

**C31.1 North Werrington Development Working Group**  
**27 June 2006**  
**Meeting held at Werrington Village Hall**

**Minutes**

**1, Attendance and Apologies**

Bob Johnson  
David Wragg  
Andy Warne  
Janet Goodacre  
Paul Curtis  
Martin Reeves

**Apologies from:**  
WNC for absence of a PCC Member

Councillor John Holditch

Neil Osborn (DLP)  
Alistair McLeod (Stefan Zins Architects)  
Tim McCracken (Fairfax Management Consultants)

**2. Minutes of 23 May 2006**

Minutes were agreed, subject to clarification of names and initials used.

**3. East of England Plan**

NO provided a brief resumé of the Panel's report with respect to:

- The recommended increase in the housing requirement for Peterborough from 21,200 to 25,000 in the period to 2021.
- The recommendation to identify Peterborough as a 'key centre for growth' in a revised hierarchy of settlements in the region.
- The recommended deletion of the sub-regional policies for the Peterborough Area,
- The importance of delivery, and the expressed confidence of the Panel in the City Council to deliver large scale new development, approximately doubling the present build rate.

JH pointed out that the build rate now proposed hasn't been achieved since the early 1990s but the City Council was gearing up to meet its obligations. NO said that he felt that the increase in the requirement further supported the need to deliver urban extensions such as that subject to this Working Party's consideration.

**4. Progress Report**

NO identified the work now being carried out by the Transportation Consultants to examine highway capacity and also connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists. NO understood that the Local Councils would shortly be in contact with Adrian Bullen, the Highway Consultant, to arrange a joint viewing of critical transportation sites, as discussed at the previous NWDWG meeting.

AW identified his particular concern about the level crossing. He referred to an incident in 1996 following which he asked for lights and bells to be fitted at the crossing as trains approaching

from Peakirk are not visible. The rail authority at the time declined this investment in view of the level of frequency of trains (11 a day). He said that it would become even more essential if plans to increase train frequencies to 4 per hour and to extend the length of trains were to occur, and he would look to the developers to sponsor/provide some form of improved safety if they could not secure the closure of the crossing.

NO identified the desirability of providing a footbridge at a mid point along the site boundary. He said that various members of the consultancy team had walked the length of the boundary to identify a suitable crossing point. JH said that the location of the crossing would be critical as the creation of a bridge close to existing houses would raise objections. NO said the he was aware of concerns about overlooking and the protection of privacy.

**Agreed - DW and Roy Beard (RB), the contact officers, would arrange to meet Adrian Bullen shortly.**

NO outlined a meeting held earlier in the day with the Howard Group regarding Werrington Centre. He said that the Howard Group appear to be at an early stage in considering their options to re-develop the Centre to provide an improved retail offer and incorporate social and community facilities. He had been a little disappointed that they had not been more forthcoming about details of their plans but anticipated there was a degree of commercial confidentiality concerned. The meeting had, however, been amicable and the Howard Group and AHE had agreed to remain in touch with regard to the evolution of their respective plans over the next few months.

There was discussion about the absence of information from Howard Group about their proposals available to WNC and the difficulty which WNC have had in contacting Howard Group regarding their existing obligations.

**Agreed - NO to provide RB with contact details for the Managing Director at Howard Group.**

NO said that it was important to AHE that provisions in Werrington and in the development area were complimentary particularly as Werrington sought to possess ownership of the project.

NO outlined progress in the preparation of the Environmental Statement. He referred to a meeting of all the relevant consultants which took place two weeks previously and said work was now under way. Some of the research, for example any invasive archaeology, would be determined by the harvesting timetable. NO said that a survey for great crested newts had now been completed following unexpectedly early consent from Railtrack. Great crested newts had been found in ponds on the western side of Lincoln Road (on Railtrack land) and, therefore, the Environment Statement would include an appropriate mitigation strategy.

There was a request made for a copy of the Scoping Opinion issued by PCC. NO said that it was a public document or would become a public document on the register at such time as an application was made.

**Agreed - NO to circulate the Scoping Opinion with these Minutes.**

JG asked if any progress had been made on matters such as schools? NO said that no further progress had been made since his meeting with Tony Reinis. AW said that there were six parishes with three first schools. Glington didn't want to lose its school and needed 190+ pupils to keep it viable.

Due the way schools are managed at local level, it was agreed that it was important that the schools themselves understood emerging plans. JH said that Gary Wentworth had been appointed the Project Manager for emerging proposals for the expansion of AMVC.

NO said that the meeting with Children's Services had identified the approximate number of pupils that would be created (which appeared to be verified by the demographic study presently

in preparation) and that, armed with the approximate end population for schools, AHE would make a proposal within the Master Plan. At that time he thought it would be appropriate to discuss it with Children's Services and, in the case of AMVC, with the College itself.

NO was asked what degree of liaison there was with PCC? NO said that his initial discussions had been with Graeme Law whilst he had been Head of Planning but that he had periodic conversations with Patrick Gear in order to keep him apprised of progress. JH agreed that GL is the appropriate point of contact.

## **5. Master Plan**

AML explained the basis of the emerging Master Plan incorporating land both east and west of Lincoln Road. He identified the:

- Community Centre
- Enterprise Centre
- Landscape gaps
- Open space
- Constraints such as the gas pipeline

He emphasised the importance of the footbridge over the railway and noted the rail crossing safety issues. NO suggested that it might be useful to speak to the Police Architectural Liaison Officer at an early stage about footpath safety.

The following specific points were raised:

- AW reiterated that he would like to see the existing level crossing shut.
- JG emphasised that the community would not support an underpass under the A15 and this was universally agreed. BJ said that it would be possible to divert the existing footpaths via the existing footbridge and there was discussion about the potential to alter and add to the footbridge to provide additional links.
- Concern was raised about the potential for congestion at the junctions onto Lincoln Road and the difficulty for traffic turning out of the site in the morning.
- It was generally agreed that there should be no speed humps within the development - speed should be restrained by other design measures.
- It was said that there is a problem with the operation of heavy vehicles using Hurn Road.
- JG raised the issue of the bridleway on the west side of Lincoln Road and asked for attention to be given to preserving bridleway rights especially at junctions
- There was some discussion about the desirability of 'sustainable urban drainage'.
- There was discussion about the type of jobs likely to be created in the Enterprise Centre. JH said that there was potentially a role for discussion with Opportunities Peterborough. NO outlined the ethos of AHE which will seek to attract green-based businesses.
- There was some discussion about the relationship of the site with the potential university.
- AW raised the importance of future maintenance, as some older areas such as Ravensthorpe now look much past their prime.

- There was general agreement that proper attention be paid to parking provision – which should be sufficient and not on the street. JG said that at least one-to-one parking should be provided and it needs to avoid congestion in the roads such as occurs at Hampton.
- AW questioned the need for an emergency access and whether Covert Lane would be appropriate as it would represent a very long detour for emergency vehicles.
- JG and AW stated that the main footpaths all tended to be used in daylight but not much at night time – it was agreed that attention needs to be paid to public safety issues.
- There was discussion about how to achieve security for the railway and to manage potential for trespass. It was pointed out that Network Rail built a fence along the rail boundary last year. NO and AMC said that it was better for dwellings to face onto the railway than back onto it and that this also helped residential amenity.
- MR raised the issue of providing a range of dwellings including bungalows or sheltered accommodation. AML said that this had been noted and that the demographics showed the need to provide a full range of property types and that there likely to be a larger proportion of conventional houses than had at first been thought.
- BJ raised the issue of the aquifer in the western part of the site. The area of the aquifer is to the west of the Gas Governor Station and was shown as a surface water pond in the illustrative plan - BJ was concerned that this location for a pond might not be acceptable.
- The issue of a Park and Ride provision was identified. The location of a Park and Ride in the triangle south of AMVC was considered to be highly controversial and unlikely to be acceptable to the communities. NO said that it was “politically correct” at this stage to show that the scheme would not prejudice the future provision of a Park and Ride but confirmed that AHE do not intend to provide a scheme where there is no present justification for it from the research work done by Atkins on behalf of the City Council. The Local Councils stressed that any provision close to Glington would be unacceptable.
- JG said that Peterborough is going to get clogged up and so something must be done about traffic and it was generally considered by the Local Councils that Park and Ride and transport would be the main battle ground.

AML illustrated some typical types of development that might be provided and identified the present expectation there would only a relatively small proportion of three or possibly four-storey, the majority being conventional housing. JG said that she thought the illustrative “modernist” housing treatments drawn from New Hall, Harlow, were unlikely to be acceptable here.

**Agreed – AML note all the points raised and reports back to the Working Group in September with some cameo details of key areas such as the boulevard along the Lincoln Road, the local centre, the elderly persons’ accommodation and so forth.**

## **6. Community Governance**

TMC outlined in brief the opportunities for Community Governance through a Community Trust which would be a not-for-profit organisation.

He identified that it might incorporate a trading subsidiary which could be a registered charity and its constitution would admit both new residents and members drawn from the existing communities, including the existing Local Councils.

The Community Trust would be able to administer as much or as little as the communities thought appropriate, from the maintenance of open space, hard and soft landscaping, buildings maintenance and repair and provision such as CCTV, parking and so forth. It might offer scope for communal insurance schemes or other means of providing cost-savings to individual owners.

Membership of the Trust would be compulsory and there would be an annual fee levied but it would be up to the Trust to determine how much and how it should be spent.

AW asked how Glington would be affected. He was concerned about the need to plan and manage the open space to the north of the A15, and how much it would cost the community.

BJ said that, as this was five to seven years away, it would be impossible to tell people today what it was likely to cost in future. AW said that there was a big issue of perceived over-charging at present. NO said that the purpose of the Trust was to give control over the costs to the community who would then be able to decide how much or how little they wished the Trust to do.

JG wondered if there could be two Trusts, one for Werrington and another for Glington. TMC said this would be possible but that there might be benefits particularly to Glington of a single Trust to have control over the whole of the development and associated land.

NO suggested that, if Glington wished to minimise or even negate, any future additional burden on the parish precept, this might be achieved through permitting a modest level of development on the Glington side. There was a unanimous view that no development on the fringes of Glington would be acceptable, even as a means of offsetting any management charges for the provision of future open space.

MR raised the need for a burial ground as the only provisions available are at Stanground and Eastfields Cemetery.

**Agreed - AHE will investigate the provision of a burial ground somewhere within the development scheme.**

NO said that there was a possibility that the primary school provision could be in two parts; one school being a faith school. The question was raised as to what faith the school would have but NO said that that would need to be a matter for further consideration.

AW asked whether the scheme would include a public house. NO said that he hoped that it would but that would be a matter for some further commercial investigation.

### **7. Open Discussion**

Both participating Councils felt that their concerns on the matters under discussion had been exercised and there was no need for any specific further discussion.

### **8. Date for Next Meeting**

It was agreed that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday, 25 July 2006.

*GPC have subsequently confirmed that the meeting will be held at Glington Village Hall at 7.30 p.m.<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> NO agreed to copy the Minutes directly to JG in absence of Roy Beard from the meeting.