

## **19/00836/OUT – Summary of public representations**

### **Original consultation (comments received between 21/08/19 to 26/02/19)**

139 representations received; 137 objections 2 support

#### **Objections**

##### Principle of development / Local Plan Policy

- The Local Plan allocation is for 250 dwellings or fewer. At 300 dwellings, the scheme is an overdevelopment of the site, which prevents sufficient open space from being incorporated and would have a significant impact on the village.
- The developer has not met Policy LP40 specifically the 8 key principle to be met at this outline planning stage.
- The site was allocated for 250 or less dwellings dependent on traffic analysis.
- There should be a comprehensive Master Plan for the whole area and this plan should have a high level of engagement with the local community.
- Alternative places in Peterborough must be looked at for development and not Eye.
- Aren't there brown field sites that could be developed first? There are empty buildings in Peterborough.
- I feel no one is listening to people from our village, yet other small villages can successfully reject plans for fewer new houses.

##### Traffic/ Highway safety

###### a. Traffic

- The traffic on Eyebury Road is already very busy and dangerous at peak times with the traffic calming causing more of an issue than help. More homes/ cars would cause even more chaos.
- Objects to the entrance to the site shown as a T Junction, this needs to be traffic lights as due to the rat run down Eyebury Rd residents will not be able to get out of the site in the morning rush hour.
- Not only is Eyebury Road used for the school and preschool, it is a very busy road into Fengate and other parts of Peterborough. I believe Fengate also has plans in the pipeline for major growth, so that will increase the use of Eyebury Road too.
- The road from the village towards Fengate is single track with passing places and is already over used causing issues.
- The road itself, as it exits the village towards Oxney Road, is not a fully two way road and has a section where vehicles have to use passing places. In the early morning traffic is continually backed up to the roundabout at the junction with the High Street and Thorney Road.
- Fears safety for children.
- No traffic calming measures proposed.
- The increase in number of houses from 250 to 300 will cause huge traffic problems in an already busy village. This could have 500+ more vehicles and Eyebury Road is not suitable for more traffic.
- Eyebury Road had a small development namely Bowberry Close which took three + years to obtain planning consent over contentious issues raised by Peterborough Highways ref. the dangers of Eyebury Road and the impact of cars for a development of 7 properties,

yet at the Larkfleet / Highways meeting with village residents Highways officials regarded that Eyebury Road was now suitable for this huge development.

- The traffic in the High Street where I live is busy and there is a constant flow at rush hour coming off the A47 and down Eyebury Road. There should be no further expansion until an improvement in travel infrastructure e.g. dualling of A47, preferably with traffic coming off before reaching Eye to get to the Parkway and reinstatement of rail line between Peterborough and Wisbech.
- Emergency vehicles won't be able to get through.
- A stranded lorry near the church brought Eye to a standstill for many hours.
- Changing road access to a new exit out to Thorney combined with pedestrian only access to the school, Eyebury road and the right of way adjacent to Fountains Place would create a healthier environment for residents, local children and the public as well as preventing much of the additional traffic issues on Eyebury road. This could be accomplished through a compulsory purchase of the land at the Thorney road/A47 end of the development.
- There is so much traffic in the village, especially Eyebury Road which is the school road. It is unsafe as it is and there is nowhere near enough parking. The village simply cannot cope with another 300 dwellings and a possible 300 plus more vehicles on the road increasing furthermore the current traffic issues.
- I can't see where the workers would park. Also this road has been closed for articulated vehicles from the quarry so that tells you it's not suitable for the extra volumes of traffic and size of vehicles required to carry materials for this type of development. The impact this will have on everyone in the village will be catastrophic.
- The pavement on the right hand side of Thorney Road, in front of the Sandleford Drive development, took a very long time to be completed and caused additional traffic problems.
- Having the cut through from Anglesey Way will just bring unwanted/ needed pedestrian traffic through, as there is already an issue with cars flying down there.
- The existing public right of way through the middle of site is upgraded to a footway/ cycleway to provide connectivity to Thorney Road, although it is noted by PCC that this currently appears to be unachievable as an adopted route to the north cannot be provided.
- Access to the school car park and drop off needs to be reviewed.
- Proposed access points for pedestrians and cyclists are not available because the Council have not adopted the locations.
- The proposed masterplan road layout does not constrain vehicle speeds to an acceptable level for a new residential development with high numbers of vulnerable highway users.
- The development will slowly but surely increase flows of traffic down the high street onto the A47 and onto Eyebury Road, which is not sustainable. Eyebury is a rat run for traffic between the A47 and Peterborough's Eastern Industry which will be further impacted by the pending development at Red Brick Farm.
- Eyebury Road is very busy especially at school times and the village is used as a rat run with heavy traffic at certain times of the day. There is nowhere to park for the houses and the school, and with more houses you are just increasing the traffic on an already very dangerous road.
- There has been inadequate parking facilities provided by this developer in recent developments, with reduced road width which means many cars are parking on pavements and residents with pushchairs and mobility scooters and those by sight problems have to go into the road to pass.
- Peterborough Road is also a problem for the village, with many people using the village to cut through due to the increase in congestion on this road.

- The village is a maximum capacity and already driving through and out of Eye is a problem.
- The possibility of over 500+ cars this will make traffic congestion through the village unbearable. Have any checks been done to see what the traffic is already like at busy times?
- Inadequate parking facilities due to overdevelopment of the site.
- Speeding issues on Thorney Road and Eyebury Road.
- No mention of how the Public Right of Way footpath running through the site will be kept open during the years of building these houses.
- The proposed site access point is dangerous. After the introduction of the 20mph zone along Eyebury Rd PCC conducted a detailed traffic survey on Eyebury Rd between the Feb 14th & 21st 2013. The data was collected at the junction of Little Close & Eyebury Road. It was within 20 metres of the proposed access road junction. In the Northbound direction 8.4% of the traffic was measured as travelling between 36 & 46 mph. 0.4% was travelling in excess of 47mph. Southbound 21% of the traffic was measured travelling between 36 & 46 mph with 1.5% of traffic travelling in excess of 47mph. There is nothing in the planning proposal to slow the traffic down. Moving the chicane that is near Field house further South will bring it much closer to the blind corner at the Southern end of the proposed development and I'm concerned that without alterations to the road to reduce the speed of traffic i.e. removal of the chicanes and installation of raised ramps, the proposals will make the road significantly more dangerous.

- 

b. Transport Assessment (TA)

- Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development can be accessed in a safe and convenient manner by both sustainable modes and by private car.
- The road safety audit carried out was done at a time that does not show the true volume of traffic that uses Eyebury Road, 30<sup>th</sup> July 2020 was not only school holidays but also Covid restrictions were in place. There should be another audit at school drop off/pick up in term time and at peak rush hour, morning and evening.
- The TA does not demonstrate that the impact of the development on the public highway will not be severe, and requires additional work to enable a full assessment of the impact of the proposals.
- The TAs undertaken to date are inadequate and understate the existing pressures. Fundamental problems in the scheme's design cannot be remedied by a later, more detailed transport plan or a slight reduction in dwellings.
- The TA that has been done does not reflect the actuality of the village today; it was carried out before the developments on Thorney Road were finished, and does not take into account the additional traffic that the 100 new houses being built will bring.
- The TA does not demonstrate that the impact of the development on the public highway will not be severe, and requires additional work to enable a full assessment of the impact of the proposals.
- A comparison of modelled and observed queue lengths for each junction model should be provided where possible.
- LOS values should therefore be reported alongside RFC values in all instances within the main body of the TA to ensure that junction performance can still be sufficiently assessed.
- There is no detailed signal controller information from PCC for the Eastfield Road / Eye Road / Parkway Slip Signals (Appendix T). A cycle time of 180 seconds has been assumed however a maximum cycle time of 120 seconds would be expected at most signalised junctions.

- Further work is required to determine the proposed school trip rates and mode share based on current pupils and staff travel patterns.
- It is difficult to determine the true impact of the development when assessed with committed developments. To understand the impact of this development on the highway network, an additional scenario for each junction needs to be modelled that considers future year background growth plus the proposed development traffic only.
- No further comments can be made on highway impact until the additional scenario (Future Year plus development flows) modelling has been undertaken.
- It would be more appropriate to use 15 minute flow profiles for OD-TAB, to identify where junctions are over capacity and then use one hour flow profiles to understand whether the potential for peak spreading would keep the respective junction within capacity.
- The TA does not demonstrate the impact of the proposed development on the highway network. Whilst there are 'committed developments' at both 'Phase 2 Perkins', and 'Red Brick Farm' in that they are both allocated sites in the Local Plan, neither of these sites currently has planning consent (although applications have been submitted) and as such they may not be developed until after this site. As a result, the LHA would expect the TA to show the impact of this development without those sites, as well as the information provided including the sites.

#### Infrastructure

- There is inadequate information on the s106 contributions required to increase primary and secondary school capacity and provide sufficient community health and GP coverage.
- Whilst a hectare of land is being given to the school, they are taking more than that away from the school by putting a road through the current playing fields which don't think anyone other than the new development residents will use.
- The doctors Surgery, dentist and school are already full (even though there are plans to extend the School), Doctors simply can't accommodate a further 300-600 plus patients.
- Lots of children will miss out on education before the school can be expanded.
- Will the school be primary or secondary?
- Inadequate playing field space for the school. Under the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 ref. change of use to existing playing fields, the already overcrowded school has already inadequate space and the Secretary of State must be made aware of any changes and the objections thereof.
- The meagre amenities in the village should be updated, expanded and improved before any development is planned.
- The village already is a big community and local families struggle to place their children in local schools and local struggle getting GP appointments because of the one GP surgery.
- The facilities that exist simply cannot handle the number of additional residents. Waiting lists for doctors and dentists are already long, and there is only one nursery. There is also no post office since it closed, two shops and a small chemist.
- You seem to be approving houses to be built all over Eye, where do you think these people are going to send their children to school and how is an already overstretched doctors and dentist going to cope?
- We don't have the infrastructure to cope with any more dwellings.
- Eye village infrastructure cannot cope already, given the over 100 houses recently built.
- The inspectorate's report stated the infrastructure needed to be in place before an application could be agreed – there's no sign of any infrastructure to support this planning application.

- Issues in respect of water pressure in the area.

#### Impact on character of the village

- The development will unnecessarily rip the character of Eye away from the village, to the detriment of existing and future residents.
- The additional housing will result in huge change to the village character of a small village. Eye still has that village feel which will be lost over the next few years should the proposal be approved.
- Eye has had more than its fair share of growth over the years. It was a lovely village to grow up in, now it's becoming small town!!
- We are a 'village' with no wish to become a Town.
- The approval of the application in its current guise would be detrimental to the village.
- Planning in other areas should be looking into, we see no growth in Castor, Ailsworth, Glinton and other areas of the city. Where is the affordable housing in these areas?
- The range of types and tenures do not respect the surrounding context and residents (the village needs bungalows, 3/4/5 bedroom houses and another elderly supported living 2-storey complex).

#### Neighbour amenity and security

- Detrimental effect to my property's outlook in respect of housing facing the rear of my land and increased noise from those properties.
- Detrimental effect on security of properties in Fountains Place backing onto the planned development due to easy access to the rear of properties.
- The quality of life of the adjacent residential users including the residential care home and primary school are not respected.
- The noise of construction is going to disrupt quality of life for years also I fear that no matter how many people oppose this building site, it will go ahead anyway... perhaps compensation can be paid to have secondary glazing installed?
- If the local authority is minded to approve the application then suggests a Condition which requires a greater distance between the care home and the adjacent rears of facing houses and a thicker tree belt or other solution to protect occupants living conditions and environmental standards.
- The dust and dirt, and pollution from large diesel trucks and the vibrations to the surrounding properties, particularly the church, will be horrendous. No mitigation for this has been found for the residential care/nursing home, neighbouring properties and Primary School.
- Crime and anti-social behaviour has been on the increase since new houses have been built.

#### Air quality impacts

- Concern over air pollution from the number of additional vehicles.
- Ignoring health issues regarding air quality around schools. An air quality assessment of the impacts of a development in the local area is required especially the impact on school children and the residents of Field House and Eyebury Road.

#### Drainage/flooding impacts

- Flooding and drainage risks have not been addressed.
- What are the proposals for drainage and sewers? Existing sewerage drains down Eyebury Road struggle now and there is a strong effluent smell regularly near the care home.
- The existing drains are regularly emptied by a sludge gulper during the night time period. Larkfleet have said that an effluent storage tank was to be installed below ground level in the proposed park and the effluent would be pumped out during the night time period but this will still cause issues with the current drains and sewers. What happens if the level controls or pumps fail and the tank over flows untreated waste into the park area?
- The Larkfleet flood ponds utilise the open space areas rendering them unusable during heavy rain events and winter.
- Drainage and flood prevention for the site and school is not agreed for the site and does not address various current flooding issues especially at the school boundary.
- The Larkfleet plan shows the sloping area to the water drain/dyke running through the site as public open space. Clearly this cannot be used due to the deep drain and gradient of the sloping sides. The side are needed for North Level Drainage machinery access when cleaning the drain. The gradient and depth of the drain will be a danger to the public and children. The edge of the drain is a PROW and will need to be maintained and available for public use not just the residents of the site.
- There is no information on how the ditches and drains on the site boundaries will be connected to the drainage system e.g. along the Northern boundary with Thorney Rd, there should be a full analysis of all ditches and drains to see if any more are within the developers boundary to correct this error in the submission.
- The sewer system can't cope with current demands and need extensive updating. Most rainfall runs into drains rather than drains, and any significant rainfall results in gardens flooding.

#### Public open space

- Green space allocation is inadequate and does not meet PCC policies and standards as raised by the PCC Landscape Officer.
- Open spaces and play areas inadequate for the size of the development.
- The village needs more sports facilities, particularly indoor space.

#### Ecology / Biodiversity impacts

- Destroying natural hunting habitat for my cat and other felines.
- Potential negative effects on wildlife (migratory amphibians and hedgehogs) due to increase road surface and fencing.
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact on local wildlife I've seen barn owls and many other species on regular walks I think a wildlife survey is required.
- Where a new development has the potential to have significant adverse effect on the integrity of a designated international or national site for nature conservation purposes, as a result of additional recreational pressure on that designated site, the development may be required to provide open space of sufficient size, type and quality over and above the standard requirements set out in this policy, in order to mitigate that pressure.
- There is no mention for the above provision and its impact on the SSSI designated Eye Green Nature Reserve and Dogsthorpe Star Pit Reserve.

#### Trees/ Landscape impacts

- As the Tree Officer states there needs to be significant tree/shrub planting within the proposed school extension area especially to the boundaries with the adjacent new housing.
- Developer states trees and hedgerows are off site yet they are within the boundary.
- No Arboricultural Method Statement to provide details of how the necessary tree protection can be implemented, initial pruning and maintenance plan and ownership going forward across the housing site and the land allocated for the school expansion.
- Object to the removal of high amenity value trees and the lack of a TPO on some trees.
- Object to the location identification ownership information provided in the tree Survey schedule which states trees T9 to T19 and G12 and G14 are off site whereas they are within the boundary of the development site and the responsibility of the developer to prune and protect and have a maintenance agreement with the Council going forward.

#### Other

- The governance of the site facilities and the plan for them is not clearly defined.
- Part of this land belongs to me, it is the only access to my field that is used all the time.
- Development includes access road to their field which is in their ownership.
- I keep a horse in the field adjacent to the proposed development and am concerned that the plans do not appear to include any access. I live approximately 50 metres from the proposed site but have received no communication regarding the planning application, relying on advice from neighbours to alert me.
- Will be moving out of the village if this development goes ahead.
- The masterplan proposes a school pedestrian/cycle access from the proposed development onto the school site. This proposal would mean the access goes directly across the planned sports pitches. This of course would be impractical to have a path through a sports field, the path will need to be around the perimeter of the sports field, which will mean more land needs allocating to the school for this.
- The applicant has not complied with the necessary building and safety regulations in their previous builds, specifically on the Parsons Prospect phase 5 development. Houses were sold on this previous development without the necessary building control certificates and with serious defects. I do not think any further developments should be approved for this company until such time as a) the regulatory and safety failures have been rectified and b) Larkfleet can prove that they have made sufficient progress in addressing these issues on their new developments.
- The residents of the developments on both sides of Thorney Road, going towards the bypass at Acorn Kennels, still have issues with their properties which remain unresolved.

#### **Support**

- I believe this would be great for Eye. I support this planning permission.
- Comment made in support of the application.

---

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Consultation period (from 03/06/21 to 25/06/21)**

87 representations received; 86 objections 1 support

#### **Objections**

##### Principle of development / Local Plan Policy

- The Inspector agreed to 250 or less depending on traffic analysis not 284.

- The development of this size represents the loss of green space, trees, and natural habitat.
- Larkfleet are challenging Highways request for detailed layout quoting 'We note that on other outline applications the LHA and the LPA have agreed that such matters of detail can be left to the reserved matters stage. I trust that can be done in this case as well.' - Other applications do not have to conform to LP40 so these details need to be supplied as part of this outline application
- As per the approved PCC Local Plan LP40 there should be a comprehensive Master Plan for the whole area and this plan should have a high level of engagement with the local community.
- The developer has not met Policy LP40 specifically included in the approved Local Plan for this site with 8 key principle to be met at this outline planning stage.
- Alternative places in Peterborough must be looked at for development and not Eye.

#### Traffic/Highway safety

##### a. Traffic

- Major road improvements to Eyebury Road and Thorney Road will be essential to minimise traffic congestion especially during the morning and evening school and work runs.
- Eyebury Road is already an extremely busy road, used by commuters as a "rat run" - to have an additional 284 dwellings will only add to the heavy traffic burden, impacting upon local residents and school children who will be travelling to and from the local primary school.
- The road that runs past the school is simply not adequate for a development of this size to add more pressure coming through the village. The amount of times that cars / vans etc. mount the curb whilst children are walking to school is scary and it feels only a matter of time before there is a serious incident. Plus the Eyebury road out the back of eye towards Flag Fen is already single lane and can already take forever to pass.
- Not only Eyebury Road but Thorney Road are really busy now.
- There is a speeding problem down the road too with users often travelling at double the limit.
- The school time traffic is horrendous, with cars parked all the way down the road.
- I am surprised that so far the daily instances of road rage have not so far resulted in murder.
- The busy road has huge lorries all day and is a rat run to avoid the roundabout near the new Aldi that opens 10th June.
- Consideration for mobility scooters.
- The road that runs past the school is simply not adequate for a development of this size to add more pressure coming through the village. The amount of times that cars / vans etc. mount the curb whilst children are walking to school is scary and it feels only a matter of time before there is a serious incident. Plus the Eyebury road out the back of Eye towards Flag Fen is already single lane and can already take forever to pass.
- The bypass built years ago was supposed to have eased the village but the extra houses built since then has made the village busy and worse than it was before the bypass was built.
- Travelling north towards the church is hazardous due to all the cars parked and the chicanes. The bend in the road around the church involves a degree of risk as it is not possible to see the oncoming traffic until you have committed to the turn and you are in the path of that traffic.

- The road itself, as it exits the village towards Oxney Road, is not a fully two way road and has a section where vehicles have to use passing places. In the early morning traffic is continually backed up to the roundabout at the junction with the High Street and Thorney Road.
- Fears safety for children.
- 284 houses is probably circa 500 plus cars that are going to be added to village life. The village simply can't cope with this extra volume of traffic both into and out of the village.
- There should be an exit/ entrance at the other end of the new estate.
- Since the original proposal, the addition of the Red Brick Farm (18/00080/OUT) Fengate extension; the Newborough (19/00272/OUT) development and finally the new Aldi superstore (18/01698/FUL) on the A1139 have not been taken into consideration for traffic flow through the village of Eye and Eye Green and the updated traffic assessment does not detail the effects of these.
- Emergency vehicles won't be able to get through.
- There has been inadequate parking facilities provided by this developer in other recent developments, with reduced road width which means many cars are parking on pavements and residents with pushchairs and mobility scooters and those by sight problems have to go into the road to pass.
- Objects to the entrance to the site shown as a T Junction, this needs to be traffic lights as due to the rat run down Eyebury Rd residents will not be able to get out of the site in the morning rush hour.
- No traffic calming measures proposed.
- The existing public right of way through the middle of site is upgraded to a footway/ cycleway to provide connectivity to Thorney Road, although it is noted by PCC that this currently appears to be unachievable as an adopted route to the north cannot be provided.
- Proposed access points for pedestrians and cyclists are not available because the Council have not adopted the locations.
- The proposed masterplan road layout does not constrain vehicle speeds to an acceptable level for a new residential development with high numbers of vulnerable highway users.
- The plan to have the entrance to this new development on Eyebury Road would exacerbate existing problems on that road at peak times.

#### b. Transport Assessment (TA)

- No TA has been completed. This make this application premature and I will continue to object to it until such time as the TA is submitted for consultation.
- The road safety audit carried out was done at a time that does not show the true volume of traffic that uses Eyebury Road, 30<sup>th</sup> July 2020 was not only school holidays but also Covid restrictions were in place. I believe that there should be another audit at school drop off/ pick up in term time and at peak rush hour, morning and evening.
- The TA does not demonstrate that the impact of the development on the public highway will not be severe, and requires additional work to enable a full assessment of the impact of the proposals.
- Careful consideration of vehicular access to and from the site, the traffic implications for wider Eye area and junctions on the A47. Survey findings are insufficient and do not take into consideration other development works.

#### Infrastructure

- More traffic through the village, which is already saturated with housing.
- Infrastructure isn't there to support any more growth, we need our open spaces too.
- The school is already oversubscribed with the existing developments so is already in need of expansion without these additional houses.
- Village isn't big enough for further development, doctor's surgery is already struggling and Eyebury road won't cope with additional traffic.
- There is one pub in the village which is nowhere near big enough for the current population of the village let alone another 500 plus.
- The school is not big enough and already needs to take on mobile classrooms.
- The whole Eye infrastructure will not be able to cope with the proposed building programme envisaged by this application.
- The doctor's surgery, dentist and school are already full (even though there are plans to extend the school), so simply can't accommodate a further 300-600 plus patients.
- The village already is a big community and local families struggle to place their children in local schools and local struggle getting GP appointments because of the one GP surgery.
- The village has no post office.
- The facilities that exist in Eye simply cannot handle the number of additional residents.
- The inspectorate's report stated the infrastructure needed to be in place before an application could be agreed – there's no sign of any infrastructure to support this planning application.
- The village does not have the infrastructure to support a development of this size. It is overdevelopment of the site.
- There is inadequate information on the s106 contributions required to increase primary and secondary school capacity and provide sufficient community health and GP coverage.

#### Impact on character of the village

- The development will unnecessarily rip the character of Eye away from the village, to the detriment of existing and future residents.
- The additional housing will result in huge change to the village character of a small village. Eye still has that village feel which will be lost over the next few years should the proposal be approved.
- We are a 'village' with no wish to become a Town.
- Eye has had more than its fair share of growth over the years. It was a lovely village to grow up in, now it's becoming small town.
- The approval of the application in its current guise would be detrimental to the village.
- Planning in other areas should be looking into, we see no growth in Castor, Ailsworth, Glington and other areas of the city. Where is the affordable housing in these areas?
- The range of types and tenures do not respect the surrounding context and residents (the village needs bungalows, 3/4/5 bedroom houses and another elderly supported living 2-storey complex).

#### Neighbour amenity and security

- A condition which requires a greater distance between the Home and the adjacent rears of facing houses and a thicker tree belt or other solution to protect occupants living conditions and environmental standards.

- Proximity to old peoples home - residents here have come for a peaceful existence in their final years. They will be burdened with noise, dirt and associated pollution, vibrations for years whilst the development is built.

#### Air Quality

- With the extra traffic with the new home Eyebury road will become grid locked and with a school on this road the carbon monoxide emissions will increase and could endanger children health.
- Ignoring health issues regarding air quality around schools. An air quality assessment of the impacts of a development in the local area is required especially the impact on school children and the residents of Field House and Eyebury Road.

#### Drainage/ flooding impacts

- The sewage pipe which runs along Eyebury road smells now what it will be like with over 284 new houses. Existing sewerage drains down Eyebury road struggle now and there is a strong effluent smell regularly near the care home.
- The sewerage along the High Street is often smelling disgusting due to the old pipes having to take much more than they were originally built for.
- Drains are inadequate and overflow in wet weather.
- Twice in 8 months my garden has flooded along with my two neighbours because of the poor drainage system that is in place which was built several years ago.
- Anglian Water tell residents the sewage system cannot cope with the housing.
- The existing drains are regularly emptied by a sludge gulper during the night time period. Larkfleet have said that an effluent storage tank was to be installed below ground level in the proposed park and the effluent would be pumped out during the night time period but this will still cause issues with the current drains and sewers. What happens if the level controls or pumps fail and the tank over flows untreated waste into the park area?
- Drainage and flood prevention for the site and school is not agreed for the site and does not address various current flooding issues especially at the school boundary.
- There is no information on how the ditches and drains on the site boundaries will be connected to the drainage system e.g. along the Northern boundary with Thorney Rd, there should be a full analysis of all ditches and drains to see if any more are within the developers boundary to correct this error in the submission.

#### Public open space

- The Larkfleet flood ponds utilise the open space area allocations rendering them unusable during heavy rain events and winter.
- The Larkfleet plan shows the sloping area to the water drain/dyke running through the site as public open space. Clearly this cannot be used due to the deep drain and gradient of the sloping sides. The side are needed for North Level Drainage machinery access when cleaning the drain. The gradient and depth of the drain will be a danger to the public and children. Finally the edge of the drain is a PROW and will need to be maintained and available for public use not just the residents of the site.
- Concern over loss of open space.
- Some of the allocated open space has been included as part of the Park Homes (Pioneer Caravans) buffer zone which is also to have hedge planting, clearly this will be inappropriate for children to play on.
- The public right of ways are just that not to be included as part of the open space calculations.

- The land to be given to the school will be fenced off so should not be included in the open space calculations for this site
- The Council Landscape Officer raises issues which have not been addressed. Include not enough open space as well as the above comment the existing deep drain will need to be re profiled to reduce the gradient of the sides and needs to be fenced off for child safety, so again cannot be include in the open space amount, the officer also called for a Super LEAP and only a Leap is shown on the plan key. The officer also stated no ponds yet the masterplan layout shows 2 ponds. The allotments should also not be included in the open space calculations as they are to be secured so children cannot use.
- The scheme is an overdevelopment of the site, which prevents sufficient open space from being incorporated and would have a significant impact on the village.
- Green space allocation is inadequate and does not meet PCC policies and standards as raised by PCC Landscape Officer.

#### Ecology and Biodiversity impacts

- Concern over negative impact of wildlife.
- Would like to point out that 4 years after the previous development was completed, the biodiversity around the previous build is still vastly depleted. I see nothing in this plan that will sufficiently offset the huge loss of habitat that will inevitably take place with this build.
- Where a new development has the potential to have significant adverse effect on the integrity of a designated international or national site for nature conservation purposes, as a result of additional recreational pressure on that designated site, the development may be required to provide open space of sufficient size, type and quality over and above the standard requirements set out in this policy, in order to mitigate that pressure.
- There is no mention for the above provision and its impact on the SSSI designated Eye Green Nature Reserve and Dogsthorpe Star Pit Reserve.
- Wildlife another concern, trees, green space, walking areas, all will be destroyed and replaced with polluting cars and humans.

#### Trees and Landscape impacts

- Object to the removal of high amenity value trees and the lack of a TPO on some trees.
- No Arboricultural Method Statement to provide details of how the necessary tree protection can be implemented, initial pruning and maintenance plan and ownership going forward across the housing site and the land allocated for the School expansion
- Developer states trees and hedgerows are off site yet they are within the boundary.
- As mentioned by the Tree Officer, there needs to be significant tree/shrub planting within the proposed school extension area especially to the boundaries with the adjacent new housing.

#### Other issues

- Anti-social problems already in the village, but with more housing will without a doubt cause more.
- As a land owner next to the planning it will stop access to my land.
- Poor water pressure - more houses will be greater strain on system.
- The construction will cause excessive dust and will be harmful to the children attending the school next to the building site.
- Larkfleet have an appalling record of actually finishing developments correctly and speedily. Parsons Prospect was managed incredibly badly and continues to have problems. The roads still haven't been adopted, play areas are not maintained.

- The land being proposed is fondly used by dog walkers from all over the village as a safe walk which will be lost if built upon.
- There are already serious issues in the village from previous decisions.
- The proposed planning is a huge increase as a percentage to the village and is excessive.
- While it would appear Larkfleet have offered land to the school to develop and other mitigating options, I believe this isn't sufficient and is just a work around to gain planning.
- If this application is given consent, it will be excellent if it is made subject to the homes being built to a standard that is net carbon zero as far as energy consumption is concerned. Ideally, homes should be fitted with solar panels on roofs, and heating and cooking sources which do not come from fossil fuels.
- Consideration should be given to an Environmental Assessment.
- The governance of the site facilities and the plan for them is not clearly defined.
- The applicant Larkfleet homes has not complied with the necessary building and safety regulations in their previous builds, specifically on the Parsons Prospect phase 5 development. Houses were sold on this previous development without the necessary building control certificates and with serious defects. I do not think any further developments should be approved for this company until such time as a) the regulatory and safety failures have been rectified and b) Larkfleet can prove that they have made sufficient progress in addressing these issues on their new developments.
- No mention of how the Public Right of Way footpath running through the site will be kept open during the years of building these houses.
- The masterplan proposes a school pedestrian/ cycle access from the proposed development onto the school site. This proposal would mean the access goes directly across the planned sports pitches. This of course would be impractical to have a path through a sports field, the path will need to be around the perimeter of the sports field, which will mean more land needs allocating to the school for this.

### **Support**

- The development of such dwellings will be a positive addition to Peterborough's housing stock, and our village(s) of Eye and Eye Green must take our fair share. The addition of these dwellings to the Eye area will also ensure that the area and local businesses continue to thrive. Further, provision of land for an extension to the school will help to mitigate the additional school places needed. We must ensure the appropriate infrastructure is put in place to support such dwellings.

---

### **3rd Consultation period (from 03/09/2021 - 22/09/2021)**

103 representations received; 103 objections 0 support

### **Objections**

#### Principle of development / Local Plan Policy

- The developer has not met Policy LP40 specifically with 8 key principle to be met at this outline planning stage.
- In the Local Plan this site was for 250 or less dwellings dependent on traffic analysis.

- A full Masterplan cannot be made and commented on, as such the submission does not meet LP40, 'a range of types and tenures that meet needs and respects the surrounding context'.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> time this application has been put forward for public consultation and the developer has still not met the requirements of LP40 in the approved Local Plan.
- Alternative places in Peterborough must be looked at for development and not Eye.

#### Traffic/Highway safety

- The Council must direct A1139's traffic away towards the bypass.
- The development will slowly but surely increase flows of traffic down the high street onto the A47 and onto Eyebury Road, which is not sustainable. Eyebury is a rat run for traffic between the A47 and Peterborough's Eastern Industry which will be further impacted by the pending development at Red Brick Farm.
- Eyebury Road is very busy especially at school times and the village is used as a rat run with heavy traffic at certain times of the day. There is nowhere to park for the houses and the school, and with more houses you are just increasing the traffic on an already very dangerous road.
- Residents already living in the surrounding area have problems with cars being parking in the way of houses and not being able to access their own properties.
- Peterborough Road is also a problem for the village, with many people using the village to cut through due to the increase in congestion on this road.
- The village is a maximum capacity and already driving through/ out of Eye is a problem.
- I have on more than one occasion witnessed near misses involving children on Eyebury Road.
- Walk from my home along Eyebury Road is dangerous, with a lot of the pathway very narrow and many cars driving very close. With a lot of young children around these times it is very concerning with the possible increase of much more traffic on the roads, This road at most times is hard to drive down with people parked all along the sides let alone at school drop off and pick up and people going to and from work.
- The possibility of over 500+ cars this will make traffic congestion through the village unbearable. Have any checks been done to see what the traffic is already like at busy times?
- Getting out of Eye towards the PE1 centre is horrendous, for a journey that should take few mins can take 20 mins plus due to the amount of traffic. Again an extra 500+ cars would make this even worse.
- Proposed access points for pedestrians and cyclists are not available because the Council have not adopted the locations.
- The junction with Eyebury Road requires traffic lights to allow for the safe exit of cyclists. Another reason for the traffic lights is parents dropping their children off at the new school drop off/car park will not be able to get out of the site due to the volume of rat run traffic.
- Eye has minimal bus service, covered by number 36 and 37 buses, and buses to and from the villages are infrequent so residents have to rely on cars.
- The proposed access from Eyebury Road is thoroughly inadequate. That road cannot accommodate additional traffic and is already a hazard.
- There is no room for cyclists anywhere even though it is part of the green wheel.
- Proposal will remove the popular walking route along the lane from Thorney Road to Eyebury Road.
- Inadequate parking facilities due to overdevelopment of the site.

- The updated road proposal intends to join on the proposed site to Enfield Court which will result in large volumes of cars coming onto Thorney Road.
  - Speeding issues on Thorney Road and Eyebury Road.
  - The rear 'pedestrian access', the planners are being naïve if it is not expected that once the main vehicle drop to the south is found to be congested at school times that parents will not use the side road adjacent to Fountains Place as an alternative pick-up/drop-off point. Defeating the purpose of the pedestrian access and resulting in noise, disruption and pollution for residents at Fountains Place.
  - Also foresee, parents parking on Thorney Road and dropping children off, resulting in congestion and increased risks on Thorney road.
  - Larkfleet have not changed the new school access 2m wide footpath layout in the new Master Plan as it still goes across the proposed school sports field. A 2m wide footpath is not wide enough for 2 way pedestrian flow especially given parents will be holding children's hands/pushing pushchairs and for those wanting to cycle. It also needs lighting for winter months.
- b. Transport Assessment (TA)
- The road safety audit was carried out was done at a time that does not show the true volume of traffic that uses Eyebury Road, 30<sup>th</sup> July 2020 was not only school holidays but also Covid restrictions were in place. I believe that there should be another audit at school drop off/pick up in term time and at peak rush hour, morning and evening.
  - A comprehensive traffic assessment is needed to measure the level of traffic at this proposed exit point of the site.
  - The Road Safety Audit Stage 1 report includes a number of problems. These require addressing at outline planning stage especially problem numbers: 2.4 – risk of collisions at night if kerb build-outs or other traffic movements are not clearly seen by approaching drivers. 2.5 Hazard for cyclists and pedestrians, risks that cyclists leaving the development will continue to cycle along the footway adjacent Eyebury Road or cycle off the cycleway into the path of a passing vehicle.
  - Various concerns have been raised by the Local Highway a number of which have not been addressed. The issues raised are of concern as Eyebury Road has significant issues with rat run traffic and any TA needs to be undertaken in school times as well as peak commuting times in mornings and evenings to full understand the traffic issues outside the school on Eyebury Road and its close location to the site entrance.
  - The TA Addendum is not showing all the information needed at outline planning stage to enable comments by all consultees as to volume of houses and site layout not in accordance with Policy LP40.

### Infrastructure

- The village already is a big community and local families struggle to place their children in local schools and local struggle getting GP appointments because of the one GP surgery.
- The facilities that exist simply cannot handle the number of additional residents. The waiting lists for doctors and dentists are already long, and there is only one nursery. There is also no post office since it closed, two shops and a small chemist.
- The school is having to put in place temporary class rooms to accommodate the numbers they already have, the school would have to be extended permanently to cope with this additional demand.

- You seem to be approving houses to be built all over Eye, where do you think these people are going to send their children to school and how is an already overstretched doctors and dentist going to cope?
- Insufficient infrastructure to cope with any more dwellings. Services are already at breaking point.
- 18 primary kids haven't got a place this year and need to look somewhere else.
- The developers are purposing to give land but where will the school get funds to increase the size? Also making a primary school too big can compromise on quality given to the students and is already a very large primary school.
- The land allocated to the school is not enough for its permanent expansion and the children drop off parking facilities.
- Eye village infrastructure cannot cope already, given the over 100 houses recently built.
- This is potentially another 1,000 people (based on an average family of 2 adults and 2 children) to an already overcrowded village.

#### Impact on character of the village

- The development will unnecessarily rip the character of Eye away from the village, to the detriment of existing and future residents.
- The additional housing will result in huge change to the village character of a small village. Eye still has that village feel which will be lost over the next few years should the proposal be approved.
- We are a 'village' with no wish to become a Town.
- The approval of the application in its current guise would be detrimental to the village.
- Planning in other areas should be looking into, we see no growth in Castor, Ailsworth, Glington and other areas of the city. Where is the affordable housing in these areas?
- The range of types and tenures do not respect the surrounding context and residents (the village needs bungalows, 3/4/5 bedroom houses and another elderly supported living 2-storey complex).
- Local residents in Eye use the local public footpaths to escape into the beautiful countryside for their wellbeing and mental health. The countryside around Eye is slowing being turned into a concrete jungle destroying the lovely scenery and natural habitat.

#### Neighbour amenity

- The quality of life of the adjacent residential users including the residential care home and primary school are not respected and there is no plan put forward for the 3 years duration to build this development.
- The dust and dirt, and pollution from large diesel trucks and the vibrations to the surrounding properties, particularly the church, will be horrendous. No mitigation for this has been found for the residential care/nursing home, neighbouring properties and school.

#### Air Quality

- Ignoring health issues regarding air quality around schools. An air quality assessment of the impacts of a development in the local area is required especially the impact on school children and the residents of Field House and Eyebury Road.

#### Drainage/ Flooding impacts

- Object to the application as there is no plan to upgrade Eye Sewage System before the site works start along with an onsite pumping state.
- Drainage and flood prevention for the site and school is not agreed for the site and does not address various current flooding issues especially at the school boundary.
- There is no management plan, approach and financial modelling to maintain the Open Space trees, and play areas along with drainage systems and ponds.
- Larkfleet have proposed that the current PROW footpath to the side of the drain would be used for cyclists/families/pushchairs and Mobility scooters to the east of the drain to gain access to Thorney Road. This would be impractical during late autumn and winter months due to the soft ground conditions and given North Level IDB (Internal Drainage Board) have stated the path cannot be made tarmac due to plant needing to work along the 9m easement area. For the safety of the residents the drain easement area should be fenced off and a new footpath/cycle way suitably tarmac and lit created to the east of it.
- I live on a Larkfleet development which would back on to the new one and the sewage system is terrible already. Toilets constantly smelling or blocking up, drain smells are coming up the sink. With an increase in housing so close would make this situation so much worse.
- 9m IDB Drain Easement is shown as part of open space allocation on Master Plan diagram cannot be used as open space as the deep drain will need to be fenced off for the protection of the children, partially sighted and other residents. Who will be responsible for the safety of the residents or the maintenance of fencing?
- The 9m IDB Easement is also a PROW, who will maintain this?
- Eye was subject to a torrential downpour, the sewage and wastewater systems could not cope with the levels of water and there was some severe localised flooding. This application is for houses to be built on farmland. The wastewater and sewage system run by Anglian Water is not fit for purpose. The system is ancient and cannot cope with the current number of houses. Any further housing will just overpower this system even more. It needs to be fully upgraded to cope with the current level of housing before any further building takes place.
- Currently the school fields flood during winter as the Dyke the other side of their boundary does not drain into the main one on the land to be developed, Larkfleet's drainage designs do not resolve this issue.
- Looking at the drainage and overlaying the housing plan, the ditches to the East (and possibly South but that is complicated by the access rights issue), have private gardens running up to them with no form of access for maintenance.
- This land floods and although Larkfleet have submitted a drainage plan to use these ditches, they do not give any land away to be able to maintain them. The plan is trying to indicate shared ownership with the adjacent field, but the ditch is within the boundary and as such needs a plan for maintenance.
- The sewer system can't cope with current demands and need extensive updating. Most rainfall runs into drains rather than drains, and any significant rainfall results in gardens flooding.

#### Public open space

- Green space allocation is inadequate and does not meet PCC policies and standards as raised by PCC Landscape Officer.
- The Larkfleet flood ponds utilise the open space area allocations rendering them unusable during heavy rain events and winter.
- The Larkfleet plan shows the sloping area to the water drain/dyke running through the site as public open space. Clearly this cannot be used due to the deep drain and gradient of

the sloping sides. The side are needed for North Level Drainage machinery access when cleaning the drain. The gradient and depth of the drain will be a danger to the public and children. Finally the edge of the drain is a PROW and will need to be maintained and available for public use not just the residents of the site.

#### Ecology/ Biodiversity impacts

- Wildlife another concern, trees, green space, walking areas, all will be destroyed and replaced with polluting cars and humans.
- No provision for mitigation of recreational impacts of development on SSSI designated Eye Green Nature and Dogsthorpe Star Pit Reserve.

#### Trees/ Landscape impacts

- The Developer states trees and hedge rows are off site yet they are within the boundary so will need to be maintained by the residents management and financial plan.
- Object to the removal of high amenity value trees and the lack of a TPO on some trees.
- Object to the location identification ownership information provided in in tree survey Schedule which states Trees T9 to T19 and G12 and G14 are off site whereas they are within the boundary of the development site and the responsibility of the developer to prune and protect and have a maintenance agreement with the Council going forward.
- No Arboricultural Method Statement provided to outline details of tree protection, pruning and maintenance plan as well as ownership going forward.

#### Other issues

- The only people who want this are those that profit from it.
- The governance of the site facilities and the plan for them is not clearly defined.
- If a significant proportion of the development were to be bungalows then the impact on the school would be reduced, lessening the burden on both primary and secondary education provision. This may also impact on the number of cars and possibly support local public transport.
- There is no management for the maintenance of the surrounding boundaries, dykes and trees especially those adjoining current housing, the school and field, and residential care facilities.
- No Highway and Anglian Water assessment of the impact on Eyebury road and the utilities if it will be used by Larkfleet for heavy lorries delivering to the site for the 2 to 3 years of building the homes and roadways.
- The Larkfleet Location Map Ref L---/LP/01 shows the site boundary incorrectly, it includes a private track to a stables and paddock beyond and another public footpath and track adjacent to that on its southern boundary opposite 67 Eyebury Road. Further, the Location Map shows housing built on top of a number of drains and a private track to a stables and paddock beyond on its southern boundary opposite 67 Eyebury Road.
- Increase the amount of crime and anti-social behaviour.
- 

---

#### **4<sup>th</sup> Consultation Period (from 21/10/21 19/11/21)**

52 representations received; 52 objections 0 support

#### **Objections**

Principle of development / Local Plan Policy

- The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site given the Core Strategy / Local Plan is for 250 houses 'or less' dependent on the traffic assessment.
- The adjustments made to the Larkfleet plans for this application have still not addressed original objections in respect of number of dwellings. The numbers submitted still exceed the agreed plan number.
- This proposal is an overdevelopment of the site given the allocations is for 250 houses or less. The proposed infrastructure and the land allocated for school is too small so 265 houses is far too many and needs reducing to provide suitable facilities for the residents as per LP40.
- The developer has not met Policy LP40 specifically included in the approved Local Plan for this site with 8 key principle to be met at this outline planning stage.
- A full Masterplan cannot be made and commented on, as such the submission does not meet LP40, 'a range of types and tenures that meet needs and respects the surrounding context'.
- 4<sup>th</sup> time this application has been put forward for public consultation and the developer has still not met the requirements of LP40 in the approved Local Plan.

#### Traffic/Highway safety

##### a. Traffic

- The Council must direct A1139's traffic away towards the bypass.
- The speed control sign location proposal is on a partially blind bend, so basically useless for inbound traffic as cars will be next to the sign before it registers and beyond it before they see it. Needs to be at the entrance to the village.
- Eyebury road cannot cope with the current traffic at peak times and to have the entrance to the new estate on the road is just ridiculous.
- Still doesn't solve the issue of traffic flow through Eyebury road, the sheer number of people using Eyebury road as a shortcut in rush hour times. The road itself is the biggest issue and the noise pollution caused will only be multiplied with another 500 cars needing to come in and out daily.
- The infrastructure to the site being the main school road and already a major hazard to children and parents is totally unacceptable and dangerous.
- Eyebury Rd cannot cope with this level of additional traffic and the Junction to the site will not facilitate ease of entry and exit during peak hours (it should be changed to traffic lights)
- Eyebury road cannot support a further 265 housing development and the vehicles that will automatically accompany this development. It is currently used as a through 'rat' route and is heavily congested during peak times. During these peak periods of congestion this area becomes grid locked with the sheer number of cars, vans and trucks using it. It is a narrow residential road that allows for cars to pass alternately. A number of cars have mounted the pavements to avoid this grid lock. This is dangerous and unacceptable. Furthermore, the pavements are narrow and the cars pass very close to the pedestrians, this was especially noted during COVID especially as a number of residents had to step into a congested road. Clearly this is a health and safety issue, but with a further development an accident is imminent.
- A cycle path around Thorney road is frankly a joke surely.
- Significant increase on traffic in an already overly burdened back road
- Removal of calming measures that were implemented to reduce speeding traffic through the village.

- The A47 section nearby is only 2 way traffic, there are always queues going up to the Van Hague roundabout and the Eyebury Road rat run to the industrial estate has passing places.
- I have serious concerns regarding the traffic along Eyebury Road, it is already over used as a rat run to Fengate. I am amazed there has not been a newsworthy road rage event on the section with passing places.
- Eyebury road is dangerous and congested as it is. There is traffic calming but cars do park very close to these areas meaning cars have to navigate multiple chicanes with unclear passing places and also a blind corner near the church where parked cars force north-bound traffic onto the wrong side of the road just before the turn.
- Traffic leaving the village to the west is already subjected to a lengthy wait at peak times. Current problems will be exacerbated by an increase in the number of residents.
- An increase in the school population will further increase both walking, cycling and vehicle traffic at the beginning and end of the school day making drop offs and pickups more hazardous and increasing the negative effects on the neighbouring residents (noise, pollution and traffic).
- Notwithstanding the other negative effects on the community, the development should not be allowed to go ahead without a significant rethink of the impact on Eyebury Road.
- Invites any reviewing member of PCC to spend a day on Eyebury Road to witness the issues with traffic, in which the report commissioned by the applicant negates to mention.
- Traffic on Eyebury Road needs to be observed for a full day 8.30am to 6pm during school terms. It will then become clear that this road is totally unsuitable and could not cope with potentially 400 vehicles from this development. It is also used as 'rat-run' for cars from Thorney and Crowland.
- A car flipped not long ago and I near witnessed a pedestrian being hit by a car due to people becoming frustrated at the queues. Don't do this to us without addressing the issues we already suffer with.
- There is not enough road management and space, the traffic and infrastructure to drop off children at school causes untold headaches daily throughout the week. Parking and car abandonment and the use of and blocking of other people's driveways has become prolific and eventually will boil over or end in an accident or loss of life.
- The A1139 is constantly blocked due to all drivers ignoring the bypass and use the A1139 as a cut through, the volume of traffic and the current road infrastructure cannot be supported by this route.
- Potholes as far as the eye can see, sunken manholes as they have been pressed into the ground by heavy HGV vehicles
- The Councillors have confirmed that they have spoken with the UK road haulage association about using the bypass to alleviate the pressure they have flatly refused to cooperate or assist in rerouting the HGV's via the bypass.
- In other similar developments there has been inadequate parking facilities with reduced road width which means many cars are parking on pavements and residents with pushchairs and mobility scooters and those by sight problems have to go into the road to pass.
- The accidents that we witness weekly have grown this is simply due the posted speeds. Vehicle hit the Eye roundabout (including HGV, in excess of 40 miles an hour) they then in turn try to wrangle the vehicles while maintaining speed around the bend. Thus clipping and damaging the roundabout.

- There are constant bottlenecks and traffic jams in Eyebury Road every day and when the large industrial site between the Power station and the Oxney Road Traveller site is complete the extra traffic it will create through Eyebury road is unimaginable.
- Larkfleet have not changed the new school access 2m wide footpath layout in the new Master Plan as it still goes across the proposed school sports field. A 2m wide footpath is not wide enough for 2 way pedestrian flow especially given parents will be holding children's hands/pushing pushchairs and for those wanting to cycle. It also needs lighting for winter months.
- Proposed access points for pedestrians and cyclists are not available because the Council have not adopted the locations.
- The junction with Eyebury Road requires traffic lights to allow for the safe exit of cyclists. Another reason for the traffic lights is parents dropping their children off at the new school drop off/car park will not be able to get out of the site due to the volume of rat run traffic.
- The Peterborough Cycle Forum have raised some important Issues about the cycle and pedestrian path design in the latest Masterplan submission, they need to be 5mtr total width with separation for pedestrians this need will further reduction in the number of houses below 250 for the site. They also raise other important Issues about the design of the cycle routes leaving the site and the residential plots needing cycle parking.
- The village is a maximum capacity and already driving through and out of Eye is a problem.
- Walk from my home along Eyebury Road is dangerous, with a lot of the pathway very narrow and many cars driving very close. With a lot of young children around these times it is very concerning with the possible increase of much more traffic on the roads, This road at most times is hard to drive down with people parked all along the sides let alone at school drop off and pick up and people going to and from work.
- The proposed access from Eyebury Road is thoroughly inadequate. That road cannot accommodate additional traffic and is already a hazard.

#### b. Transport Assessment (TA)

- Careful consideration of vehicular access to and from the site, the traffic implications for wider Eye area and junctions on the A47;' - Survey findings are insufficient and do not take into consideration other development works.
- The TA Addendum is not showing all the information needed at outline planning stage to enable comments by all consultees as to volume of houses and site layout not in accordance with Policy LP40.
- A comprehensive traffic assessment is needed to measure the level of traffic at this proposed exit point of the site.
- There are a number of problems in Road Safety Audit Stage 1. These require addressing at outline planning stage especially problem numbers: 2.4 – risk of collisions at night if kerb build-outs or other traffic movements are not clearly seen by approaching drivers. 2.5 - Hazard for cyclists and pedestrians, risks that cyclists leaving the development will continue to cycle along the footway adjacent Eyebury Road or cycle off the cycleway into the path of a passing vehicle.
- The possibility of over 500+ cars this will make traffic congestion through the village unbearable. Have any checks been done to see what the traffic is already like at busy times?
- Traffic Survey done at the least busiest times on Saturday 13th November 21 when there is no School traffic , most of Eastern industry will be closed and traffic at a minimum and the process over a short time (picture provided).

- LP40 is clear that this TA and Travel Plan needs to demonstrate that the quantity of homes proposed 'is deliverable taking account of; safe and suitable access to the site; and cost effective and necessary improvements to the transport network.' The application does not showing all information needed at outline planning stage to enable comments by all consultees as to volume of houses and site layout.
- The road safety audit was carried out at a time that does not show the true volume of traffic that uses Eyebury Road, 30<sup>th</sup> July 2020 was not only school holidays but also Covid restrictions were in place. I believe that there should be another audit at school drop off/pick up in term time and at peak rush hour, morning and evening.

#### Infrastructure

- The village has the capacity to support more houses and after recent developments.
- The doctors and dentist are oversubscribed and you struggle to get appointments.
- The school needs to be expanded for the current population and will struggle to take on more children.
- Until we see proposals for more doctors, dentists and basic other amenities this is truly a non-starter.
- The infrastructure e.g. open and green space and the land allocated for school is too small so 265 houses is far too many and needs reducing to provide suitable facilities for the residents as per Policy LP40.
- Infrastructure cannot cope already, given the over 100 houses recently built.
- Eye School is already full and has a waiting list, it is about to have temporary classrooms. The land allocate to the school is not enough for its permanent expansion and the children drop off parking facility.
- We have no Post Office, it is impossible for newcomers to sign up with the GP or have NHS dental treatment.
- And how exactly does 35 less houses make much of a difference? Eye is not expanding, terrain wise, how are you expected to fit at least 300 new tenants (I'm assuming families with children are going to be moving in) in this small village that only holds 2 tiny grocery stores and 1 poorly serviced GP practice. There is however no mentioning of upgrading the services around village so I'm asking again how exactly is that beneficial for the village to push in more houses.
- The current infrastructure of Eye is at near breaking point. Don't allow this development to be the reason that Eye becomes just another grouping of faceless dwellings like the rest of Peterborough has become.
- The village already is a big community and local families struggle to place their children in local schools and local struggle getting GP appoints because of the one GP surgery.
- The school is having to put in place temporary class rooms to accommodate the numbers they already have, the school would have to be extended permanently to cope with this additional demand.
- Local shops regularly run out of fresh items.

#### Impact on character of the village

- Walking where you propose to place these houses further removes space in Eye leaving frankly just the nature reserve and nothing more.
- Eye is becoming more of a township than a village, why aren't the other villages around Peterborough getting more new houses, rather than us.
- The development will unnecessarily rip the character of Eye away from the village, to the detriment of existing and future residents.

- The range of types and tenures do not respect the surrounding context and residents (the village needs bungalows, 3/4/5 bedroom houses and another elderly supported living 2-storey complex).

#### Neighbour amenity and security

- As an adjoining neighbour plans do not detail housing layouts, so no idea if we will be overlooked by multiple houses.
- The quality of life of the adjacent residential users including the residential care home and primary school are not respected and there is no plan put forward for the 3 years duration to build this development.

#### Air quality

- The issue of pollution needs to be considered. The cars and vans have to sit idly during periods of congestion, emitting fumes to the most vulnerable members of society, our children; exacerbating health conditions and leading to further future illnesses. It seems counter intuitive to harm the future generation.

#### Drainage/ Flooding impacts

- Covering of land with houses increasing risk of flooding to an area that has witnessed significant flooding in recent years.
- Drainage and flood prevention for the site and school is not agreed for the site and does not address various current flooding issues especially at the school boundary.
- There is no management plan, approach and financial modelling to maintain the open space trees, and play areas along with drainage systems and ponds.
- Larkfleet have proposed that the current PROW footpath to the side of the drain would be used for cyclists/families/pushchairs and mobility scooters to the east of the drain to gain access to Thorney Road. This would be impractical during autumn and winter months due to the soft ground conditions and given North Level IDB have stated the path cannot be made tarmac due to plant needing to work along the 9m easement area. For the safety of the residents the drain easement area should be fenced off and a new footpath/cycle way suitably tarmac and lit created to the east of it.
- 9m IDB Drain Easement is shown as part of open space allocation on Master Plan diagram cannot be used as open space as the deep drain will need to be fenced off for the protection of the children, partially sighted and other residents. Who will be responsible for the safety of the residents or the maintenance of fencing?
- The 9m IDB Easement is also a PROW, who will maintain this?
- Currently the school fields flood during winter as the Dyke the other side of their boundary does not drain into the main one on the land to be developed, Larkfleet's drainage designs do not resolve this issue.

#### Public open space

- Green space allocation is inadequate and does not meet PCC policies and standards as raised by PCC Landscape Officer.
- SUD's and ponds are not usable by children and should not be included in open space allocation.

#### Ecology/ Biodiversity impacts

- Wildlife another concern, trees, green space, walking areas, all will be destroyed and replaced with polluting cars and humans.

#### Trees/ Landscape impacts

- The developer states trees and hedge rows are off site yet they are within the boundary so will need to be maintained by the residents management and financial plan.
- Object to the removal of high amenity value trees and the lack of a TPO on some trees.
- Object to the location identification ownership information provided in in tree survey Schedule which states Trees T9 to T19 and G12 and G14 are off site whereas they are within the boundary of the development site and the responsibility of the developer to prune and protect and have a maintenance agreement with the Council going forward.
- No Arboricultural Method Statement provided to outline details of tree protection, pruning and maintenance plan as well as ownership going forward.

#### Other issues

- Amendments do not overcome previous objections (previous consultation comments have been appended by some objectors).
- All comments made on the previous applications must be considered when reviewing this application.
- The proposed reduction of 19 dwellings fails to address any of these concerns.
- Larkfleet also need to finish their other housing areas before taking on another development.
- There is ample opportunity for development at the north/west of the village which would have none of the above disadvantages.
- In proposing 265 houses, greed is taking over/it is money orientated.
- Has anyone thought of the benefits to the village, the people and the planet of turning that area into a park and wood?
- If Larkfleet gets planning approval for this development it will be disastrous for the village of Eye.
- The governance of the site facilities and the plan for them is not clearly defined.
- If a significant proportion of the development were to be bungalows then the impact on the school would be reduced, lessening the burden on both primary and secondary education provision. This may also impact on the number of cars and possibly support local public transport.
- There is no management for the maintenance of the surrounding boundaries, dykes and trees especially those adjoining current housing, the school and field, and residential care facilities.