and infill sites

5. From the questionnaire sent around the village there was a slight majority in favour of some small scale development.
6. Thorney Parish Council preferred type of growth is residential with affordable housing and also some executive homes, employment, retail, community facilities and leisure facilities.
Social housing seems inappropriate as public transport to and from the village is poor.
For the mixed use sites Thorney Parish Council doubts that Peterborough City Council can bring employment, retail and community facilities when no funding or incentives are available.
There should be provision made for the care of the elderly (possibly sheltered homes).
7. There must be compliance with the VDS and Community Planning exercise
8. The education of children needs clarifying as per 100 dwellings usually produce 25 pupils of primary school age, 18 pupils for secondary school and 4 for 6th form. Peterborough City Council have a history of changing the catchment areas which leads to family uncertainty and children being bussed out of the area.
9. Potential expansion of quarries – excavations should not be used for waste infill but should be returned to low level agricultural land. These will limit expansion to the west.
10. Thorney has the following ‘planning problems’ that exist at present
 - a. Lack of affordable housing
 - b. Inadequate sewage infrastructure. AWA (with Peterborough City Council involvement) had plans for upgrading many sections prior to the bypass being opened (the scheme was delayed to avoid unacceptable traffic hold ups in the village before traffic was diverted onto the bypass). This upgrading has never been carried out. The centre of the village has a Victorian installation onto which Woburn Drive estate discharges. This will cause problems for proposals H078, H079, H081. A new main sewer will have to be installed.
 - c. Water runoff and road flooding after heavy rain problems exist in Woburn Drive and Topham Crescent area – but these same problems exist in other parts of the village.
11. Thorney will have the following ‘planning problems’ created by development
 - a. Telecommunications will need upgrading as these are inadequate
 - b. Power supplies will need upgrading as these are inadequate with frequent “blackouts”.
 - c. Are the water and gas supplies capable of withstanding extra homes?
 - d. Carbon footprint of additional people travelling to work areas will increase
 - e. Worsen the perceived crime problem
 - f. Increase parking problems
 - g. Expansion will be necessary to the health centre and school
12. The following benefits could be provided by development
 - a. Village Improvements in line with Jim Daley’s ‘Conservation Area Appraisal 2007’
 - b. Planting to The Causeway, Station Road, east and west Wisbech Road approaches to village

- c. Street furniture/traffic signage rationalisation in Conservation Area (including removal of ‘Armco’ barrier to bridge)
 - d. Street lighting appropriate to historic village rather than a trunk road
 - e. Re-paving of east side of Abbey Place, Abbey frontage, Church Street
 - f. Tree planting in Tankyard to reinforce sense of enclosure
 - g. Funding to set up central store of historic building materials
 - h. Sports Pavilion in park
 - i. All-weather football pitch(es)
 - j. Restore tennis courts
 - k. Review of sewers/drainage/surface drainage
 - l. Cycle path to Eye
 - m. Up-grade Bedford Hall interiors
 - n. Fund essential external decorations to Community Centre
 - o. Improve public transport service
 - p. Youth facility in park or elsewhere (shelters, BMX track?)
 - q. Garden/seating area in park for elderly
 - r. Physical measures against speeding (Station Road, Abbey Place, Wisbech Road)
 - s. Maintenance of river walk – creation of more circular walks
 - t. Wildlife park/nature reserve with jogging track and exercise stations
 - u. Footpaths, bridleways, cycle-paths on route of old railway.
13. Voice objection to all sites (under Policy IMP1) unless assurance they will contribute to local infrastructure and/or community facilities. Objection will be “It is expected that IMP1 will contribute to local facilities the following item(s).....
14. The documents are very clear that none of these sites have yet been adopted for development but call for comments on each site proposed by 1 December 2008

Village envelopes will be ‘up for review’. In other words if any potential sites are to be adopted which lie outside the existing envelope the envelope boundary will be adjusted to suit.

15. Comments on Site-by-Site basis

The Housing Sites are:

At this point Councillor Harlock left the room

Site H076 and E017 – east side Station Road (Brownfield) 2.27 ha.

Residential only, low flood risk, access good, needs improved footpath in Station Road and the site’s junction to Station Road needs roundabout as a traffic calming measure. Loss of employment area. Two storey height limit to buildings as VDS suggests.

At this point Councillor Harlock returned to the room

Site H077 – Peterborough City Council land to north of village (Greenfield) 6.87 ha
 Loss of agricultural land, access problems, higher flood risk, rumour that south of railway line land is contaminated by anthrax buried cattle in the mid 1800’s. Noise from bypass. Pedestrian and cycle access should be provided to Wisbech Road. Two storey height limit to buildings as VDS suggests.

Site H078 – Sandpit Road (Greenfield), 2.79 ha.
Sewage problems (requires new main sewer), poor road access, high land with less risk flooding

Site H079 – Park Close/Park Crescent (Greenfield), 1.60 ha.
Sewage problems (requires new main sewer), poor road access, high land with less risk flooding
Improve image of village from east

Site H080 – Gas Lane (Greenfield), .44 ha.
Inside new limits of conservation area. Suitable for large properties.

Thorney Parish Council allotments 1.23 ha
Gives access to H077, M009.
Two storey height limit to buildings as VDS suggests. Could be a ransom strip.

Site H081 – Woburn (Greenfield), 3.41 ha.
Sewage problems (requires new main sewer), poor road access, high land with less risk flooding
Possible archaeological survey needed as this land is on a high point of the village and has possible Roman remains

Site H128 – Briggs Farm (Greenfield) .68 ha.
This should be rejected as it is development in open countryside.

Councillor Gee declared an interest in this proposal and left the room

Whittlesey Road between Park and Cemetery
High land, access from main Whittlesey Road. Could be screened by tree belt in keeping with area. Possible road access to H081.
Possible archaeological survey needed as this land is on a high point of the village and has possible Roman remains
If limited development this should be adjacent to Whittlesey Road and in keeping with surrounding properties.

Mixed Use Sites.

In total this offers 41.34 hectares for mixed use development which would typically be residential and employment although no indication is given of what the ratio may be between these.

If say one third of this land was allocated to residential this would provide for the potential for a further 480 houses.

Site M008 – Station Road (Greenfield), 20.54 ha.
This site encompasses most of the land west of Station Road between the old A47 and the by-pass
Low flood risk, next to bypass so noise and air pollution. Major impact on local character and amenity – although outside the conservation area would ruin approach to village from west. Way outside village envelope and landscape impact alters shape of village. Locality of main grid gas pipe.

Suggest only N.E area developed not whole site. Grade 2 agricultural land. Continue low density development of nearby estate.

Site M009 – North of Wisbech Road (Greenfield) 20.80 ha.

This site encompasses land from the east end of the village with a link through to Station Road and would connect sites H077 and H080 and allotments.

Complete overdevelopment. Major impact on local character and amenity – although outside the conservation area would ruin approach to village from east. Way outside village envelope and landscape impact alters shape of village.

Should be considered as a wildlife/recreational area.

Does not provide an access to H077. Immediately adjacent to H077 could be developed with access from H077

There does not seem to be any indication of the timescale for the assessment of these sites by Peterborough City Council to arrive at their ‘preferred options’ nor is there any clear indication as to what criteria will be applied in this assessment. In particular there is still no evidence of any review of the existing infrastructures and their capabilities in respect of development although this will presumably be a major factor in assessing sites.

16. Thorney Parish Council preferred options.

- a. Preference for development on E017, H076, H077 (north), H080, Thorney Parish Council allotments, new site with development bounding Whittlesey Road. Very limited development M008, M009 as detailed above.
- b. Because of the difficulties of sewer, surface water and road access not to contemplate any southern development i.e. H078, H078, H081. No development on south H077 (possible contamination)

17. Thorney Parish Council expects actions from sale of Peterborough City Council land to provide replacement allotments, to include Thorney Parish Council allotment land in overall scale of plans and development at some time and section 106 contributions to be put to Thorney village amenities.

Current Planning Applications

Councillor Bartlett declared an interest in this application and therefore took no part in the discussion or voting

08/01327 change of use of open land to garden, 4 Erica Walk – no objections

Thorney Parish Council printer – this had developed a fault and needed to be replaced. It was proposed by Councillor Harlock, seconded by Councillor Buddle and unanimously agreed that if Councillor Harlock could not provide a second hand unit the Clerk should order a new unit.

The meeting closed at 10.12pm