

**RESPONSE MADE ON BEHALF OF WERRINGTON  
NEIGHBOURHOOD COUNCIL  
TO PLANNING APPLICATION 20/01113/FUL FORMER STANILAND COURT AREA  
July 2021**

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. We support the 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. There are however still several concerns, ambiguity and the need for clarification. These include the following:

**1. Open space and the environment**

- i) The lower flats only have a small garden and communal space so the surroundings are not in keeping with the local character especially given the importance that Peterborough & Werrington gives to open spaces.
- ii) Even at a conservative estimate there could be around 150 people with no access to any substantial open space. There is little 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 29 families putting these children within the Werrington Centre courtyard. The shop owners already describe the damage caused by the juveniles playing. 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 existing 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. The number of trees being removed are not being adequately replaced
- v) Given Peterborough's Environment City status and the need to achieve sustainability, there are no obvious zero carbon initiatives – not even provision for electric cars nor renewable energy for the building.

**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). 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.
- ii) 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.
- iii) 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.

- iv) 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.
- v) Not clear what is happening to the area of the derelict toilets and its potential effect on residents of Sutton Court.

### **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 just over the minimum legally permitted distance. As these flats have kitchens and lounge accommodation at 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> 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 the residents opposite. 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) There has been much improvement to the narrow access from Goodwin Walk. Notwithstanding this this still remains a narrow access at the eastern end with 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 close to the bus pulling in thereby putting pupils at risk and creating disturbance for the flats.
- iii) This 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 is under estimated. In the morning there are additional shops with employees opening up, customers arriving and shop deliveries, home deliveries (where will they park?) 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 2 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. Tescos 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 as the wrong peak times are being addressed.

iii) The local Doctors and Dentists are already under significant strain. The surrounding infrastructure is not adequate for the increased residents and there is not indication about how that will be addressed.

## **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 the recent changes in shopping habits and the current lack of demand, there is the prospect for these new units to remain empty with the potential for antisocial behaviour.
- iii) The two shop units will move the retail sector 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.

## **7. Car parking and transport**

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 can be overturned for this application and by such a large extent. Having read the parking assessment we would reflect on the following:

- i) There is no provision for motorcycles with the National Travel Survey suggesting that at least 2 motorcycles would need to be accommodated
- ii) Given the allocation to over 55s, there would need to be increased numbers of disabled spaces with spaces being increased from 2.4m width to 3.6m width. Even as a minimum there should be 3 spaces, more because of the higher percentage of the older age group thereby reducing car park capacity.
- iii) There are 29 two bedroom flats therefore most of the case studies are irrelevant as they refer to one bedroom flats.
- iv) Werrington is not a transport hub with only one suitable bus route so therefore it cannot be related to a City Centre location. The main bus service going into the town centre is a slow and unreliable with no services for people on early and late shifts and does not reach out to employment areas. At 30 mins it takes double the length of time to a journey from Hampton being quoted in the revised report. Call Connect services are listed which is a bookable service linking Lincolnshire villages to Peterborough and Stamford and is not for Peterborough commuters. The inclusion of these timetables gives the misleading impression of an extensive bus connection to a wider area.
- iv) People will be arriving home at night to find no parking. Local residential areas already suffer their own crippling parking problems. 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.
- v) The future of unrestricted car parking is questionable in the Tesco car park.
- vi) Having a car is important for most people in employment, seeking work or for older people to keep their independence. Studies say that the 70+ age group are increasing car mileage compared to the younger age groups and a McCarthy and Stone survey of 13 of their complexes said that out of 390 residents, 161 were car owners (Housing, Learning and Improvement Network). 2017 statistics say that 77% of 60+ are car owners ([www.statista.com](http://www.statista.com)). Therefore the justification to remove the parking standards based on the older age profile is flawed.
- vii) Work vans are increasingly taken home requiring larger spaces.

- viii) There is no provision for electric cars given that this is the future of car transport which will require extra space to protect the equipment.

**8. Consultation.**

There is no opportunity for anyone not online to see these proposals. Werrington's older generation are proportionally the biggest users of the Centre with several sheltered accommodation nearby. These residents have not had the chance to adequately express their opinions on this.