

Review of the Castor Neighbourhood Plan (CNP). 2024.

Introduction

1. The CNP was adopted in December 2017. The plan includes a statement that it will be reviewed every 5 years. This is to ensure it is kept up to date and carries the most possible weight in determining planning applications.
2. Clarification has been sought from Peterborough City Council Planning Department on how this review should take place. A summary of this advice is contained in Appendix 1 below. The advice was confirmed by Peterborough City Council as Local Planning Authority on 13 December 2023, see Appendix 2 below.
3. This note provides a written review of the Policies in the CNP and, as a consequence of that review, a proposal to make a “material modification” which does not change the nature of the Plan.
4. **The one change proposed is in paragraph 34 below. There is also one typing correction proposed in paragraphs 37 and 38).**
5. The vision for the Parish, as stated in the CNP in 2036, remains the same.
6. To progress this modification it was necessary to undertake a consultation exercise under regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. The Parish Council has therefore consulted with businesses and landowners who are directly effected, and Statutory consultees. This list includes: Country Court Care, Starleen Investments Ltd, Nene Park Trust, Peterborough City Council as landowner, Environment Agency, Natural England, Heritage England, Anglia Water, and Sport England.
7. All consultees had 6 weeks to make representations which needed to be made by Friday 19th April 2024 to The Clerk, Castor Parish Council, 22 Borrowdale Close, Gunthorpe, Peterborough PE4 7YA or by email to clerk@castor-pc.gov.uk
8. Responses to the consultation have been received from:
 - Nene Park Trust: objection (appendix 3)
 - Natural England: No comments (see appendix 4)
 - Environment Agency: No comments (see appendix 5)
 - Anglian Water: No comments (see appendix 6)
9. Of these responses only one is considered to be potentially substantive which is the comment from The Nene Park Trust. The Parish Council response to this comment is in appendix 7. The Parish Council does not consider that any of the responses require any change to the procedure.
10. The Parish Council now wish the Peterborough City Council to proceed to the next stage of an examination to consider the changes.
11. The Parish Council acknowledge the relationship of the Castor NP with the Ailsworth NP and will liaise with Ailsworth PC to ensure coordination with a Minor Amendment to the Ailsworth NP which is also progressing.
12. The Parish Council expects to undertake the next review 5 years from adoption of this review, or earlier if deemed necessary due to changes in the Peterborough Local Plan.

Review of Policies

CH1 Criteria for all building development within the parish

13. Since the adoption of the Plan there has been a period of time during which there was no scheduled public bus services through the village. However a new scheduled service, although different, has started.
14. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and there is no reason to change the policy.

CH2. Housing Growth

15. The Plan allows for a total of 30 new homes between 2017 and 2036, which should be designed in accordance the village character.
16. To date:
 - 1 new dwelling has been granted planning permission at 35a Peterborough Road
 - The development of the Castor Lodge care home (C2 use) has been granted planning permission at Woodlands and counts as the equivalent of 49 new homes (using a 1.5 ratio as indicated by Peterborough City Council Planning Department)
 - As part of the same planning permission the conversion of the existing Woodlands building to C2 use counts as 16 units.
17. Applications for homes at 45 Peterborough Road and on Mill Lane have been refused as they did not fit the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.
18. The purpose of this policy was to limit the number of new homes to a level higher than that envisaged in the Local Plan through carefully chosen development adjoining the village envelope, rather than just within the village envelope. The number of new homes planned has been exceeded through the development of Castor Lodge. This was supported by the parish. While we have therefore exceeded our target before the end date of the Plan, this is not seen as a reason to specifically increase this target. This is especially the case for three reasons:
 - a. The homes granted permission have not all yet been built and may take a while to be completed.
 - b. The policy does allow for exceeding the target if there is clear community support.
 - c. Local Plan policies will continue to allow suitable development within the village envelope, though not outside the envelope. As there are still potential sites within the village envelope there is still the potential for further new homes.
19. Therefore the policy still seem relevant and appropriate and there is no reason to change the policy.

Policy CLU 1 Environmental Impact

20. No matters relating to this policy have changed. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and therefore there is no reason to change this policy.

Policy CLU2 Wildlife corridors

21. No matters relating to this policy have changed. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and therefore there is no reason to change this policy.

Policy CLU3 Open Spaces

22. Planning permission has been obtained for a new cricket pavilion on the Castor Recreation Ground. This was supported by the parish council as a necessary improvement to the existing recreational use.

23. The Parish council has completed improvements, including tree planting and pond creation, to the wildlife habitat at Tween Towns.

24. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and there is no reason to change the policy.

Policy CLU4. Protection of the historic environment

25. No matters relating to this policy have changed. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and therefore there is no reason to change this policy.

Policy CSE 1. Retail and business development

26. No matters relating to this policy have changed. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and therefore there is no reason to change this policy. A typing error does need correcting which is explained in paragraphs 37 and 38 below.

Policy CSE 2 Working from Home

27. No matters relating to this policy have changed. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and therefore there is no reason to change this policy.

Policy CSE3 Education

28. No matters relating to this policy have changed. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and therefore there is no reason to change this policy.

Policy CSE4. Health care

29. No matters relating to this policy have changed. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and therefore there is no reason to change this policy.

Policy CRV1. Rural recreation and sport

30. Since the adoption of the NP planning permission has been granted for the change of use to, and development of, C2 use (residential care) on part of the Woodlands site. This has involved the construction of an entirely new building on the south side of the original Woodlands Sports and Leisure building and the intended conversion of the original building. The new build has been completed and is occupied but the conversion has not yet been implemented. A condition of the planning permission was that temporary changing facilities, to replace the loss of the changing room facilities in the original building, needed to be provided to serve the outdoor playing fields. The Planning Officers report recommending approval of the Care Home application concluded that the development would “enable the redundant Woodland Centre to be brought back into beneficial use providing sports facilities to be used by local residents and the wider community”.
31. Temporary changing facilities have been provided and the outdoor playing fields are used to a greater extent than previously.
32. It is therefore considered that the proviso for development indicated as attracting support in the third paragraph of policy CRV1 has been achieved.
33. Therefore the quantity of “some” development in the third paragraph of Policy CRV1 is considered to be the existing C2 use and development (as granted planning permission, or as varied to be similar in impact). Any further development is unlikely to be supported unless accompanied by evidence of clear local community support for the proposed scheme (demonstrated through a thorough and proportionate pre application community consultation exercise).
34. In line with Policy CH2, in respect of proposals which might exceed expectations, it is therefore proposed to add the following wording as a modification to policy CRV1:

“As a consequence of planning permission having been granted for C2 use and development on the Woodlands site the quantity of “some” development in the third paragraph of Policy CRV1 is considered to be the existing C2 use and development (as granted planning permission, or as varied to be similar in impact). Any further development is unlikely to be supported unless accompanied by evidence of clear local community support for the proposed scheme (demonstrated through a thorough and proportionate pre application community consultation exercise).”

Policy CRV2 Footpaths, cycleways and bridleways.

35. No matters relating to this policy have changed. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate and therefore there is no reason to change this policy.

Policy CRV3. Visitor Access

36. A substantial part of the Nene Park Rural Estate has been moved from arable farming to Sheep pasture. It is not considered that this has any significant implications for access. The policy still seems relevant and appropriate. It is considered therefore that there is no reason to change this policy.

Correcting an error

37. Policy CSE 1 refers to policy AH1. AH1 is the similar policy in the Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan which was prepared at the same time. When editing the policy in the CNP the reference was not changed. **In the CNP this should refer to policy CH1, not AH1.**
38. It is recommended that this is corrected as a minor (non-material) modification.

21 June 2024

Appendix 1

Informal meeting held on 21 July 2022 re- Castor & Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plans (NPs)

Present: David Shaw, CPC; Phil Hylton, PCC and John Hodder

APC & CPC had each informally considered the policies in their respective NPs during 2021 and recorded in the summary of their joint informal meeting held on 30 September 2021 that they were content that the non-housing policies in each were operating effectively. Recent planning approvals for Ailsworth also indicated that its housing policies were also on track and the Care Home development in Castor also meant that its NP housing target was catered for.

At the subsequent joint meeting on 8 June 2022 it was confirmed the joint village fete would be held in July and provide villagers with an opportunity to comment on PC matters including the NPs. The PCs also agreed that early contact with the NP adviser at PCC would be needed to clarify what a review process might entail. On behalf of the two PCs David Shaw arranged an informal meeting with the current PCC point of contact for NP matters, Phil Hylton, to cover an outline agenda as numbered below.

1. Clarify what the latest regulations are re-NPs and what specific requirements there are for NP review.

The NP Act and Regulations continue to be subject to frequent updates and change and can be found at: [Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017](#)
[Neighbourhood Planning \(General\) Regulations 2012 as amended](#)

NP Guidance is also available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2>

Phil confirmed that there were no requirements for a NP to be formally reviewed if it was considered to be functioning properly.

2. Both NPs conclude by stating that they will be reviewed every five years. When last discussed both PCs seemed to feel that the plans were working well and didn't envisage the need for change, so how formal does the review need to be and who should be consulted?

Even though both the Ailsworth & Castor NPs refer to review every five years this could be a relatively informal process. For example, each PC could formally consider their NP at one of their usual public meetings and if no change was considered necessary simply record the fact in their minutes. The nature of each review would depend on the extent of any changes that might be proposed and there were three types of modification which could be made.

- **Minor (non-material) modifications** which would not materially affect the policies in the plan, which may include correcting errors, would not require examination or a referendum.
- **Material modifications** would require examination but not a referendum if they are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan.
- **Material modifications which do change the nature of the plan or order** would require examination and a referendum.

3. CPC may wish to clarify the interpretation of one of the Castor NP policies without altering its original intent.

David outlined that policy CRV1 of the Castor NP might require clarification of the reference to "some development of parts of the Woodlands site" in the third paragraph. Phil's view was that this would fall in the **second category of modification and would require examination but not a referendum**. He

suggested the best approach would be to add a new NP policy to cover the point rather than simply adding words of clarification.

It would not need a detailed consultation process but he suggested that CPC should consult with the various owners of Woodlands on the proposal and hopefully gain their acceptance. It should also be discussed, agreed and recorded at a formal CPC meeting prior to submission of a short paper outlining the position to PCC, for their consideration under the second category of modification. Phil would be happy to comment on proposals as they were developed.

4. A sentence is missing from the Heading 'Housing Growth' in section 7.4 of the final version of the Ailsworth NP.

The following sentence was somehow omitted from the final version of the Ailsworth NP:

"The Parish Council will work with developers and the Local Authority to deliver the envisaged incremental growth over the Plan period."

This could be added to correct the omission and in Phil's view was **a minor (non-material) modification, i.e. it would not require examination or a referendum**. It would need to be discussed and recorded at a formal APC meeting and the PC would then need to submit a statement to PCC to consider and make an appropriate amendment to the adopted NP.

5. When will the 2021 Census figures for the two parishes be available?

Some 2021 Census information was now available but not detail at parish level. It was anticipated that it would become available in 2023 and would be available online.

Finally, Planning services at PCC were currently being reorganized and a review of the Peterborough Local Plan would probably commence next year. PCs could register their interest in having an input to proposals.

Appendix 2

Email from PCC dated 13 December 2023

.....
Castor Neighbourhood Plan- It would also appear that this would fall within the second category of modification and would require examination but not a referendum

- A typing error was subsequently noticed in the Castor NP, to correct an erroneous reference in Policy CSE1 to refer to CH1 rather than AH1.
- In line with Policy CH2, in respect of proposals which might exceed expectations, it is therefore proposed to add the following wording as a modification to policy CRV1:

"As a consequence of planning permission having been granted for C2 use and development on the Woodlands site the quantity of "some" development in the third paragraph of Policy CRV1 is considered to be the existing C2 use and development (as granted planning permission, or as varied to be similar in impact). Any further development is unlikely to be supported unless accompanied by evidence of clear local community support for the proposed scheme (demonstrated through a thorough and proportionate pre application community consultation exercise)."

There is a slight material modification here, that would ultimately appear to require the examination, but not so far as to require a referendum. Therefore, I would agree with Phil Hylton's previous comments to you.

"The two NPs each refer in some ten places to the former joint NP website which has since been closed. The various evidence documents are now shown on each of the PCs' websites. The closure of the joint NP website was notified to PCC at the time and, in lieu of amending the two NPs, a note was added against the two NP entries on the PCC website as follows: "Please note: the joint Castor and Ailsworth Neighbourhood Plan website is now closed. To view other related evidence, please contact the parish council." Depending on how PCC feels that the modifications now proposed should appear against the NP entries on the PCC Website, should these outdated references to the joint NP website also be amended".- I would suggest leaving as it is for now, until further changes are made.

Kind regards,

Maria Salemme BSc(Hons), MSc
Strategic Planning Officer
Place and Economy
Peterborough City Council
Sand Martin House, Bittern Way, Peterborough, PE2 8TY

Appendix 3

Email from NPT dated 19 April 2024

From: Andrew MacDermott <Andrew.Macdermott@neneparktrust.org.uk>

Sent: 19 April 2024 09:01

To: clerk@castor-pc.gov.uk

Cc: maria.salemme@peterborough.gov.uk; planningpolicy@peterborough.gov.uk

Subject: RE: Castor NP Review consultation

Dear John,

Thank you for contacting us on the 29th February with regards your proposed Neighbourhood Plan policy change in relation to Woodlands.

We note the Parish Council consider the change to be minor, however we disagree and see this as a distinct, significant and deliberately limiting change which is not in line with the original policy of enhancing facilities on site. As CPC and NPT have an ongoing relationship in relation to many matters, the nature of this consultation also appears limited when Councillors could very easily have discussed these proposals informally with the Trust over the last 18 months whilst they have been engaging PCC before proposing them in this formal manner.

The review document dated January 2024, notes the installation of **temporary** changing facilities and states levels of use are “to a greater extent than previously.” It is important to note that by their very nature, temporary facilities will need viable long term replacement to enable continuing sports use which would be in line with the existing policy CRV2. It is also important to note the use levels are not greater than when the facility was fully operational, however they are clearly greater than when the site was derelict and are providing significant positive impact for local communities. This supports the community feedback included within the Neighbourhood Plan indicating 91% support the improvement of local sport facilities and 87% wanted to see Woodlands Sports Centre brought into full use.

It is clear in the original Neighbourhood Plan policy that the reference to “some” development was linked to the provision and enhancement of recreational facilities as stated in CRV2. Whilst a level of development has occurred on the site it has yet to create permanent sports provision or enhance recreational facilities, therefore the implied level of “some” development cannot have been reached. Therefore a change to this policy would be premature and contradictory to the intent and spirit of the original policy.


In light of the above Nene Park Trust are not in agreement with this change and do not support it.

Kind regards.

Andrew

Appendix 4

Email from NE dated 17 April 2024

<p>Date: 17 April 2024 Our ref: 468689 Yourref: CastorNeighbourhoodPlan</p>	
<p>Mr John Haste Castor Parish Council</p> <p>BY EMAIL ONLY</p> <p>clerk@castor-pc.gov.uk</p>	<p>Hornbeam House Crewe Business Park Electra Way Crewe Cheshire CW1 6GJ</p> <p>T 0300 060 3900</p>

Dear Mr Haste

Castor Neighbourhood Plan - Review Regulation 14 Consultation

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 29 February 2024.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and to the following information.

Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in [Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species](#) .

Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission [standing advice](#).

We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.

Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.

For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely Sally Wintle Consultations Team

Appendix 5

Email from EA dated 5 March 2024

From: Crawford, Amelia <Amelia.Crawford@environment-agency.gov.uk> **Sent:** 05 March 2024 13:08
To: clerk@castor-pc.gov.uk **Subject:** RE: Castor NP Review consultation

Dear John

Thank you for your email.

We have no observations or comments to make on the proposed amendments to the Castor Neighbourhood Plan.

Kind regards

Amelia Crawford

Planning Advisor

Environment Agency | Sustainable Places | Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire Area

✉ Nene House, Pytchley Lodge Road, Kettering, Northants, NN15 6J

Appendix 6

Email from AW dated 1 March 2024

From: Carry Murphy <cMurphy5@anglianwater.co.uk>
Sent: 01 March 2024 16:40
To: clerk@castor-pc.gov.uk
Subject: Re. Castor NP Review - Anglian Water Services response

Dear Parish Clerk,

Thank you for consulting Anglian Water Services on the modification being undertaken to the Castor Neighbourhood Plan. I am writing to confirm that we have no comments to make on this occasion.

Please do not hesitate to contact myself in the Sustainable Growth Team regarding any neighbourhood plan related matters. I have also been in touch with PCC to inform them I am the main point of contact for such.

Kind regards,

Carry Murphy

Chartered Town Planner - MRTPI
Spatial and Strategic Planning Manager – Sustainable Growth

Quality & Environment

Appendix 7

Response to NPT comment

It is noted that the NPT state that the Parish Council consider the proposed modification to be minor. This was an expression used by the Clerk in his email accompanying a request for comments. However the document sent out for consultation makes it clear in paragraph 3 that the modification is a “material modification”, as confirmed by Peterborough City Council.

The purpose of the proposed change is to ensure that policy CRV1 is not used to support further development of the site for non sporting uses or what is often termed “enabling” development. Such development is often proposed to create funds which can then be diverted into other non profitable schemes.

The Parish Council policy on Woodlands has also been provided in the “Woodlands Development Guidance” which was sent to The Trust on 7 February 2022. (see below).

In terms of consultation procedures the Parish Council has had public meetings about Woodlands that the NPT have been to. They have all been arranged by the Parish Council. The NPT have not arranged any of their own consultation within the village. It is noted by the Castor Parish Council that The NPT has not discussed changes they have made to their current pending planning application with the Parish. The Parish Council as a publicly accountable body has made clear its position on Woodlands while the NPT has no public accountability.

Email to NPT 7 February 2022

Subject: Woodlands Development

From: clerk@castor-pc.gov.uk

To: matthew.bradbury@neneparktrust.org.uk, david.hicks@countrycourtcare.com

CC: "neil Boyce" <neil.boyce@castor-pc.gov.uk>, "David Shaw" <david.shaw@castor-pc.gov.uk>

Date: 07/02/2022 22:39

Dear Matthew and David

We have previously sent you a record note of our Village meeting on 30th November 2021. The Parish Council have subsequently discussed the content of your presentation and the Village meeting at their meetings on the 2nd December and 6th January. The Council has prepared a note which I attach. This has been prepared to provide context within which the Parish Council will consider any formal planning application. We hope this will be helpful.

I would also like to emphasise at this stage that the Parish Council continues to consider it is very important that the Woodlands site is considered comprehensively and that development is not on a piecemeal basis.

John Haste, CPFA, CiLCA

Woodlands Development Guidance

This note has been prepared following draft proposals presented by Nene Park Trust and Country Court Care at the public meeting held at Castor Village Hall on 30 November 2021. The note does not represent any view on any planning applications which may be made. It is intended to provide guidance on two key issues. Full planning policies are available in the relevant Development Plan documents.

There are two main issues

1. The setting of the village, bearing in mind in particular the Conservation Area.
2. The Climate Emergency

Dealing firstly with the setting of the village

1. Planning laws require any development which effects the setting of the Conservation Area to take into account any harm on that setting. For example, the recent planning appeal at 45 Peterborough Road (Peterborough City Council ref 20/00775/FUL), which immediately adjoins Woodlands, determined that the setting of the Conservation Area was important in the decision to refuse planning permission for a single dwelling, mainly due to the loss of trees.

Policy CRV1 of the Neighbourhood Plan

2. Planning policy CRV1 of the Neighbourhood Plan is as follows: Proposals which involve some development of parts of Woodlands site will be supported providing that the recreational facilities identified above (*such as cricket, football and other ball games, tennis and lawn bowls*) are enhanced and the development does not create significant extra traffic, or harm the amenities of the village or landscape setting of the village. Any development should accord with policy CH1. Key elements of policy CH1 are that proposals should identify the realistic levels of traffic likely to be generated and assess the potential impact on pedestrians, cyclists, road safety, parking and congestion and demonstrate clearly how they include measures to mitigate any impacts, maximise opportunities to walk and cycle, as well as supporting public transport where possible. Incorporate relevant design criteria in Appendix 1 (Checklist for development site assessment).

In summary this policy would potentially provide a reason for refusing development that does not sympathise with the landscape setting of the village, which is a heritage asset.

Policy LP 24 of the Peterborough Local Plan

3. Policy LP 24 of the Peterborough Local Plan (Nene Valley) is as follows: supports development that will safeguard and enhance recreation and/or bring landscape, nature conservation, heritage, cultural or amenity benefits. The proposals will need to be appropriate in terms of use, scale and character within its townscape or landscape setting. There will be a general emphasis on development involving low impact, informal activities in the rural area of the Valley.

In summary this policy would potentially provide a reason for refusing development that does not sympathise with the landscape setting of the village if it is out of scale and the use does not fit with the rural area that surrounds Castor

4. Given this context it should be understood that the original “Planning” of Woodlands was based on the buildings and “hard” areas being on the east side of the Woodlands site, softened by existing and new landscaping. This reduced the impact on the Conservation area with a large open “Green” sward being retained on the west side.
5. The new proposals break with this by bringing new hard areas, fencing, and new buildings into this green sward, potentially changing its character.
6. Any new development should minimise development in this sward, and new planting could potentially soften any new structures.

Dealing secondly with the climate emergency.

1. The City Council has formally agreed as part of its Climate Emergency actions to use planning powers to deliver net zero carbon new development and increase tree planting.
2. In general the proposals could create a much more intense use than previously. (It is currently unexplained as to what happens to the existing tennis courts and bowling greens. Until this is determined it can only be assumed, in planning terms, that they remain as the current use. They thus should be included in any traffic analysis as continuing to generate traffic). This would increase carbon use.
3. The care home proposals on balance reduce the traffic movements to the site compared to the original Pearl facility (see traffic note below). However the outdoor sports proposals will have two impacts. Firstly that the vast majority of users will come by car. There is no public transport and most users will be from outside the village so walking and cycling is not easy. Secondly more land will be “hard’ and the grass pitches will be more intensively used, requiring more carbon use.
4. In order to reach a “zero” carbon development then options potentially include reusing existing facilities, attracting fewer car born visitors, developing less new “hard” areas, and planting more trees.

Other issues which were raised at the meeting and which also need discussion are:

Traffic impact on Splash Lane: A note on traffic is provided below. However the experience of a major football event in June 2021 which caused severe problems suggest that some strong management controls are needed.

Energy efficiency: should national requirements be bettered?

Access to the village: how could this be improved?

Programme for development: need to be informed

Lighting: what amenity impact will any lighting have?

Adhering to Planning Conditions: some planning conditions applied to the Care Home permission may not be being adhered to.

Note on Traffic

1. According to standard traffic analysis which was agreed for the original planning permission for the care home, the following amounts of traffic would be expected from the original Pearl centre:

For the **outdoor sports**; between 26 and 228 traffic movements per day.

- a. This was based on:
- b. Summer; 2 cricket pitches, 4 tennis courts, 1 bowling green and 1 all weather pitch
- c. Winter; 4 grass pitches, and 1 all weather pitch

For the **indoor leisure centre**: between 436 and 1112 traffic movements per day

2. This gives a **total** of between. 462 and 1254 traffic movements per day.
3. The analysis for the proposed fully built out **care home**, is 269 traffic movements per day.
4. There is no analysis yet for the new NPT proposals.
5. The above figures all exclude construction traffic.

Note on land ownership (information from Land Registry):

The freeholder is Peterborough City Council. There is a long lease of 999 years from 1988 to the Nene Park Trust. The NPT have leased the east part of the site (where the Care Home , car park, original Tennis Courts and Bowling green, to Starleen Ltd for 970 years from 2017 for a sum of £365,000 plus VAT. This has in turn been leased by Starleen to CCC for 969 years for a sum of £2,100,000.

January 2022.