

MINUTES OF NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL MEETING Monday 19th October 2020 HELD VIRTUALLY BY ZOOM

PRESENT:

WARD COUNCILLORS:

APOLOGIES:

VISITORS:

Ivan Hammond, Vince Moon, Roger Proudfoot, Sally Weald
Cllr John Fox, Cllr Judy Fox, Cllr Stephen Lane
Martin Greaves, Bill Mercer, Geoff Smith, Cllr Sandra Bond
Nyree Ambarchian, Kate Wood

1. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS: Vince Moon welcomed everyone.

2. URGENT BUSINESS:

- Roger said that one of the environment group volunteers is doing a university course which requires him to do volunteering work and he would like to do some of this work with the Environment Group. It was agreed that he could be co-opted as a member.
- Sally advised that the underpass was nearing completion. Whilst Nathan has said that he would maintain the underpass, she suggested that a fund was set up to ensure that his expenses were covered. She was agreed.

3. FORMER STANILAND COURT SITE APPLICATION:

Kate Wood planning consultant for the applicant joined the meeting.

She clarified the following points:

- Car parking spaces on former toilet site: These are not included in the numbers allocated for the flats and are available for public use. Are the residents of Sutton Court aware of this?
- What is the width of the alleyway leading from the bus stop? This information isn't available yet. The visuals are still causing concern especially given that the Medical Centres land is not this manicured area that is being shown and the shrubs and trees over shadow the proposed alleyway.
- In response to the lack of gardens, her client has advised that the ground floor flats do have gardens and with 25% of the flats being for over 55s then there is no need for play areas. In principle of flats is that there is no open space provided. The response was that this is Werrington which is characterised by open space, that the Centre will just be used as a social space and that over 55s need open space as much as families.

The Neighbourhood Council's proposed response was then read out:

Werrington Neighbourhood Council has taken the views of its members and has reviewed comments expressed by its residents. We acknowledge Peterborough's need for housing especially the provision of affordable housing. Generally: we support development of the Staniland Court site as it forms an important part of Werrington Centre which is desperate for regeneration and increased footfall to support the existing shops and services. Despite adjustments being made to the original plans, however, we still oppose the development described in the application for the following reasons:

1. Open space and the environment

- i) The lower flats only have a minute garden and no communal open space so the surroundings are not in keeping with the local character especially given the importance that Peterborough & Werrington gives to open spaces,
- ii) There could be around 140 people with no access to any substantial open space. There is no space for parents with younger children, children to play on their bikes, people to sit out after work, older generations to sit out nor even space for hanging out washing. Covid 19 has demonstrated that how important access to open space is to health and mental health.
- iii) Given that half of these flats have more than one bedroom there could be over 30 families with children putting these children within the Werrington Centre courtyard. The shop owners already describe the damage caused by the juveniles playing. (The 'Post and Packing' shop currently has a smashed window caused by a football). Local open space is 5 mins or more walk away. 60 households looking for an immediate space to relax, play and socialise is going to add to the antisocial problems.
- iv) The area is losing a large informal open space, numerous trees and extensive shrubbery areas. It cannot be said that the landscaping and installation of bat and bird boxes described in the ecological report gives

compensatory environment benefit nor enhanced biodiversity. The trees in the car park will be vulnerable to car damage, run off and root compaction.

v) Given Peterborough's Environment City status and the need to achieve sustainability, there are no obvious zero carbon initiatives.

2. Antisocial behaviour

- i) Werrington Centre is already subject to antisocial behaviour: drug taking, petty crime and vandalism (eg stealing of artificial grass, damage to canopy), youths loitering making it a no go area (see 1 iii)
- ii) By enclosing the Centre and making narrow approaches this will encourage more antisocial behaviour. The flats are not facing in the right direction to provide natural surveillance.
- iii) In the appeal decision of application: APP/J0540/W/19/3221876 the inspector said of Werrington Centre the following: 'Proposals should be 'safe and designed to minimise crimes and anti social behaviour...'; any development should be 'well spaced built form, ... have views through the central area, ... prevent a sense of enclosure ... have a spacious appearance and ... not an enclosing effect on the appearance of the precinct's central area'. None of these Inspector's views have been addressed in this new application.
- iv) The above appeal also refers to the installation of CCTV as follows: 'recourse to such measure does not indicate a proposal which constitutes good design ... and does not render the enclosed walkways more attractive ... It does not overcome the public safety concerns'. This applies equally Goodwin Walk walkway in this application.
- v) There is no convincing argument about how antisocial aspects will be addressed eg given the CCTV blind spots especially around the canopied area, how/where the enhanced lighting will improve things.

3. Design and Height of building

- i) There are no residential developments of this height and style and it is out of character with the immediate area and Werrington.
- ii) The structure will overwhelm Goodwin Walk and the landscaped treelined setting. It only stands a short way back from the edge of the road and is out of character for the design of the road.
- iii) The distance between the structure and Ploverly/Crowhurst is only just over the minimum legally permitted distance (being 24 metres at the narrowest point). As these flats have kitchens and lounge accommodation at 1st/2nd floor level and the large windows and Juliette balconies this will encourage people to stand at their windows/balconies and take the view - thereby directing looking into the windows and back gardens of residents opposite. Given the road, there is no landscaping to soften this. Therefore the overlooking aspect and loss of privacy is not acceptable for these residents directly opposite.

4. Bus stop and access path

- i) The access to/from Goodwin Walk from the Centre will be a narrow path between the 3 storey flats/ 2 storey shops and the Dentist/Medical Centre. The visuals do not give a true impression of this access as they show a wide path enhanced by a well trimmed border. In reality the border to the south owned by the Medical Centre is an overgrown shrubbed area with an over hanging tree thereby narrowing the path and giving a feeling of enclosure. This busy narrow access has the potential to create an unsafe path in an area already susceptible to antisocial behaviour and making the adjoining flats vulnerable to crime. (see 2 above).
- ii) Ken Stimpson Community School has a significant number of pupils using the bus service. This enclosed space has impact for pupil movement passing by shops and flats creating problems for their chaperones. The accumulation of pupils in this space is too close to the bus pulling in thereby putting pupils at risk and creating disturbance for the flats.
- iii) Visuals are suggesting there will be a crossing on Goodwin Walk which we understand is not the case.
- iv) This narrow path will be the main way into the Centre for those living in East Werrington and this is not a welcoming gateway. It conflicts against the open spaciousness of the Centre design.

5. Infrastructure

- i) This development will put increased traffic on the already busy Staniland Way. The pinch point is the Davids Lane roundabout with queuing traffic at school run times backing onto the Paston Parkway roundabout in the morning and down Staniland Way in the afternoon taking many many minutes of queuing. When Ken Stimpson Community School was proposing to expand, the proposed changes to the roundabout layout confirmed the local roads inability to handle increased volumes of traffic.
- ii) The suggested increase in traffic seems very under estimated. In the morning there are three shops with employees opening up, customers arriving and shop deliveries, home deliveries and workmen, school runs (given that many local secondary pupils travel to Arthur Mellows) and people going to work. The majority of people now use a supermarket delivery service and online shopping and this is not reflected in the dated traffic data being supplied. It is impossible to suggest that 60 flats and 3 shops generates comparable traffic to an office last occupied approx. ten years ago where approx. 30 people worked. Similarly the peak time pm is being shown as Friday 5pm to 6pm. Tesco's is not the generator of traffic as this is a small supermarket used predominately by people on foot. The peak time is earlier with the school run of William Law and Ken Stimpson and when Igo4 and Olympus House employees leave. Most office workers on a Friday will have left by 5pm. The Centre dynamics are not understood by the applicant as the wrong peak times are being addressed.
- iii) The local Doctors and Dentists are already under significant strain.
- iv) We note that Section 106 aspects are being considered by other residents.

6. Shop Units

- i) With the stated need for housing why aren't the shop units being used to create residential units.
- ii) There are empty units within the Centre desperate for occupancy. With no demand, there is the prospect for these new units to remain empty with the potential for antisocial behaviour.
- iii) This will move the retail sector into the narrow access point outside the foot print of the current Centre
- iv) The shop buildings block the current open access thereby enclosing the Centre to create a courtyard effect, a bottle neck and narrow access. This is contrary to the open plan nature of the Centre and general green openness which characterises Werrington. The Centre deserves a better gateway from the east.

7. Car parking and transport

- i) The proposed car parking is inadequate for the number of potential residents. Given that the City Council have parking standards we cannot understand why these are being so radically overturned for this application. Having read the parking assessment we would reflect on the following:
 - There is no provision for motorcycles with the National Travel Survey suggesting that at least 2 motorcycles would need to be accommodated
 - There are 30 two/three bedroom flats therefore most of the case studies are irrelevant as they refer to one bedroom flats.
 - Werrington is not a transport hub with only one suitable bus route so therefore it cannot be related to a City Centre location.
- ii) People will be arriving home at night to find no parking. No one will choose leave a car in the Tesco carpark overnight and the walk through the Centre is unsafe in the dark especially for women. People will choose to park in the adjoining residential areas which are already suffering their own parking problems. If people park in Skaters Way it will affect the trade of those local businesses.
- iii) The future of unrestricted car parking is questionable in the Tesco car park. Despite acknowledging this, the report still refers to this as a 'public carpark'. Free unrestricted parking will surely end if the development is built bringing into question longer carparking for users of the library and Sports Centre.
- iv) The main bus service going into the City is a slow and unreliable with no services for people on early and late shifts and does not reach out to employment areas. Having a car is important for most people in employment, seeking work or for older people to keep their independence.
- v) The other two listed services are the Call Connect service for designed for Lincolnshire residents linking villages to Peterborough and Stamford (Per Call Connect the service is not for commuters and rarely comes into Werrington) and a meandering service linking the northern villages to the City. The inclusion of these timetables gives the misleading impression of an extensive bus connection to a wider area.

8. Consultation.

- i) There is no opportunity for anyone not online to see these proposals. Werrington's older generation are proportionally the biggest users of the Centre and they have not had the chance to adequately express their opinions on this.
- ii) The visuals are giving concern giving the depiction of spacious alleyways and crossings on Goodwin Walk.

Kate thanked the Neighbourhood Council for this information as it will be useful in reviewing the development of the Plans

- Kate asked about how to communicate further with other residents. The Spotlight details were handed over but deadline was tight. Also Sally had put up extract of the plans in the library and this needs to be used more.
- In response to school impact, clarification was made of the schools involved.
- John questioned the bus services as the number 61 does go into town. Sally said that the problem is that the proposals are describing the bus service as being 'excellent' linking Werrington to all these places when in reality it doesn't. It was agreed that the lack of bus turning circle is a problem for the number 61.
- Kate advised that if the Plans are revised then the consultation period will open again and be open to responses.

Kate then left the meeting

- Roger Sale asked if everyone had seen the letter from the MP. The response had been put on facebook and was on the Planning website.
- It was agreed that the response should now be submitted.
- Nyree complimented the response. She said that she was talking to Planning Officers about the Section 106 aspect. Sally said that she would refer to this in the submission but not refer to any detail as she is not an expert on this.

The meeting closed at 8.00pm.