

# BARNACK PARISH COUNCIL

## Notes of a Public Meeting

Held in Barnack Village Hall, on Monday 12 October 2015.

To discuss the proposed development:

# West of Uffington Road.

About 100 people attended the public meeting. Prior to the meeting, leaflets asking whether residents are for or against the proposal were delivered to 441 dwellings in the Parish (excluding Burghley Park and Wittering Ford Road)

**74 were returned: 53 against the proposal, 10 in favour and 1 undecided.**

### Contents:

1. Chairman's statement
2. Comments from the Audience
3. City Councillor
4. Summary
5. Update

### 1. Chairman's opening statement:

Good evening everyone.

Before I throw the meeting open for discussion, I would just like to advise you all of the current position regarding this possible development.

- a) Gladman Developments have so far, just asked for a screening opinion from Peterborough City Council (PCC) which is basically an environmental impact assessment on their plans to build 85 houses adjacent to Payne's Field. Margaret Palmer is the expert on the screening process and I am sure could enlarge upon it if you would like her to, but I understand it is all going through OK.

The planners are unable to take any objections into account at this stage.

However the Parish Council has already lodged a letter registering our objections which will be developed and expanded upon, if this meeting agrees with us.

- b) Our main concerns are 2 fold. One: If this development goes ahead it will set a precedent for building on the edge of the village, outside the Village Envelope, with the affect that every green field site around the village will become a potential development hotspot.

And two: Our Status as a limited growth village will no longer count for anything. This was meant to limit Barnack to approximately 55 houses between 2009 and 2026. We have recently had 41 built in Payne's field, 1 in Main Street and 1 in Orchard Road and 3 are being built in Millstone Lane all of which are sensible developments within the village envelope, but already that adds up to a total of 46 and it is only 2015.

If these two safeguards alone are relegated to the dustbin there is a very real fear that the village will no longer be the village it is now but it will become a developers dream and grow in size at an alarming rate.

- c) So far Gladman have not put in an outline planning application, although we expect one in the next week or two and when they do the PCC planners will ask for comments, which they can then take into account.
- d) There is of course another side to this argument and that is that another development may well be good for the School, the Church and the Pub and if the Post Office is taken over it may be good for that also. It should also be noted that the Village would receive substantial CIL money (Community Infrastructure Levy – a contribution made by the developer to PCC – and the Parish receives 15%) So we would like to hear from anyone who is in favour of this Plan for those or other reasons.
- e) Now, if you had asked me a fortnight ago, what are our chances of stopping this development, assuming that is what we all want, I would have replied Very Good. However since then, PCC have started drawing up their 2016 – 2020 local plan, and they are now indicating that their Land Bank is not going to cover their new allocation of houses, so something is going to have to give and I see in the paper today that David Cameron has said that, if Local Councils have not found enough land by 2017, that he will find it for them.  
Also at the Conservative conference the Chancellor was very busy saying ‘we are the builders’ and indeed, he has appointed Lord Adonis a Labour Peer, to oversee the relaxation of planning regulations to ensure that building plans go through. So even if this is refused by PCC planners, Gladman will almost certainly go to appeal and then what?
- f) If I can just finish by saying, Barnack Parish Council is not opposed to the growth of our village, but we are in favour of controlled growth within the Village Envelope, which this proposal would not be. With the building of Payne’s field and this proposal together, the village will already have grown by over a third, 131 houses, within a very short space of time.

## **2. Comments from the audience:**

- a) What type of houses will the proposed estate consist of?
- b) Gladman’s website shows brutality in acquiring land, even offering money to farmers.
- c) Asking residents to respond to by simply replying for or against is not conducive to a good discussion. I am in favour of the proposed development.
- d) Affordable housing is included and we could ask for a substantial contribution to traffic calming.
- e) Is the School full? Response: No, the Head Teacher has stated that there are plenty of places. Also, a developer could offer to fund building of another classroom.

- f) As Head Teacher of Barnack School in 1982, we had 92 pupils and there were thoughts of amalgamating with Helpston School. The School now has 170 pupils. Regulations may have changed on class sizes but we want it to remain a village school.
- g) Every member of the School staff knows every pupil, if it grows, we will lose this.
- h) Example of uncontrolled growth, as Hampton has grown, the township centre is becoming tired and tatty.
- i) Affordable housing is great but we need jobs and public transport. Kids won't be able to live here without them.
- j) Uffington Road wasn't improved to cope with the increase in traffic when Paynes Field was built.
- k) Most people came here to live in a village not a township.
- l) Do we have a position statement from Burghley regarding the development?
- m) Traffic – development will produce 160 cars, Uffington Road is a real problem.
- n) More houses would make crossing at rear of School even more dangerous.
- o) How do we act as a group?
- p) We need a power group to organise our efforts. Response: It is the Parish Council's role to take the lead.
- q) I feel this is a done deal, why not collaborate with other parishes?
- r) Public opinion does not carry much weight, we must object on purely planning grounds and we need professional advice. Response: Good idea we will look into it.
- s) Stay optimistic, a vigorous campaign is needed.
- t) Who do we contact to get a pressure group going?
- u) Why not write now to planners?
- v) Community Radio is open to items about Barnack.
- w) How many people object because of closeness to the development site?
- x) I am in full support of the Parish Council, no good having little groups – comments must relate to planning law.
- y) Parish Council must tell us immediately application is made.

### **3. David Over, City Councillor for Barnack Ward.**

- a) I take it from comments received that most of you are against the development.
- b) I recently met Brandon Lewis, Housing Minister, and asked, what about Local Plans? He replied, 'the intention is not to build in villages but to use brown field land.'
- c) Although Peterborough has a Local Plan, planning officers are very worried indeed.
- d) Residents should write to planners after the application has been made.
- e) If application is rejected by PCC, Gladman will probably appeal, if it is turned down by Government Inspector, then they can go to the High Court. This could cost PCC a great deal of money.
- f) It is no good talking about utilities or roads because relevant organisations have to provide. Stick to accurate statements and arguments on planning grounds.
- g) I implore you all to support the Parish Council.

- h) But, wait for the application to be made and write individually to planning officers and members of the planning committee.
- i) A PCC Cabinet Member recently stated, 'there is plenty of land around Peterborough for housing.'
- j) I stress, writing now has no impact but once the application is made, write and keep writing and attend planning committee hearings.
- k) It is better not to correspond with the developer, any information they get will be used against us and they may submit 2 applications, one may be tweaked depending on information received.
- l) Petitions have been shown not to work, we need lots of individual letters.
- m) The planning committee consists of 12 City Councillors, they will have no sympathy with Barnack as a rural Parish, it is important to bombard them with individual communications.
- n) Recently a developer wanted to build south of the A43, the application was turned down by planners as there is land in plenty elsewhere.
- o) Villages are an asset to Peterborough, **this proposal can be stopped.**

#### 4. Summary

If you want to be kept informed, send the Clerk your email address at [barnackparishcouncil@outlook.com](mailto:barnackparishcouncil@outlook.com)

Show of hands revealed all except one against the proposed development.

Please do not write to Gladman, they will use everything and anything against us.

As soon as the planning application is received, notices will be placed on the Parish Council notice boards and website ([barnackparishcouncil.org](http://barnackparishcouncil.org))

Once the planning application has been submitted, write to PCC.

The Parish Council will fight the proposal with all means at its disposal.

If you need any information please contact the Clerk: Telephone 07944 054546

Email [barnackparishcouncil@outlook.com](mailto:barnackparishcouncil@outlook.com)

#### 5. Update

Screening Opinion:

Gladman Developments Ltd. Has requested a Screening Opinion from PCC to find out whether the proposed development would require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) PCC has replied saying, 'It is not considered that the development would have significant environmental effects and as such an EIA is not required.'