

CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** held in Council Chamber, Priory House, Monks Walk, Shefford on Wednesday, 28 February 2018

PRESENT

Cllr K C Matthews (Chairman)
Cllr R D Berry (Vice-Chairman)

Cllrs M C Blair
Mrs S Clark
K M Collins
I Dalgarno
F Firth
E Ghent

Cllrs C C Gomm
K Janes
T Nicols
T Swain
J N Young

Members in Attendance: Cllrs S Dixon
Mrs S A Goodchild
Ms A M W Graham
B Saunders
P Smith
B Wells

Officers in Attendance:	Mr D Ager	Principal Highways Officer
	Ms P Bramwell	Planning and Highways Solicitor, LGSS Law
	Mr J Ellis	Planning Manager South
	Mr A Harrison	Principal Planning Officer
	Mr M Heron	Principal Planning Officer
	Mrs C Jagusz	Committee Services Administrator
	Mr S Kemp	Planning Officer
	Mr D Lamb	Planning Manager East
	Mrs D Lavender	Principal Planning Officer
	Mr L Manning	Committee Services Officer
	Mrs J Selley	Head of Planning Delivery
	Mr P Vosper	Principal Planning Officer

DM/17/132. **Chairman's Announcements and Communications**

The Chairman advised the meeting that the order of business for the planning applications would be as follows:

Morning: Items 6, 7, 12, 11, 13, 16.

Afternoon (not before 1.00 p.m.): Items 8, 9, 14, 10, 15.

DM/17/133. Minutes

A Member raised a number of points regarding the content of the minutes and the Chairman undertook to deal with these outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED

that the minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 31 January 2018 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

Apologies for Absence – delete ‘B J Spurr’

Substitutes – delete ‘B J Spurr’ and insert ‘F Firth’

DM/17/134. Members' Interests

**(a) Personal Interests:-
Member**

	Item	Nature of Interest	Present or Absent during discussion
Cllr F Firth	10 & 15	Knows the applicants.	Present
Cllr T Swain	16	Lives within the ward. Was not present at Houghton Regis Town Council Meeting.	Present
Cllr M Blair	14	Knows the architect.	Present
All	15	Applicant is a Central Bedfordshire Council Member.	Present
Cllr N Young	All	Knows some of the applicants through his role as the Portfolio Holder/Executive Member both for	Present

strategic planning and regeneration particularly with regard to Item 6 because he has meetings with Taylor Wimpey, Item 8 because the developer approached him to look at the land which he did as well as attending the site inspection and Item 13 as, whilst he has had no involvement with Crest Nicholson, he had, for various reasons, met the original promotor/master developer of the land. Has kept an open mind on all of the applications.

Cllr K Matthews	6, 7 & possibly 9	Has met the speakers through his previous position on CBC.	Present
All except Cllrs Firth, Ghent and Swain	7	Knows the Parish Council speaker.	Present

(b) **Personal and Prejudicial Interests:-**

Member	Item	Nature of Interest	Present or Absent during discussion
Cllr E Ghent	16	Recently became Executive Member for Assets. Was not previously involved in this	Absent

application which
is on CBC land.

(c) Prior Local Council Consideration of Applications			
Member	Item	Parish/Town Council	Vote Cast
Cllr F Firth	10 & 15	Northill	No

DM/17/135. Planning Enforcement Cases Where Formal Action Has Been Taken

The Chairman advised Members to raise any issues they might have with regard to the planning enforcement cases with the Planning Enforcement and Appeals Team Leader.

DM/17/136. Planning Application No. CB/17/05913/FULL (Stotfold and Langford)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/05913/FULL for the demolition of existing industrial units and the development of 32 residential dwellings (including 12 affordable homes), vehicular access, pedestrian links, car parking, drainage, public open space and associated works on land at Taylors Road, opposite Aspen Gardens, Stotfold, Hitchin, SG5 4AX.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional consultation/publicity responses, additional comments and an additional informative.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received representations from Stotfold Town Council and the agent for the applicant under the public participation scheme.

A Member sought clarification from the Stotfold Town Council representative on sustainability in terms of employment; the Town Council having objected to the loss of the site as existing employment land. The Member also queried whether Stotfold had a significant level of unemployment. The Town Council representative replied that there was some unemployment but it was not at a significant level. Another Member referred to the Town Council representative disputing the number of traffic movements and queried on what basis the Town Council had increased them to a level it felt was more appropriate. The Town Council representative stated that the increase had been based on Central Bedfordshire Council's own car parking policy, regarding the number of cars per dwelling, and observing the extent of car use and level of traffic movements outside the schools in Stotfold. The Town Council representative added that at a recent public enquiry for a site in Stotfold he had asked the developers if they assumed any car movements took place within the walking and cycling areas

and they had stated that they did not, hence the extremely low level of estimated vehicle movements stated in the report.

A Member commented that the Town Council's assumption that there would be at least 50 vehicle movements in the morning and in the evening was based on approximately two cars per household travelling at the same time and in the same direction. He queried whether these travel times and directions could actually vary from this assumption. The Member also asked if the Town Council had employed a traffic engineer to establish the above or whether it was based on supposition alone. In response the Town Council representative stated that it was based on experience and local knowledge. He referred to the issues relating to local road junctions. He stated that the figures were based on observations and the details had been discussed by the Town Council. A traffic engineer had not been employed to carry out a survey.

A Member stated that the latest figures revealed that of twelve thousand residents in Stotfold, 70 were claiming job seekers allowance. The unemployment rate for the town stood at 4.2% whilst the national average rate stood at 9%. He stated that, with regard to employment sustainability, there was an existing high level of employment and job availability in Stotfold and so did not regard this as a valid reason for objection.

A Member sought clarification from the applicant's agent. The Member referred to one of the Town Council's objections to the application being that the proposed affordable housing was not 'pepper potted' throughout the development. He also referred to the agent having referred to the affordable housing being 'clustered' in line with Central Bedfordshire Council's policy when both the Council's policy and that of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was that dwellings should be tenure blind. He felt it was difficult to achieve this when the affordable housing was all placed in one location. In response the agent explained how the proposed 12 affordable homes were split within the site in two clusters of 10 and 2. He assured the Committee that the dwellings were tenure blind and that their design mix and location would not be unacceptable to the Council.

The Member stressed his opposition to the clustering of affordable housing and stated that he would strongly prefer to see such dwellings distributed throughout the estate. He acknowledged that registered providers preferred affordable housing units to be located together but he felt that this was a policy which needed to be changed. He therefore asked that the distribution of affordable homes be taken into account, if not with the application before Members, then with regard to future applications. The agent assured the meeting that, as part of the s106 negotiations his client would need to partner with a registered provider and this matter would be discussed with the provider.

The Chairman stated that on very large developments the Council sought the dispersal of affordable homes and that clusters should be of no more than 10 units. On relatively small developments, such as the one before Members, this

approach gave rise to difficulties. In view of the agent's comments he hoped that the registered provider would take the views expressed into account.

A ward Member referred to Astwick Road, which led up to The Green and which he described as dangerous, and how residents and Town Councillors had complained about the road's safety on previous occasions. However, despite the application before Members representing the fourth opportunity for highways officers to propose remedial measures, they had not done so. Instead they appeared content overall and had recommended only minor improvements to the entrance to the site. The ward Member expressed disappointment that no plan had been submitted to improve the road's safety.

The ward Member next referred to local schools. He stated that the school data was from 2016 and he expressed concern that by the time the dwellings were built the data would be three years old and it was impossible to state what the need for school places would be. He asked if the education admissions officer was aware of the site and what the impact of the proposed development would be.

Last, the ward Member referred to the Transport Statement and the reference to a nearby café which, he said, did not exist. He used this as an example of how the information supplied could be out of date and inaccurate.

In response the Executive Member for Education and Skills, who was also a ward Member, stated that, with regard to school spaces, this was a problem with all developments. Uncertainty existed regarding when the dwellings would be built, when they would be occupied and the type of demand generated. He added that this was a challenge experienced by all education authorities faced by such planning applications. The Council had, therefore, to estimate future demand to the best of its ability. The Executive/ward Member stated that he was aware that larger HGVs were not suited for accessing this location by using the Astwick Road. However, he felt that, on balance, he was unable to object to the application. Nonetheless, he asked that the Committee be aware that, despite the success the Council had enjoyed in creating employment locally in nearby Biggleswade there had been a cumulative loss of employment land in Stotfold. Whilst acknowledging that the employment land under consideration was not in the best location given the town's development he made clear that this was the last occasion that he wished to see such employment land lost.

The planning officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- With regard to the sustainability of Stotfold, Policy CS1 referred to Stotfold as a minor service centre and so the town was considered sustainable. This was based on the Council's own data and not that supplied by the applicant.
- The education officer was comfortable that the demand for places generated by the application, and by those other local applications currently under appeal, could be met subject to contributions being

forthcoming from s106 Agreements to fund extensions or alterations to the existing schools.

- Reference to the loss of employment land had been covered in the officer's report, a marketing strategy had been supplied by the applicant which covered a 4 year period, there were safeguarded employment areas within Stotfold and the Council's recent Economic Market Assessment and Employment Land Review Studies had confirmed that there was sufficient existing supply of sites to meet the local business growth and employment generation for Stotfold so it was not possible to defend the retention of the site for employment purposes.
- With regard to the claim that there was no public transport, and so the development was unsustainable, the planning officer stated that she was unable to immediately confirm the location of local bus stops but advised that there was an acceptable level of public transport to the site and to Stotfold as a whole. She reiterated that Stotfold was designated as a minor service area and as such was regarded as sustainable.
- The suggestion that as there would be a loss of employment land in Stotfold there should be s106 contributions from developers in the future. The planning officer explained that, in order to obtain such contributions, it was necessary for them to meet the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) tests or tests reasonably related to the development. She was of the opinion that it would be unreasonable to include any s106 contributions towards an offset of employment.

The highways officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- With regard to safety concerns relating to Astwick Road he reminded the meeting that the roads local to the site would have previously experienced traffic movements related to the industrial use. As a result of the application site's change of use there would be a reduction in the number of large HGV movements to and from the site which was welcome in highways safety terms.
- With regard to traffic generation the site had been assessed using a nationally recognised database which showed that, overall, the residential use of the site would result in a lower movement figure than that experienced under the existing use.

The Committee considered the application. A Member commented that objectors to the method by which highways movements were arrived at should pursue this at a national level given that this matter was calculated on a model formulaic basis. He then advised the Committee of the substantial difference in value between commercial and residential development. The Member roughly estimated that, should the Stotfold site be redeveloped on a modern basis for commercial use, it would be worth only approximately one third of the value than if the site were developed for residential use. In view of such a major difference in value, commercial land would be used for residential development. Further, he doubted that it was possible to influence this issue due to the national method by which such commercial values were arrived at.

The Member also commented on difficulties which would arise should the site be employed for B1/B2 (industrial) uses given that it was located within a residential area. He stated that he would expect it to operate for 12-14 hours per day, in order to extract the value from such a site, with the working day starting at 7.00 a.m. and finishing at 7.00 p.m. and with an hour either side to allow for vehicle deliveries and collections. Noise and disturbance would be generated throughout this period to the detriment of nearby residents. He commented that the decision to allow housing to have been built around industrial sites should not, perhaps, have been made but it had. He also stated that he understood why the site, as with other such sites, had to be used for residential development. People expected a far higher quality working environment and this would require the redevelopment of obsolete industrial sites to make them suitable in this respect. Given the difference in value between commercial and residential it was inevitable that the sites would be used for residential developments. The Member stated that he would prefer to see replacement industrial units on open land and indicated his support for the application.

A Member confirmed that highways movements were calculated against a national formula and, unless town and parish councils employed an expert to challenge the figures supplied, the Committee had to accept them. The Member then referred to the forthcoming release of the revised NPPF for consultation on 5 March and that he was of the opinion that the document would require planning in principle to be granted to brownfield sites. This would not remove the need to examine whether it represented an appropriate employment use or whether jobs would be lost as a result. He reminded Members that the Committee had looked on many occasions, and particularly in Leighton Buzzard, at the number of jobs that could be lost if the premises concerned was a functioning commercial unit. The Member added that the commercial site which was the subject of the application employed only four people in an outdated and inappropriate factory unit. Further, the developers had satisfied officers that the site could not be rented commercially, that the area enjoyed one of the lowest unemployment rates in the UK and that the emerging Local Plan had allocated the appropriate amount of employment land. The B1/B2 uses were not appropriate for the site's location and the view provided by the industrial units was unattractive. He then indicated his support for the application.

The Chairman reminded the meeting that little weight at this stage could be awarded to the emerging Local Plan.

A Member expressed concern regarding parking on the site in the form of triple tandem parking at some 4-5 bedroom dwellings. In particular he referred to the proposed displacement parking on the estate roads. He commented that people not using their allocated parking but parking on the estate roads instead would, based on experience, lead to the estate 'not working'. A policy allowing this was, therefore, a retrograde step and he asked if it would be possible to

make better arrangements without making unallocated spaces part of the scheme.

Following queries by the Chairman the planning officer explained that the triple tandem parking only existed where garages were also proposed. The presence of a garage, which formed one of the three parking spaces, required the provision of a means to access to the back garden. With regard to displacement parking, this could be accommodated by a layby. The highways officer added that the proposed public block paved areas in the development, and which incorporated both roads and pedestrian footways, would be shared use and visitor parking could be accommodated on them.

Having received an explanation with regard to the reason and layout of triple space parking which provided, in effect, driveways to the properties concerned, the Member welcomed their provision. However, he expressed concern regarding the proposed shared use for parking. In response, the Chairman stated that, in his experience, such shared use spaces worked quite well.

On being put to the vote 12 Members voted for approval, 0 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/17/05913/FULL relating to land at Taylors Road, opposite Aspen Gardens, Stotfold, Hitchin, SG5 4AX be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

DM/17/137. Planning Application No. CB/17/05230/RM (Sandy)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application CB/17/05230/RM, a reserved matter of outline application CB/16/04657/OUT for the residential development of 0.49 hectares of land to form 9 bungalow/chalet dwellings with associated garaging, parking and other associated works, to include the discharge of conditions nos. 2, 8, 9, 12 and 14 on land north east of Walnut Close, Blunham, MK44 3NB.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional consultation/publicity responses and additional/amended conditions as set out in the Late Sheet.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received representations from Blunham Parish Council, an objector to the application and the agent for the applicant under the public participation scheme.

In response to a query made by the Blunham Parish Council representative during his representation the Chairman explained that, arising from a ministerial statement, any development of less than 10 dwellings was unable to attract s106 contributions or be required to provide affordable housing.

Given the size of the site and the resulting density a Member sought clarification from the Parish Councillor as to why he thought the application represented overdevelopment. In response the Parish Councillor stated that the application was larger than the approved outline application and Members had said at that time that anything larger would be unacceptable. The Chairman intervened at this point and stated that he believed the reference was to the height of those properties (which lay to the rear of the northern boundary) which had originally been conditioned to be single storey but which now included dwellings of one and a half storeys (with rooms in the roof space). Further, those properties that were single storey were as high as the one and a half storey. The Member acknowledged that it had not been a reference to the ground area.

A Member sought clarification from the objector regarding the latter's claim that a turning area had been blocked. In response the objector explained that two parking spaces at the southern end of The Barns (an extension to the original Close) had already been removed to provide a turning area. In view of the absence of any alternative parking provision visitors parked on the turning area. This prevented residents from reversing out of their properties, turning and then driving forward out of Walnut Close. Instead they had to reverse out of The Barns and Walnut Close.

Following earlier expressions of concern regarding egress from the properties in The Barns the agent for the applicant stated that the Council's highways officer had assessed the application and had raised no issue with regard to the blocking of access to the objector's property.

A ward Member indicated his support for the residents' objections. He stated that he drove into Walnut Close on a regular basis and could confirm that drivers had to reverse out of The Barns and turn to drive out of Walnut Close. Reversing back into Walnut Close was particularly dangerous because of the parking on pavements and verges throughout the Close.

(Note: At this point in the proceedings the fire alarm sounded and the Committee adjourned at 11.20 a.m. On being allowed to return to the Chamber the meeting reconvened at 11.36 a.m.)

The ward Member drew the Committee's attention to the principle behind the original outline application and that behind the current application and the differences between the two. He stated that the outline application was predominantly for a bungalow development. The application before Members had gone through several revisions and whilst the number of bedrooms in plots 7, 8 and 9 on the north of the development had been reduced to two the roof size provided occupants with the opportunity to apply for planning permission to install additional dormer windows and a third bedroom. He felt that this measure had been taken in order to encourage sales.

The ward Member warned of potential problems arising in the future with regard to the development.

The ward Member then turned to the landscaped buffer which he felt was of particular concern because there was no detail provided of future maintenance. He was aware that, depending on what was planted, the growth could be quite substantial and there was no indication that the borderline between plots 1, 2 and 3 in particular was provided. Fencing was shown at the back of the gardens but he queried what would happen if the residents decided to remove the fence and try to take ownership of the land. He asked for detail on how and for how long the landscaped buffer was going to be maintained as this was not set out in the report apart from in very general terms.

The ward Member referred to the access issue which he felt predominantly related to the curve that lead into the site and the impact on access and egress for The Barns. He expressed concern if drivers had to reverse out of The Barns and Walnut Close and commented that the loss of the two unallocated parking spaces was significant in this context. He next referred to displacement parking provision and how problems would arise if the two bedroom properties on plots 7, 8 and 9 did acquire third bedrooms. Also, plots 3, 4, 5 and 6 were three bedroom properties which had the potential to acquire fourth bedrooms and therefore increase the number of 3-4 bedroom dwellings on a relatively small site. Displacement parking could therefore become a major issue in the future and he asked that the Committee alleviate the problem.

The ward Member noted that there were four unallocated parking spaces to the side of the access road into the site given the narrowness of the road. However, discussion on the previous application (minute 136 refers) had referred to shared surfaces that cars could park on and he acknowledged that this approach could provide some alleviation. However, he stated that he would also wish to see additional formal designated unallocated parking.

The ward Member commented on the apparent uncertainty as to whether or not the Council, as the highways authority, or the owner of 15 Walnut Close owned the land which formed a border to the site and whether that land could continue to be a public footpath if an ownership dispute arose.

In conclusion the ward Member stated that full clarification was required from the developer regarding his intentions for plots 7, 8 and 9, the maintenance of the landscaped buffer, the turning area and the provision of visitor spaces.

The planning officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- With regard to plots 7, 8 and 9 there had been a number of amendments to ensure they adhered to the parameters of the outline permission. She stressed that whilst the relevant condition set out that particular plots could be one or one and a half stories it did not place a limit on height.

- Plots 7, 8 and 9 were single storey and there were no rooms in the roof space. There was a recommended condition that would prevent the roof space being extended to allow additional bedrooms.
- An attempt had been made to try and capture any potential concerns regarding additional bedroom space in the first floor that could have a visual impact or create a potential parking issue.
- With regard to parking spaces she stated that there was an overprovision for each of the individual units. In addition there were four unallocated parking spaces at the entrance although the development itself only required two visitors' spaces to be provided. There was also a further parking space to the northern edge of the site. Whilst two unallocated parking spaces had been removed from The Barns the visitor parking spaces provided on the development could compensate for this. Parking provision was therefore considered acceptable and seen as exceeding requirements.
- The proposed double garage at the entrance to the site adjacent to the unallocated parking spaces had been reduced to a single garage. Other garages had been removed in order to open out the views across to the field.
- An outline condition required details of long term management of the landscaped buffer areas to be submitted by the applicant so had not formed part of the application before Members. The acceptability of the details would therefore be considered by officers.
- With regard to access and egress to The Barns she commented that the provision of car parking spaces in the development should prevent parking within The Barns turning area. It should therefore be possible to reverse along The Barns to the turning point and then drive forward into Walnut Close from the point of access into the new development.
- On the matter of footpath provision from the point of access into the new development to adjacent to 15 Walnut Close she stated that it had been confirmed that the allocated route was public highway.
- The Barns was a private road. The Chairman suggested that residents prepare a scheme which would nullify the problems which had been raised.
- In response to comment by the objector the planning officer advised that Condition 8 in the outline application had dealt with the number of stories permitted for the dwellings but did not place limits on the actual height. She confirmed the scheme before Members did not, therefore, contradict the outline application permission.
- With regard to comment by the objector on Condition 12 in the outline application the planning officer confirmed that the land concerned was public highway and was able to be used as a public footpath.
- With regard to a suggestion by the objector that the three metre landscaped buffer be in place before building works the planning officer stated that the landscape details (Condition 7 of the outline application) required a timetable for the implementation to be agreed. The details had not yet been submitted but when they were the implementation issues could be captured at that point.

The highways officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- With regard to the issue of public highway the freehold of the land could be registered and owned by individuals however, the top surface could still remain as appeared to be the case with the land owned by 15 Walnut Close.

The Committee considered the application. A Member commented on his attempt to research the Committee's previous debate on this development at the outline application stage but the minuting style in place at that time had not recorded the information he sought. The Member stated that it appeared the Committee was bound by the comments and deliberations at that meeting and he felt uncomfortable with this. However, given the proposed density of the development it could not be regarded as overdevelopment. He also acknowledged that the Committee had agreed that the proposed properties were meant to be bungalows but, leaving aside queries regarding their height, he regarded them as an opportunity to provide much needed housing. The Member felt that to accept the arguments put forward against such developments would lead to the building of ever larger numbers of new dwellings on green land. He also queried why the properties had been restricted to a single storey on the northern edge of the site when there was no overlooking. On this matter he stated that if applications were submitted in the future to add a floor to these dwellings he felt that he probably would be minded to be open to such requests. With regard to the access to The Barns he commented that the local residents were used to parking in an area which had not been formally allocated to them for this purpose but were now losing it. In conclusion he stated that he felt the development to be reasonable and indicated his support.

The Chairman pointed out that one of the Parish Council's objections referred to a statement allegedly made by a Member of the Committee and asked if the Member was able to reply to this. In response the Member stated that he was unable to remember in detail but the principle was that the view should not be restricted by the excessive height of the buildings. The planning officer assisted by drawing the meeting's attention to the lower height of the proposed dwellings in relation to those in The Barns and that opportunities had been taken to amend the layout to ensure views through. She stated that all of the requirements of the outline application had been adhered to as far as was possible.

On being put to the vote 12 Members voted for approval, 0 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/17/05230/RM relating to land north east of Walnut Close, Blunham, MK44 3NB be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

DM/17/138. Planning Application No. CB/17/04638/FULL (Aspley and Woburn)

The Committee had before it a report regarding the redevelopment of a brownfield site within the infill boundary with a residential development of one new dwelling and demolition of the existing public conveniences at Duck Lane, Woburn, MK17 9PT.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional consultation/publicity responses and additional comments as set out in the Late Sheet. The planning officer also advised the meeting of an error on line 1 of recommended condition 3. The condition should be amended to read "All new doors and windows should be timber and detailed..."

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received representations from Woburn Parish Council and the agent for the applicant under the public participation scheme. In addition the Chairman advised Members that a person who had been registered to speak on behalf of Bedford Estates, which objected to the application, had been unable to attend the meeting because of the weather conditions. It was noted that she lived some distance from the Council Offices. The Chairman advised, however, that the registered speaker had prepared a statement and he read out a copy on her behalf.

A Member sought clarification regarding reference in the absent speaker's statement that the public convenience was currently in use. In response the Chairman stated that the most recent use was as a public convenience for which it had not been used for some time.

Another Member sought clarification from the agent for the application regarding her use of the phrase 'pastiche design', used to describe those newer buildings which attempted to replicate the Georgian style found in Woburn, as being inappropriate for the proposed dwelling. He also referred to her comment that Duck Lane was built in the 19th and 20th centuries. He asked if she regarded the half-timbered building (3 Duck Lane) adjacent to the development site as a pastiche design. In response the applicant's agent stated that she did not know the age of the half-timbered building but she had assumed it was older than some of the others. However, Duck Lane was possibly a service lane and the development which had taken place on the west side of the road was newer than other parts of Woburn. There was a mock Georgian building (1 Duck Lane) on the corner with Leighton Street and the design was subjective with some believing the design fitted in whilst others would feel the attempt to replicate Georgian buildings failed because of the modern form and its execution. Equally, on the southern side of the timber framed buildings was a row of four 1970's buildings which were of a design which could be found anywhere. Those buildings had not been designed specifically for Duck Lane. The proposed dwelling represented an evolution in design terms in the local area and that it was not necessary to simply replicate

what had been done before. Further, whatever was done, it was important that it would be of a high standard and this was her client's intention.

The ward Member stated that he had supported a new building on the site since the public convenience had closed in March, 2006. However, he felt that residents should expect a structure that had some sympathy with the village scene given as it would be they who would see it in the future. The ward Member stated that he had examined some of the policies which he felt could be relevant including CS14 (High Quality Development), CS15 (Heritage) and DM3 (High Quality Development) and challenged how the proposed development could meet the requirements set out within those policies. Finally, he stated that that it was thought that the building represented an overdevelopment of the site. He was aware of two buildings occupying the site since he had moved to Duck Lane in 1987 - the old public convenience, which had been demolished in 1995, and its replacement. He stated that it was a compressed site and the residents living behind it and to the right would almost certainly be overlooked. Further, the proposed frontage would be totally out of keeping with the existing form. With regard to the evolution of design mentioned by the applicant's agent he stated that no one could object to the improvement of the visual aspect of any village but he was suggesting to the Committee that the application had moved too far away from the Georgian design found in Woburn and was too modern in its appearance.

The planning officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- With regard to the impact on the Conservation Area and the design of the dwelling in terms of where it was sited he stated that the conservation officer was in support of the application and had set out the reasons why in the officer report.
- A proposed condition would control the building materials used and the applicant would be required to submit details of the final materials to be used for approval by the Council before development started on site.
- In connection with possible overdevelopment, and whilst the site was relatively constrained in size, the planning officer stated that it was considered to be an infill plot. As such only the rear garden area, in terms of private amenity space, only had to meet one of the requirements outlined in the Council's Design Guide with regard to either the depth requirement or the overall area requirement. The application met the overall area requirement though not the depth requirement.
- Due to the siting of the dwelling off of the boundary to the front and to the north of the site to allow for the parking area there was sufficient private amenity space and general living space and so it did not represent overdevelopment.
- The site would be visible from points within the centre of Woburn but was set back and the design of the flat roofed garages adjacent to the site it would not have a materially significant impact on the Conservation Area or view from that area.

- With regard to the loss of a community facility, the public convenience had been closed in March 2006 according to the ward Member so had not been in use for a number of years, hence the continued public use of the site had not been considered. Further, Central Bedfordshire Council had sold the land to a private developer.
- With regard to scale the proposed dwelling was significantly lower in height than the ridgeline of the neighbouring properties so there was no issue with the scale of the proposed building in that regard.
- The Chairman referred to the policies and other points raised by the ward Member and sought comment from the planning officer.
- Policy CS14 (respect the local character). In response the planning officer stated that this issue, in relation to Duck Lane, had been considered within the report and in the conservation officer's comments. Whilst Woburn centre itself had a specific design character there had been a number of more modern, contemporary developments especially along Duck Lane, in particular with regard to the 1970's and 80's front gable facing properties which provided a mix in character.
- CS15 (conserve and enhance the built environment). This issue had been considered within the conservation officer's comments in the report. The conservation officer had relied on paragraph 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and to the revealing of the timber framed building (3 Duck Lane) to the south of the site. The officers did not feel that the existing public conveniences enhanced the Conservation Area or the character and appearance of the area in general. However, due to the setting back of the proposed building, the side timber gable of 3 Duck Lane would be revealed and would enhance character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- Policy DM3 (appropriate in design and scale). With regard to the scale the overall height of the proposed building was well below the ridgeline of the neighbouring property. Whilst a contemporary design it took cues from the flat roofed garages immediately next to it to the north so it acted as a natural progression.
- Overdevelopment leading to overlooking and loss of light to neighbouring properties. The planning officer stated that both points had been considered in the officer report and, with regard to overdevelopment, he referred to his previous comments regarding private amenity space. As regards the impact on the neighbour the applicant had submitted photographs showing the position of the neighbouring dwellings to the rear of the site. These were some distance behind the proposed property and the back to back distance met with the design guide requirements. He added that the properties were not fully back to back but were off set slightly. Turning to the immediate neighbours he stated that the rear garden of 1 Duck Lane which faced the side aspect of the proposed dwelling and 3 Duck Lane had a number of windows that faced the site. The latter were either secondary windows with supporting windows to the front and rear or non-habitable rooms such as toilets. There was not considered to be a detrimental loss of light or privacy to that neighbour. With regard to the

impact on 1 Duck Lane the planning officer advised that there was a window almost centrally in the side elevation of the proposed dwelling but this had been conditioned to be obscure glazed to prevent direct overlooking. Another window to the front corner of the proposed dwelling but this would also not lead to the direct overlooking of the rear garden of 1 Duck Lane.

The Committee considered the application. A Member referred to the viewpoint of the organisation once known as English Heritage (now Historic England) which had made clear its dislike of pastiche and a clear preference for buildings to be authentic in their design so the difference between old and new was clear to observers. He also felt the way the proposed building was set in the street scene complied with the wishes of English Heritage in that it would not detract from the genuine older property. The Member believed that some local residents were seeking a more traditionally styled house with a pitched roof as could be seen to the south of the timber framed building. However, he commented that the architect had allowed light into the proposed building using large front windows and if these were removed, and a pitched roof added, the building would have to be significantly larger in keeping with the buildings to the north. The Member felt that the architect had attempted to deal with the privacy issues by placing windows to the front of the proposed dwelling where they would cause the least harm. A traditional style would require more windows and this could lead to privacy issues. The Member stated that the proposed building was a modern style with large windows and a flat roof and he felt it did successfully reflected the flat roofed garage design to the north. He also felt that everything hung on the quality of finish. If done to a high quality, professional standard then the building could look quite smart. The Member stated that it would stand apart from its neighbour to the south which he thought was the underlying purpose. He indicated his support for the application.

Another Member indicated his support for the views expressed above.

On being put to the vote 10 Members voted for approval, 2 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/17/04638/FULL relating to the public convenience, Duck Lane, Woburn, MK17 9PT be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

AT THE CONCLUSION OF ITEM 12 ABOVE COUNCILLOR B WELLS LEFT THE MEETING

DM/17/139. Planning Application No. CB/17/05250/FULL (Silsoe and Shillington)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/05250/FULL for a proposed grain store including new access and means of enclosure on land to the south west of Higham Cottages, Higham Road, Higham Gobion.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional/publicity responses, additional comments and additional/amended conditions in the form of additional informatives as set out in the Late Sheet. In addition the planning officer advised the meeting of an additional recommended condition to ensure that the proposed building and premises were used only for the purposes of agricultural storage. There was also an error in recommended condition 6. The distance given of '215.0mm' should be amended to read '215m'. Following a query by the Chairman the planning officer explained that the new condition had been introduced because of an existing industrial site nearby. He also confirmed that the new building was to remain in agricultural use in perpetuity unless an application was made otherwise.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received a representation from the applicant's agent under the public participation scheme.

A Member sought clarification from the applicant's agent regarding the loss of the existing grain store and the reason for the location of the proposed grain store. In response the agent stated that the existing store had already been lost and the tenant farmer only had a small amount of temporary storage. However, the tenant currently had to transport crops off site to a remote storage facility which was not financially viable. The proposed grain store would be located centrally between the two land holdings.

The Member then sought clarification regarding the agent's mention of restrictions around the location of the proposed store to the existing cluster of buildings at Manor Farm when, she felt, it would cause less landscape harm if it was placed close to existing farm buildings and why this was not an option. The agent responded that the Manor Farm business park was entirely tenanted by a veterinary practice so putting a building on the site or using its access was not possible legally because of the tenancy that existed. A building could be put on the opposite side of the road where there was a junction but there were no access points on to the land so a new one would need to be provided. However, it was a more elevated position so it was felt that putting the proposed grain store lower down in the dip of the landscape was preferable than at the top of a hill where it would be more prominent.

At the request of the Member the agent defined the tenanted area to the north of Higham Road.

Another Member sought clarification as to the location of Manor Farm and Bury Farm in relation to the proposed grain store site and the former storage site at Chalton Cross and the distance involved in miles. In response the agent stated that the former arrangement, by which the grain was transported to Chalton Cross, had been inconvenient because of the lengthy distance involved. He was unable to inform the meeting of the mileage between the various sites mentioned but, instead, held up a map which, he claimed, illustrated the central position of the proposed grain store in Higham Gobion. In relation to the land holdings. The Member stated that he believed the agent had assisted him as far as he could but this was insufficient.

Another Member sought clarification as to why the application had been required. He referred to the height and construction of the building as being appropriate regarding Permitted Development Rights (PDRs) and asked if it was the floor area of the proposed grain store which prevented it from fully complying. The agent stated that he believed it was the floor area took the store beyond the PDRs' limits. The Member repeated that the height of the store was acceptable and asked why the applicant required the floor area when, if it had been slightly smaller, the application would have been unnecessary. In response the agent explained that the floor area was dictated by the amount of storage required to serve the landholding. He added that even the floor area requested was not sufficient in itself for a landholding of that size and some crops would still have to be taken off site to remote storage. The proposed store would deal primarily with the wheat crop.

The ward Member commented that the officer's report appeared finely balanced and referred to the large number of conditions imposed. She then stated that she would focus on the road traffic problems, the waste water issues the archaeological implications and the landscape itself.

The ward Member stated that Higham Road was a busy road with a 60 mph speed limit, an acknowledged need for speed restrictions and frequently the scene of near misses. She referred to photographs which showed recent skid marks at the site and to the recently broken yellow chevron sign at the Shillington end of the road which she felt indicated another speeding vehicle having crashed into the hedge. The ward Member stated that the visibility splays only appeared to refer to vehicles leaving the site. However, the problem was one of a lack of visibility for drivers approaching the site from around the bend from the direction of Shillington especially should they encounter an articulated lorry turning across the road into the site.

Turning to the possible contamination of the water source the ward Member referred to the site laying above a principal aquifer and an open brook with indigenous cray fish. She stated the list of recommended conditions was the longest she had seen outside an industrial site and, having read out some of them, commented that they indicated the scale of the threat from what was called an agricultural site.

The ward Member next raised the matter of archaeology. The sites opposite that proposed for the grain store were defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as heritage sites of highest significance. There was also a 14th century church with a 16th century manor house adjacent to it nearby. 12th century pottery had been found in the field directly opposite the site and it was therefore highly probable that the mediaeval village continued under the modern road and the grain store site. The ward Member referred to the recommended condition relating to archaeological investigation as confirmation of this.

Last, the ward Member turned to the living environment. The applicant had stated that the proposed grain store would be in keeping with the landscape. However, at just under 9 metres high with a 2 metre metal fence it just fell within the parameters for such a building. Whilst the planning officer felt its appearance would not have an unacceptable impact the landscape officer had disagreed in full and provided a number of reasons why the application was unacceptable. Further any planned landscape mitigation would be inadequate due to the large scale of the proposed store.

In conclusion the ward Member briefly reiterated the impact of the application on Higham Gobion and rendering Shillington Church and Higham Gobion Church invisible by its position and size.

The planning officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- With regard to the possible contamination of the water source which bordered the site to the east there were a number of recommended conditions following consultation with the Environment Agency and the Internal Drainage Board. Neither body had objected to the proposed grain store.
- The archaeology officer, in recognition that archaeological assets might be in the area, had suggested conditions for adoption to protect any items. He had not, however, objected to the application.
- The landscape officer had objected with regard to the scale of the building. However, it was the officers' opinion that the site was located in a natural dip in the ground and the local churches referred to by the ward Member sat on much higher ground levels. Whilst there would be a visual impact on the landscape it was a rural landscape without any special protection. It was not an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or Green Belt or other landscape designation.
- On balance, and given the need for the proposed grain store location and the potential impact on the landscape, the officers felt that the impact of the store was felt to be acceptable given the location of the building.

The highways officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- The speed of the road was 60 mph which was in line with the design manual for roads and bridges. Visibility splays of 2.4m by 215 metres would need to be provided as conditioned. Some hedges would need to be removed and replanted outside of the visibility splays.
- Any speeding vehicles were the responsibility of the Police.
- There would be a requirement for three HGV spaces and four car spaces on the site and, given the size of the site, this could be met.
- As regards the slow turning speed of the HGVs entering the site from Higham Road given the speed of traffic the highways officer stated that the visibility line of 215 metres was there for vehicles approaching the site to enable drivers to see any obstruction. He added that the distance of 215 metres was an older standard and a shorter distance was now recommended. However, the Council wished to continue implementing the old standard.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- A Member asked for clarification with regard to PDRs in the open countryside. In response the planning officer explained that there were PDRs which related to agricultural holdings for the erection of buildings to be used in conjunction with those holdings (buildings for agricultural use). Whilst the grain store had not been directly assessed against the Permitted Development requirements the comments raised earlier by a Member were correct in that the floor area was over that permitted under the PDRs for agricultural buildings whilst the height of the proposed building was under the 12 metre limit of the PDRs.
- The Member, whilst understanding the need for a grain store because the previous one had been lost, expressed concern regarding its isolated location on what she felt was the wrong side of the road. She expressed support for the ward Member's comments and for the views of the landscape officer and stated that she was unable to support the application.
- Another Member commented whilst there appeared to be a need for the proposed grain store its proposed location also appeared to be a considerable distance from the nearest farms. He referred to the officer's report and the opinion expressed in it that the application would not result in an unacceptable impact on the character of the area. The Member commented that it would, in fact, have a major impact on that area of countryside given its size and design. He stated that he was unable to support the application.
- A Member commented on the opposition to larger housing developments that would arise because of the loss of agricultural land and yet opposition had also arisen to the provision of a grain store that impacted on the landscape. He advised the Committee, however, that the applicant could build a taller grain store with a smaller footprint by going through the PDRs process.

- With the applicant in mind a Member suggested that it would be perfectly possible to site a grain store in a way that was less harmful to the landscape. The Member also referred to the landscape officer's comments which she felt were well made. She commented that the landscape officer rarely objected to an application but, as she had done so on this occasion, the Committee should take note. She emphasised that there was no opposition to a grain store as such but that the location was the issue and it was possible for agricultural buildings to be sited more sensitively.
- Whilst expressing full agreement with the previous speaker a Member stressed that the applicant could, none the less, return with an application for two taller grain stores if he so wished.
- The Chairman reminded the meeting that the proposed location was not regarded as suitable by some but it was the one before the Committee and had to be determined.

On being put to the vote 8 Members voted for approval, 4 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/17/05250/FULL relating to land south west of Higham Cottages, Higham Road, Higham Gobion be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

AT THE CONCLUSION OF ITEM 11 ABOVE COUNCILLORS COLLINS AND GHENT LEFT THE MEETING

THE COMMITTEE ADJOURNED AT 1.10 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 1.38 P.M.

PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF ITEM 13 BELOW COUNCILLORS A BROWN, S DIXON, MRS S GOODCHILD AND A GRAHAM ENTERED THE CHAMBER

DM/17/140. Planning Application No. CB/17/05966/VOC (Stotfold and Langford)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/05966/VOC for the removal of condition no. 16 of planning permission ref: CB/15/03182/FULL dated 18/12/15 at the former Pig Testing Unit, Hitchin Road, Fairfield.

The Committee was aware that Condition 16 required the occupation of an apartment block of 19 residential units by those aged over 55 only.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional consultation/publicity responses and additional comments as set out in the Late Sheet.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received a representation from the applicant under the public participation scheme.

A Member sought clarification from the applicant regarding where the apartment units had been marketed. He also referred to the applicant's brochure for the development as a whole which pointed out the benefits of living so closely to Letchworth and the facilities available in nearby Fairfield Park but which did not appear to refer to the over 55 accommodation. In response the applicant stated that reference to the apartments was not necessarily in the brochure as its purpose was to show what they looked like. She referred the Member online to Right Move and in advertisements where it was clear the apartments were for over 55s. In response to a comment by the Member that the advertisements for over 55 accommodation had only been made on line and not within the brochure the applicant stated that the only persons receiving the brochure were those who had already expressed an interest in purchasing a property on the development. The applicant referred to a log of the interest shown since May 2017 recorded by sales advisors of the interest shown in the apartments. She stated that approximately 20 persons had made enquiries, many of whom had not been over 55.

Members had noted earlier that three reservations for apartments had been registered.

In response to a query by the Chairman the applicant stated that a couple of advertisements had also been placed in local newspapers. She added that visitors to the site were advised of the over 55 accommodation.

A Member asked what the price would be for the apartments. The applicant stated that she believed the prices ranged from £270k for a two bedroomed apartment and 350k for a three bedroomed apartment with terrace.

A Member asked what market research was carried out regarding over 55 accommodation before the original application had been submitted. The applicant stated that the site had been purchased with planning permission which included the provision of over 55 accommodation. The company had been fully aware of that aspect of the permission. Some advice was taken from Connells, a local estate agent which had been heavily involved in selling the Fairfield development. Connells had expressed concerns about being able to sell that many (19) apartments from the site and whether there would be sufficient demand as Connells believed the area was more attractive to young persons and families. The marketing exercise which the applicant had undertaken performed the role of market research. If there had been demand and the company had more than three reservations for the over 55 apartments then she would not be present at the meeting.

Arising from a Member's question to the applicant the Chairman queried how the condition had come to be included in the planning permission. In response another Member, who had been involved in preliminary negotiations with Campbell Buchanan, the original developer, provided background to this issue.

He drew Members' attention to the absence of affordable housing on the development though there was an offsite contribution for affordable housing. During subsequent negotiations, which he had not been involved in, it had been agreed to substitute an element of elderly accommodation. It was not thought that this would be in the form of a care home or affordable elderly accommodation. However, given that the Council was aware of the need for downsizing accommodation it was believed that Fairfield, as an attractive location, would fulfil a particular market need. This had formed an integral part of the Committee's deliberations.

The Member also referred to the presence of a lift in the apartment block and queried why this would be present if not for use by older residents.

A ward Member, who also spoke on behalf of Fairfield Parish Council which objected to the removal of the condition, raised the issue of viability and why the apartments were not selling. He suggested that the reason was because it was too early in the build process and the site's development given that the apartments would not be available for 4-6 months. He also expressed concern with regard to the comparison, offered in the officer's report, with a successful development in Hitchin. He pointed out that the latter was located only five minutes' walk from the railway station, and therefore appealed to a different type of buyer.

The ward Member stated that when the apartments were first permitted the Council was praised for the development mix of a care home, houses and the over 55 apartments, with the latter offering an alternative to the existing Fairfield Hall apartments. He expressed concern at the loss of the apartments for over 55s on the issue of viability when he did not believe supporting evidence existed. He acknowledged that this matter would possibly need to be considered again but it was too early to make any decision. The ward Member also stated he was confused by the officer report in that it was stated by the planning officer that over 55s remained active and used cars. In comparison the MANOP team, which had supported the original application, appeared concerned that the apartments were some distance from shops, amenities and so on. He stated that the apartments were no further from the shops and facilities than when permission had been originally been given; the furthest facility being a 12 minute walk. The ward Member referred to the evolution of Fairfield and was providing the sort of facilities that were attractive to the over 55s. He also referred to another such development in Langford, which was selling well and which was a similar distance to Biggleswade than the Fairfield development was to Stotfold. The Council also planned its own developments in Biggleswade, Houghton Regis, Flitwick, Ampthill and elsewhere. The Priory View development in Dunstable had also been a huge success.

The ward Member stated that there was no mention of the apartment block in the developer's brochure. He believed the market for the apartments would come from within Fairfield and from people who had originally moved to the area 10-12 years ago and who wanted to remain in the area. This was the message he had received from talking to local people and Fairfield Parish

Council. The provision of dwellings for over 55's allowed them to downsize. He referred to the sale of a house in Fairfield to a cash buyer within 48 hours and that this speed of sale, coupled with the current state of the development, meant that existing local residents would defer taking action. He also referred to the muddy conditions on the site which acted as a deterrent to visitors.

The ward Member stated that he believed the marketing period should start from the present and asked that the Committee support the retention of Condition 16. He believed it added to the mix and fluidity of dwellings in the area.

In response to the ward Member's representation the Chairman commented that the officers had required a minimum marketing period of six months and it had actually lasted ten months. With regard to the claim that there was significant demand within Fairfield the Chairman referred to the low level of interest. The ward Member stated that his point was that the period in which the marketing would be effective would be from the present because the building would not be complete for six months. Given that properties were selling so quickly in Fairfield a seller would time their sale accordingly if they wished to downsize. Discussions with many local residents had revealed that they were pleased with the provision of over 55 apartments and the option it provided if they downsized. There were very few small properties in Fairfield and those that were present were not of the type of apartment that was sought.

The planning officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- The Housing Development Officer had advised that a marketing period of six months was appropriate. A consultation on the application had been carried out and the evidence submitted had led to the recommendation before the Committee. The planning officer stated that he was not aware of the brochure's contents but he did have other pamphlet material for the development which did state that the apartments were for over 55s.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- A Member's comment that if he was one of those who had already purchased an apartment and then found that the over 55s only restriction had been removed he would be upset having expected a peaceful environment without the presence of families. To remove the condition would be to let the three purchasers down and impact on any contract they had. The Chairman commented that it would depend on the precise wording of the contract which the Committee did not have before it.
- Another Member referred to the applicant's comments on the type of purchaser that was being sought including first time buyers. He stated that he was not aware of many first time buyers who could afford the prices asked. He also stated that he passed the development site every

day and it was not possible to access the development site because of the developer's long standing, poor quality highway works at the entrance, a situation that was likely to continue for some time. He also referred to complaints by local residents to him in his role as Portfolio Holder for Highways on this issue. Possible purchasers who drove around looking at likely developments would also be deterred. The Member commented that the developer had failed to encourage sales though the marketing or the maintenance of the site and area and expressed support for the ward Member's comments.

- Another Member drew a comparison with a current development in Dunstable which involved the conversion of a listed building. The Council had requested that ground floor apartments be made available to the over 55s. The Member explained the building process which had been followed and how access to those apartments had been provided before marketing had started. This had encouraged the purchasing of the units. With regard to the development before the Committee he referred to its origins, the high quality of the marketing brochure and was of the opinion that, if marketed in the right places, 55 year olds would be attracted to live on what was a prestigious development. The Member turned to the lack of amenity provided for the apartment block and how condition 16 made the application acceptable in planning terms. He commented that the lack of such amenity, in the form of an absence of private gardens, could prove attractive to some older people. The applicant's argument that the condition was unreasonable at a time of a national housing shortage ignored that owners who downsized left an empty house behind.
- A Member referred to the sale of only three apartments in comparison to a huge uptake of similar elsewhere. Whilst acknowledging that it was difficult to enter the site there should have been a corresponding impact on the sales of the other properties on the development and this had not apparently happened. He referred to the applicant being unable to sell the units and queried how long this situation could be allowed to continue. He stated that if the developer was unable to sell the units then the Council should be revising its arrangements in recognition of this.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds of prematurity due to the lack of marketing for a sufficient period and would make the development unacceptable in terms of the lack of amenity associated with the apartment block.

The proposer commented that, whilst seeing a brochure he saw no evidence of marketing. Whilst he accepted the planning officer's position he would have wished to have seen that evidence set before the Committee to have been more convinced that the apartments had been thoroughly marketed in depth in the right places. The planning officer stated that he understood the papers referred to were from the developer's (Crest Nicholson) website and not the brochure. The Member reiterated that there were no alternative brochures, there were some advertisements in newspapers which he had not seen and the

information was only on the developer's website. Further the development had not been built out.

A second planning officer advised that any reason for refusal should focus on the original reason for the condition being imposed. This would include the need for elderly accommodation in the area. He therefore suggested a reason for refusal based on the limited amenity space for the apartments, the need for elderly accommodation in the area and the Committee not being satisfied that there was no demand for the apartments would be appropriate given the concerns expressed. In response the Member who had moved the recommendation welcomed the suggestion. The Chairman stated the precise form of words would become clearer once the officers had the opportunity to deliberate further.

A Member commented that there was no mechanism available to the developer if they were unable to sell the apartments. He asked that a mechanism be embedded to allow the applicant to come back to the Committee without having to go to appeal. In response a Member, whilst acknowledging this point and that made by the applicant that the condition was in perpetuity, referred to the disturbance which would be caused to those over 55s which would be caused by a young, large family moving into the building. Referring back to his previous comments he emphasised that the prematurity was the point he was trying to make and there was nothing to prevent the developer returning to the Committee in a year or so with another application and advising how their attempt to sell the apartments had been unsuccessful.

A Member stated that he was examining the developer's website for the development and there was no reference to over 55s.

The Chairman stated that the recommended reason for refusal was based on prematurity which could relate to insufficient advertising having taken place and the lack of amenity space for the apartments.

On being put to the vote 9 members voted for refusal, 1 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/17/05966/VOC relating to the former Pig Testing Unit, Hitchin Road, Fairfield be refused as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

DM/17/141. Planning Application No. CB/18/00077/FULL (Houghton Hall)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/18/00077/FULL for the temporary use of land as a car park with minor works, temporary stationing of 2 no. portable buildings for ancillary use as

security and shelter and temporary stationing of lighting at the Co-operative Supermarket, High Street, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5QT.

No additional consultation/publicity responses, comments or additional/amended conditions were set out in the Late Sheet.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received a representation from the agent for the applicant under the public participation scheme.

A ward Member referred to the sensitivity regarding the site since the fire in 2005. The Member stated that, whilst content to leave recommended condition 1 relating to the end date of the use of the site as a temporary car park unamended, she sought assurance from officers that if the Council needed to extend the period beyond the recommended end date, then consultation would take place with local Members, Houghton Regis Town Council and the local community. The ward Member stated that she wished to see the matter be dealt with in as transparent manner as possible. She also felt that any extension should not exceed one month. The ward Member again referred to public scrutiny around the application and to the recommended condition that stated that the site would be returned to its pre-development condition. However, a number of local residents had pointed out to her that this could not happen because a tree had already been felled on the site. Whilst not a material planning issue she felt it worthy of note given the public interest in the site.

The planning officer responded to the points raised so far as follows:

- Should an extension to the temporary use was sought a new application would be required to vary the condition. Consultation would take place with relevant parties. The Chairman queried whether, if the requirement was for, say, one month, it would fall within the officer's authority to grant the extension without the need for a new application. In response the planning officer referred to the content of the recommended condition which stated that the use of the site as a temporary car park would cease on 31 July in accordance with the proposed six month period. He added that in view of the Independent Living Scheme for Older Persons (which was due to be built on the site) there would be a reluctance to extend the period. However, if a request to extend the period was sought there would need to be a variation. The Chairman assured the ward Member that the need for a new application would therefore arise and consultation would take place.
- A Member stated that the recommended temporary use cessation date was a condition and the Committee could make that more open ended until such time that work was ready to commence on the Independent Living Scheme. This would remove the need the matter to return to the Committee.

- With regard to returning the site to its pre-development condition the Chairman referred to the removal of the tree and that this had to be regarded as a matter to be carried out as far as it was practical to do so.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- A Member sought an assurance that the recommended cessation date of 31 July was not exceeded so works could commence on the Independent Living Scheme. In response the Chairman stated that an assurance could be given but the date might still not be achieved. The Committee therefore needed to consider what would happen next given that the applicants could return with a further application for an extension. Alternatively, the Committee could, as suggested, anticipate such a request and condition accordingly.
- Another Member reminded the meeting that weather conditions could lead to an extension in the time required the construction of the applicant's decked car park (for use by the company's employees at the applicant's site at Houghton Hall Business Park). However, any building project included a contingency period and it was hoped that such a period would not be exceeded. The Member stressed, however, that delays did occur and he was sure that the applicant had a robust plan, checked by the Council's officers, to deal with such delays.
- In response to query by the legal officer regarding the need to clarify the point at which an application to extend the temporary car park use would need to be submitted, the planning officer stated that a practical approach was necessary and that a new application would not be expected if additional use was only expected to continue for up to a few weeks. The Chairman commented that, given the time required to undertake enforcement action, the matter would be settled by then.
- A Member felt that recommended condition 1 was suitable as it stood and that it should not be necessary for the applicant to submit a further application to the Committee if the agreed cessation time was exceeded. The officers could consider time pressures regarding the building of the Independent Living Scheme and if there was a clash with an extended use of the site for car parking the officers would refuse a time extension. He felt that the officers were capable of being left to deal with issues should they arise.
- A Member commented that the Council (which owned the site) was attempting to assist a major local employer with a temporary car park and she was unable to understand why the application had generated such debate.
- A Member referred to a delay which had arisen with regard to development within Houghton Regis but assured the meeting of the desire to proceed as quickly as possible with the construction of the Independent Living Scheme. He stressed that the use of the Co-op site as a temporary car park would not delay it further. The Member also referred to the objection to the application and criticised its relevance. In

response the Chairman stated that the site was Council owned land and there was an issue of public perception and transparency. There was already comment within Houghton Regis that a decision in favour of the application had been, in effect, a forgone conclusion. The Chairman stated, however, that good debate had taken place and the various reasons and issues had been considered. Further an objection had been received, although he acknowledged it had not been completely relevant.

On being put to the vote 10 Members voted for approval, 0 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/18/00077/FULL relating to the Co-Op Supermarket, High Street, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5QT be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

AT THE CONCLUSION OF ITEM 16 ABOVE COUNCILLORS S DIXON AND MRS S GOODCHILD LEFT THE MEETING

DM/17/142. Planning Application No. CB/17/00442/VOC (Silsoe and Shillington)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/00442/VOC for the variation of condition 14 attached to planning permission reference CB/15/04081/OUT dated 17 January 2017 so that landscaping on the south eastern boundary of the site was carried out in accordance with drawing number WHK20175 11E (Southern Boundary Proposals) on land rear of 7-37 Barton Road, Gravenhurst, Bedford, MK45 4JP.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional/amended conditions in the form of an additional informative as set out in the Late Sheet.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received a representation from the agent for the applicant under the public participation scheme.

A Member sought clarification from the agent. The Member stated that he had closely examined the trees (the subject of the application together with other landscape features) when on the Council's site inspection and several appeared to have been dead for approximately ten years. He asked the agent if the applicant could remove the trees regardless of their condition given they were not covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). In response the agent referred to the planning officer's introduction and to the arboriculture report submitted in support of the application which stated that the trees were not protected by any designation and could be removed at any time.

A second Member sought clarification as to whether the proposed layout of the trees lay within private gardens or outside them. In response the agent explained that the layout was a Reserved Matter and would come forward with a Reserved Matters application. The application before Members was for a variation to a condition attached to the existing outline planning permission. There was an illustrative layout but that was not necessarily the layout that would be submitted under Reserved Matters.

A Member asked the agent to confirm that there was a provisional layout which placed some of the trees outside of the gardens and some inside them. In response the agent stated that in terms of the current proposal the outline planning permission included a management plan which sought to protect the landscape features on the site. With regard to the location of the proposed trees some were within gardens but that was not to be determined at this stage.

A Member asked if it would be possible to lay out the site in such a way that the trees would not be in private gardens. The agent advised that the scheme had been considered so that it would be possible to retain the trees that the Council's officers had considered to be of importance. With regard to the trees on the south-eastern boundary he stated that options had been considered whereby they were protected or there could be a means of protecting them. That was the key intention of the condition. The Member felt her question had not been answered and repeated it. The agent stated that in terms of the layout of the site and the original outline application the intent was that they would lie outside the public domain. However, he was of the opinion that if the trees were placed in the public domain it would not be an efficient use of land on that site.

The ward Member acknowledged that none of the trees in the screening area had any individual importance and none were protected by a TPO. She explained, however, that this was not the issue when condition 14 was originally imposed. Whilst the site had been referred to as an undeveloped plot by the planning officer it was actually the remains of an old village apple orchard; 80% of which had already been destroyed. The applicant was focused solely on the existing trees rather than the whole area which provided a landscape feature denoting the transition from a built environment to the open countryside. She advised the meeting that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) included increased support for the protection of existing trees.

The ward Member then referred to the objections from the ecology officer and the green infrastructure officer to the removal of the natural screen which had been defined as a priority habitat, wildlife haven and a wilderness area with a rich diversity. The applicant wanted to remove most of the larger trees and slightly extend the boundary area with new trees. She referred to the officer's report which stated that the surviving trees would then be incorporated into gardens and that residents could ignore, neglect or replace garden hedges with

fences and cut down the surviving trees. Whilst the planning officer felt that any loss would be outweighed by other material considerations these had not been defined. The ward Member concluded by stating that the 20% of the orchard which remained was a link to the old village. She referred to how the Committee had originally decided to retain the remainder of the orchard and how nothing had changed since that decision. She asked that the Committee continue to preserve it.

The planning officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- Whilst acknowledging the history of the site and the removal of the trees composing 80% of the orchard the Committee had to consider what was before it.
- Whilst the ecological impact had been referred to he reminded the Committee that the reasons for the original condition 14 were the retention of landscape features and to ensure an acceptable appearance of development. No ecological reason had been attached.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- A Member's comment that the condition had been imposed at her request because of, in particular, concern that if the site was built out, the long distance views from the south to its elevated position, would present an unattractive, hard edged urbanisation of the landscape.
- The Member stated she had acknowledged that the trees were not in good condition but stressed that the belt of trees helped to soften the proposed development. She stated that this point had been recognised by a number of officers who all supported the retention of the trees. However, the developer was also within his rights to remove them all and if only a few were retained in residents' back gardens they could also be removed. On this basis she sought a compromise under which as many trees and hedgerows as were possible were retained outside of the back gardens to maximise the screening and ecological value.
- A Member commented that from the bottom of the hill it was possible to see two sheds together with some of the orchard and some hedging further to the east of the development. He added that if the Committee wished to create sanctuaries of environmental land then it was a separate issue. He did not understand why the Committee was trying to protect the land as it did not form a buffer strip and was merely a piece of scrub land with dead trees which at some point would be removed. Live trees might stay within residents' gardens though none were protected by a TPO and none appeared to be prime specimens. He stated that his only concern was that he felt fuller use could have been made of the land to help reduce the need to build dwellings on green land.
- A Member referred to the planning officer's statement in his report that all the trees would be dead within ten years. The Member stated that he

was unsure if the applicant could proceed with Reserved Matters while still having an unfulfilled condition in the Outline Permission though the applicant could cut down the trees. Although the Council could respond with enforcement action, the trees would be gone and there would be little the Council could do. He indicated that the Member who had originally requested the condition wished to see a reasonable buffer and that there would be a landscaping condition under Reserved Matters. He added that the houses would be taller than both the sheds and trees so the latter would make no significant difference to the view from the valley or the site.

- Discussion took place on the size of the replacement trees to be planted following a Member's expression of concern that they might be removed by residents.

On being put to the vote 9 Members voted for approval, 1 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/17/00442/VOC relating to land rear of 7-37 Barton Road, Gravenhurst, Bedford, MK45 4JP be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

AT THE CONCLUSION OF ITEM 8 ABOVE COUNCILLOR A GRAHAM LEFT THE MEETING

THE COMMITTEE ADJOURNED AT 3.10 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 3.17 P.M.

DM/17/143. Planning Application No. CB/17/02615/OUT (Shefford)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/02615/OUT, an outline application for a residential development comprising 31 no 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses, and 6 no 1 and 2 bedroom apartments (37 no total dwellings) following demolition of existing single dwelling with new access onto Ivel Road and reconfigured parking for existing office at Pinehurst, 17A Ivel Road, Shefford, SG17 5LB.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional consultation/publicity responses, additional comments and additional/amended conditions as set out in the Late Sheet. The Committee noted that a typographical error had occurred and the reference to 'Stotfold Town Memorial Association' should be amended to read 'Shefford Town Memorial Association'.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received representations from Shefford Town Council under the public participation scheme.

A Member sought clarification from the Town Council representative regarding the 250 vehicle movements per day which the latter had suggested would arise from the development. The Town Council representative informed the meeting that the number was based on guidance found on a website which advised town and parish councils on this issue. The Member suggested that the link to the website be provided to the highways officer for consideration given the different outcomes that had been arrived at by the two parties.

A ward Member objected to the application on the following grounds:

- the Council had recently established a five year land supply so the application was non-essential.
- Ivel Road was a major road link between the A507 bypass to the town centre. He referred to the difficulties experienced in vehicle movements and parking obstructions in Ivel Road at the section where the site access was proposed.
- The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to restrict parking in Ivel Road but only provide two parking spaces in the site would create an ongoing problem for the residents of Ivel Road.
- To recognise that restrictions on parking would only be required during the operation of waste collections confirmed that the problem was anticipated and restrictions could not be enforced. Should the emergency services or other vehicles be required to enter the site major problems would arise.
- Whilst Anglian Water had claimed it had sufficient capacity to process foul drainage from the site at Clifton Water Recycling Centre he queried whether the drainage infrastructure was able to transport it to the Centre. On many occasions he had witnessed the need for Clifton Road to be unblocked using a tanker vehicle as the system was gravity fed rather than through a pump system. He added that the presence of a parked tanker adversely affected vehicle movements.
- The list of items being considered for financial contribution recognised the importance of the Shefford Town Memorial Association (STMA) play area within the town. It would be of benefit to the developer because it would not need to provide play areas as the STMA play area was on the site's boundary.
- There were no school places available in Shefford across all age ranges. Whilst an extension at the Acorn Pre-School had been mentioned it was not possible as it lay sandwiched between the middle and lower schools. The lower school had been extended twice within the last six years and could not be extended further.
- It was not sustainable to transport children from the site to Meppershall Lower. Meppershall was at near capacity the school would be oversubscribed as a result of local developments. He believed that there were currently four vacancies with planning consent for 100 dwellings approved and a forthcoming public appeal with regard to a further 145 dwellings.

- In the emerging Local Plan there was a potential to build a further 55 homes. As a result of this expansion Meppershall would be unable to offer any lower school places.
- Robert Bloomfield Middle School was at capacity even with the additional nine classes that were built a few years ago.
- The measuring point for children to apply for places in Shefford schools was now the centre of the town. Due to the location of the site it would gain preference over outlying homes that had been in the town for many years. He argued that this was wrong and priority should be the provision of new schools
- Shefford currently had over 250 homes approved and in varying stages of build. The emerging Local Plan called for a further 72 properties which would feed into Ivel Road.
- The rear garden sizes only 'generally' met the standards in the Council's Design Guide. He asked that the Committee ensure that all met the design standards.
- The trees on the site and on its boundary were important to the development and should be retained. Plot 11 should be repositioned to protect tree roots.
- No provision had been made for fire hydrants in the cul-de-sac and he asked for this to be addressed.
- He stressed that he was not opposed to a development on the site but his previous comments should be given consideration before a decision was made.

The ward Member asked that a decision on the application be deferred for three cycles for reconsultation or rejected outright.

The planning officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- The emphasis was on the Council to provide an education strategy. The onus was not on the applicant. Through the contributions requested by education officers the officers were confident that they had a strategy to allow for the education of children and to alleviate the impact on the infrastructure. It would not, therefore, be reasonable to refuse the application on those grounds.
- With regard to concern over sewerage he pointed out that the SUDS officers had considered the application acceptable. Further, detailed drainage plans had been requested by condition and sewerage would be more fully assessed at that stage.
- The proposed parking arrangements, including the TRO and displacement parking bays, were considered acceptable in terms of vehicle movements.
- Whilst the Council had a five year land supply the Committee was required to consider and assess all applications on their individual merits. Further, the application complied with policies CS1 and DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (CSDMP) so

it would be unreasonable to refuse the application because the Council had a five year land supply.

- With regard to play areas the site was adjacent to an existing recreational ground and the applicant had offered a contribution in relation to the duty to meet infrastructure demand.
- Only limited weight could be given to the emerging Local Plan at this stage and education were satisfied that, through contributions, a scheme for education could be provided.
- Most of the rear gardens met the guidance document. He stressed its status as a guidance. In addition, the spacing around the properties was not dissimilar to that found at other homes in the surrounding area. On the whole it could not be considered to be overdeveloped.
- No request for fire hydrants had been received from the fire officer so they were not required.

The highways officer responded to the points raised as follows:

- The application was for only 37 dwellings so it fell below the Council's requirement for a transport statement, the threshold being 50.
- The standard database revealed 14-17 movements in the a.m. peak and 11-14 movements in the p.m. peak giving rise to an average of only one car every three minutes during the morning and evening rush hour peak. This was not classified as severe under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- The application site road width was 5.5 meters wide and so complied with the Council's design guide. The road width could be reduced to 4.8 meters for a site of that size.
- To offset possible parking issues two visitor parking bays had been provided within the development near to Ivel Road and within the estate road that could be used when traffic restrictions were in operation.
- He felt that throughout a 24 hour period a total of 200-250 movements was a reasonable estimate.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- This was an application for a development within the settlement envelope.
- The Council had a legal obligation to supply school places and, recognising that there was a shortage of land, the Education officers had agreed intermediate arrangements to do so until such time a new school or land for a new school was available or both. A Member understood that a site had been identified in the emerging Local Plan for this purpose.
- A Member sought clarification as to whether the application was outline or full as the application reference was outline and the recommended decision was approval for a full application. In response the planning officer stated that the application was an outline application. A second

Member then sought a change to the application's description so as to set out the maximum number of dwellings permitted. A second planning officer explained that the application's description could not be amended. However, it was possible for the Committee to condition the maximum number of dwellings permitted.

- A Member sought clarification on the planning officer's earlier comment that 'most' of the rear gardens met the size requirements in the design guide. In response the planning officer stated that the assessing officer was of the opinion that the majority of the rear gardens were of sufficient size in line with the guidance. He stressed that the design guide was a guidance. He was unable to identify the gardens or their number which failed to meet the requirements but overall sufficient spacing would be left around the buildings consistent with that found around existing dwellings to the south. The Member stated that she would feel uncomfortable approving an application where she was unclear how many gardens met or did not meet the design guidance. She acknowledged that the document was a guidance but that the Committee was keen that it was imposed and the application was for a reasonably substantial development so clarity was required.
- The Member next sought clarification on the operation of the proposed TRO which she felt to be impractical. In response the planning officer advised that the TRO would prevent parking in the turning and manoeuvrability areas for larger vehicles. To offset any parking loss two bays would be provided for off street parking. Following a further query regarding the times the TRO would operate the highways officer explained that times had not yet been approved. He added that under the Highway Code parking was not permitted within 10 metres of a junction and this would be of relevance to emergency vehicles attempting to turn and manoeuvre during the times the TRO was not in operation. The Chairman stated that the Highway Code did not have the force of law which was why TRO's were used on junctions.
- The Member again sought clarification on the above issue and queried whether, as she believed, there would be a temporary ban at a particular time to allow refuse vehicle access and turning. She expressed extreme doubt that this would be enforceable. The highways officer responded that the TRO would be permanent but the Member again queried its enforceability. The Chairman stated that this would depend on the presence of the Council's civil enforcement officers. The highways officer confirmed that the TRO would be enforceable and double yellow lines would be employed. Another Member asked if the two parking bays were covered by the TRO. The highways officer explained that the bays within the development site would remain available for use at any time.
- A Member reminded the Committee that it could not impose TROs as this was the function of the Traffic Management meeting. He referred to a previous attempt by the Committee to do so and which had been rejected by Traffic Management. The Chairman explained that should the application be approved as recommended then the Highways team

would be required to submit the proposed TRO to Traffic Management for consideration. He acknowledged it might or might not be approved.

- A Member stated that the application was within the settlement envelope, the education authority had provided reasons for its stance on the application and whilst the proposed arrangements appeared unpalatable he asked that, should refusal of the application be moved, then it be supported by a good reason to do so.
- A Member stated that having listened to the discussion he had not heard any substantive argument for refusal. Following discussion he moved the recommendation subject to a condition that the scheme was for a maximum of 37 dwellings. The recommendation was seconded.
- As an aside the Member commented that reports used to include the hectarage of the site and how this made it possible to work out the density of a development. He asked that this be included in future reports.
- The second planning officer stated that the layout, space, position of buildings and gardens and the size of gardens formed part of the application. If the application was approved, therefore, there would be no opportunity for the Committee to revisit the size of the gardens. He pointed out that all matters were reserved on the application except for access and layout and explained that, whilst it would be possible to include a condition setting out the maximum number of dwellings, if the submitted plan was approved it would, in effect, determine this issue. The Chairman commented that the application was unusual in that outline applications were normally for the principle and means of access. The application before Members differed in that it also specified the layout. The Member who had moved the recommendation acknowledged the clarification and withdrew the additional condition for a maximum number of dwellings. This was also accepted by the seconder.
- The ward Member stated that there were no school places available in Shefford. Meppershall, Campton and Clifton were all full and the financial contributions being made available would last only a short period in being used to transport children to schools with places. In response the Chairman stated that the Council had a statutory responsibility to provide school places but not where the places were. The education officers had assured the Committee that they could find the spaces the Committee was left with no other option.
- A Member commented that he felt consideration as to whether schools could accept additional pupils should involve the chair of governors. In their absence, however, he felt that Members should not ignore officers' advice.
- A Member expressed concern regarding the means by which peak time vehicle movements were arrived at and his request that Members be briefed on how the model worked in order to gain a greater understanding. He emphasised the importance of the issue. The Chairman concurred and requested that it be included in Members' annual training.

- Following a Member's query regarding the delay in submitting the application to the Committee the planning officer explained that the application had been open to amendments in order to overcome technical issues.
- A Member noted that the planning officer who had written the report was not present and so was unable to advise on the number of houses with gardens that met the design guide. She again stated that she was uncomfortable regarding the application and referred to earlier confusion as to whether the application was full or outline and what matters were covered by it. She again sought clarification on how many houses contained gardens that met the design guide. The Member reiterated that although only a guide it included standards which the Committee wanted to see applied. The Member felt that she was being manipulated and did not have command of all of the information she required in order for her to make a decision.

On being put to the vote 7 Members for approval, 2 voted against and 2 abstained.

RESOLVED

That Planning Application No. CB/17/02615/OUT relating to Pinehurst, 17A Ivel Road, Shefford, and SG17 5LB be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

AT THE CONCLUSION OF ITEM 9 ABOVE COUNCILLOR A BROWN LEFT THE MEETING.

DM/17/144. Planning Application No. CB/17/06061/FULL (Amphill)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/06061/FULL for a first floor side extension above garage/utility (previous planning permission CB/15/01464/FULL) at 14 Verne Drive, Amphill, Bedford, MK45 2PS.

The meeting noted that the item was before the Committee because the applicant was a member of staff within the development management team.

There were no additional consultation/publicity responses, comments or additional/amended conditions reported in the Late Sheet.

A ward Member indicated that he had no objection to the application.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- A Member stressed that the application was not being approved automatically. He understood that the proposal had already been

through the proper process so the Committee's reaffirmation was being sought. The status of the application was discussed given that the same proposal was granted permission by the Committee in May 2015.

- The ward Member reiterated that he had no objections to the application and he believed that Ampthill Town Council had none either.
- The Chairman commented that the application was new and not simply to be reaffirmed.
- A Member stressed the complete absence to any objections to the application.

On being put to the vote 10 Members voted for approval, 0 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/17/06061/FULL relating to 14 Verne Drive, Ampthill, Bedford, MK45 2PS be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

DM/17/145. Planning Application No. CB/17/06001/FULL (Northill)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/06001/FULL for the construction of two agricultural barns at Water Lane Farm, Biggleswade Road, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BP.

The meeting noted that the item was before the Committee because the applicant was related to a Member of the Council.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional consultation/publicity responses and an additional/amended condition in the form of an additional Informative as set out in the Late Sheet.

No representations were made under the public representation scheme.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- In response to a Member's query the officer stated that two existing barns would be removed and replaced by an agricultural building.

(Note: At this point in the proceedings Councillor Firth referred to his earlier declaration of a Personal Interest for this item and sought confirmation that he was able to move the recommendation. The legal officer advised that he was).

On being put to the vote 10 Members voted for approval, 0 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/17/06001/FULL relating to Water Lane Farm, Biggleswade Road, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BP be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

DM/17/146. Planning Application No. CB/17/05981/FULL (Northill)

The Committee had before it a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/05981/FULL for a single storey rear extension and alterations at 203 Biggleswade Road, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BJ.

The meeting noted that the item was before the Committee because the applicant was a Member of the Council.

There were no additional consultation/publicity responses, comments or additional/amended conditions reported in the Late Sheet.

No representations were made under the public representation scheme.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- A Member's reference to comments from a neighbour regarding the impact of the application on the access to the side of the property. Another Member pointed out that the applicant's agent had confirmed in writing that the proposal would not encroach on the neighbour's legal rights of way.

On being put to the vote 10 Members voted for approval, 0 voted against and 1 abstained.

RESOLVED

that Planning Application No. CB/17/05981/FULL relating to 203 Biggleswade Road, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BJ be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.

DM/17/147. Late Sheet

In advance of consideration of the planning applications attached to the agenda the Committee received a Late Sheet advising it of additional consultation/publicity responses, comments and proposed additional/amended conditions. A copy of the Late Sheet is attached as an appendix to these minutes.

DM/17/148. **Site Inspection Appointment(s)**

NOTED

that the next meeting of the Development Management Committee will be held on 28 March 2018.

RESOLVED

that all Members and substitute Members along with the relevant ward representatives be invited to conduct site inspections on 26 March 2018.

(Note: The meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m. and concluded at 4.15 p.m.)

Chairman

Dated

Item No. 6

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/05913/FULL
LOCATION	Land at Taylors Road, opposite Aspen Gardens, Stotfold, Hitchin, SG5 4AX
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing industrial units and development of 32 residential dwellings (including 12 affordable homes), vehicular access, pedestrian links, car parking, drainage, public open space and associated works.
PARISH	Stotfold
WARD	Stotfold & Langford
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Dixon, Saunders & Saunders
CASE OFFICER	Donna Lavender
DATE REGISTERED	15 December 2017
EXPIRY DATE	16 March 2018
APPLICANT	Taylor Wimpey North Thames
AGENT	Bidwells
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Major Application with Town Council Objection on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Loss of employment• Increased Traffic Generation• Affordable Housing not dispersed within the site
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Recommended for Approval subject to the completion of a 106 agreement

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be APPROVED conditional on the completion of a 106 agreement and subject to the following:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The materials to be used for the external walls and roofs of the development as shown on drawing no. LSD181-04 Rev D shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To control the appearance of the building in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.
(Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 7, NPPF)

- 3 **No development shall take place until details of hard and soft landscaping (including details of the species, sizes and densities) together with a timetable for its implementation have been submitted to**

and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved and in accordance with the approved timetable.

**Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of landscaping.
(Policy DM14 of the Core Strategy for the North and Sections 7 & 11, NPPF)**

- 4 No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied, until a Landscape and SuDs Maintenance and Management Plan for a period of ten years from the date of its delivery has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the management body, who will be responsible for delivering the approved landscape maintenance and management plan. The landscaping and SuDs shall be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved plan following its delivery.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the site would be acceptable in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Core Strategy and Sections 10 & 11 of the NPPF.

- 5 The positioning of the protective fencing details as supplied in support of the application, shall be erected to protect the natural canopy spread and root protection areas of the trees proposed to be retained. The protective fencing shall then be fully implemented before the commencement of any site construction works, and the approved fencing shall remain firmly in place throughout the entire course of development.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory standard of landscape protection is fully implemented in the interests of maintaining the health and natural canopy spread of the protected trees. Failure to secure these details prior to commencement of development could result in the unreasonable loss of a trees and landscaping that adds amenity value. (Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy and Section 7 of the NPPF).

- 6 **No development shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing how renewable and low energy sources would generate 10% of the energy needs of the development and also showing water efficiency measures achieving 110 litres per person per day. The works shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.**

**Reason: This condition is pre-commencement as the efficiencies could affect the construction or materials of the dwellings which will require to be ordered prior to commencement and In the interests of sustainability.
(Policy DM2 of the Core Strategy for the North & Section 10 of the NPPF)**

- 7 **No development shall take place until a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for the provision of fire hydrants at the development. Prior to the first occupation of the dwellings the fire hydrants serving that development shall be installed as approved. Thereafter the fire hydrants shall be retained as approved in perpetuity.**

Reason: This condition is pre-commencement as the ground works for connectivity will need to be considered prior to construction in order to ensure appropriate access to fire hydrants for use in the event of emergency in accordance with policy DM3 of Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy for the North and Section 7 of the NPPF.

- 8 **Development shall not commence until a scheme for the diversion of the public right way including a timeframe for its implementation and the improvements to public rights of way (FP7) including appropriate connections and enhancements to surfacing and drainage arrangements where deemed appropriate, has been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall then be carried out in full in accordance with the approved scheme.**

Reason: This condition is pre-commencement as a diversion will need to take place so that existing occupiers can gain appropriate access throughout the development phase and to ensure that public rights of way within the site are protected, enhanced and promoted as part of the development.

- 9 **All ecological measures shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in Part 6 of the May 2017 Ecological Appraisal.**

Reason: To ensure all impacts from development are taken into account and mitigated.
(Section 11, NPPF)

- 10 **No development shall take place until details of the method of disposal of foul and surface water drainage (which shall include a copy of the correspondence with Anglian Water regarding permission to discharge in to the public surface water sewer including the rate of discharge Anglian Water will allow) have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including any land drainage system. Thereafter no part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until the approved drainage scheme has been implemented.**

Reason: This condition is pre-commencement as ground works will be required prior to construction to ensure that adequate foul and surface water drainage is provided and that existing and future land drainage needs are protected.
(Section 10, NPPF)

- 11 **No development approved by this permission shall take place until the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:**

A Phase 2 investigation report as recommended by the previously submitted Rolton Group Ground Investigation report summary dated 15th December 2015 ref 14-0087 XL002 along with a Remediation Method Statement should the Phase 2 discover the need for remediation.

Reason: This condition is pre-commencement as it relation to ground works and remediation to ensure that the site is suitable for its end use

**and to protect human health and the water environment.
(Section 11, NPPF)**

- 12 No occupation of any permitted building shall take place until the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

A Validation Report by means of which the effectiveness of the remediation implemented by any Remediation Method Statement shall be demonstrated to the Local Planning Authority (to incorporate photographs and depth measurements).

Any unexpected contamination discovered during works should be brought to the attention of the Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the site is suitable for its end use and to protect human health and the water environment.
(Section 11, NPPF)

- 13 The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of the bin storage & collection areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the bin storage/collection areas have been implemented in accordance with the approved details. The bin storage & collection areas shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of amenity.
(Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 7, NPPF)

- 14 No building shall be occupied until the junctions of the proposed vehicular access points with the highway has been constructed in accordance with the approved details. No other part of the development shall take place until the visibility splays at the junction of the accesses with the public highway shown on the approved drawing have been provided. The required vision splays shall for the perpetuity of the development remain free of any obstruction to visibility.

Reason: In order to minimise danger and to provide adequate visibility between the existing highway and the proposed accesses, and to make the accesses safe and convenient for the traffic which is likely to use them. (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 4 of the NPPF)

- 15 Before any vehicular access is first brought into use a triangular vision splay shall be provided on each side of the new access and shall measure 2m along the fence, wall, hedge or other means of definition of the front boundary of the site, and 2m measured into the site at right angles to the same line along the side of the new access drive. The vision splays so described and on land under the applicant's control shall be maintained free of any obstruction to visibility exceeding a height of 600mm above the adjoining footway level.

Reason: To provide adequate pedestrian/driver intervisibility between the highway and the proposed accesses, and to make the accesses safe and convenient for the traffic which is likely to use them. (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 4 of the NPPF).

- 16 **No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Traffic Management Plan, associated with the development of the site, has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which will include information on:**
- **The parking of vehicles**
 - **Loading and unloading of plant and materials used in the development**
 - **Storage of plant and materials used in the development**
 - **The erection and maintenance of security hoarding / scaffolding affecting the highway if required.**
 - **Footpath/footway/cycleway or road closures needed during the development period**
 - **Traffic management needed during the development period.**
 - **Times, routes and means of access and egress for construction traffic and delivery vehicles (including the import of materials and the removal of waste from the site) during the development of the site.**

The approved Construction Management Plan associated with the development of the site shall be adhered to throughout the development process.

Reason: In the interests of safety, protecting the amenity of local land uses, neighbouring residents and highway safety. (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 4 of the NPPF).

- 17 **No development shall take place until wheel-cleaning facilities which prevent the deposit of mud or other extraneous material on the highway during the construction period have been installed at all vehicular site exists and made operational and the Site Developer(s) shall ensure that these are used by all vehicles exiting the site until the development has been substantially completed or until the roadworks necessary to provide adequate and clean access to and from the public highway have been completed (apart from final surfacing).**

**Reason: In the interests of the amenity and to prevent the deposit of mud or other extraneous material on the highway during the construction period.
(Section 7, NPPF)**

- 18 **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers LSD181-01T (Site Layout Plan), LSD181-05B (Site Layout Plan), LSD181-04D (Materials Plan), LSD181-01 Rev T (Parking Strategy), 10E (Landscape Masterplan), Planning Statement, Design & Access Statement Rev A, Market Assessment Report (May 2017), House Type Pack Rev A (All House Types), JKK8224_1 Rev B & 02 Rev A (Topographical Survey), Energy Statement Rev C, Statement of Community Involvement May 2017, Transport Statement Dec 2017, Flood Risk Technical Note Rev B & Preliminary Drainage Strategy Rev D, Ecological Appraisal Rev A, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method statement Rev A & Twnt20184-03A (Tree Protection Plan), Landscape Design**

Statement May 2017 & Geophysical Report Issue 1.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. In accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the reason for any condition above relates to the Policies as referred to in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Core Strategy for North Central Bedfordshire.
2. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.
3. The British Standard for Topsoil, BS 3882:2007, specifies requirements for topsoils that are moved or traded and should be adhered to. The British Standard for Subsoil, BS 8601 Specification for subsoil and requirements for use, should also be adhered to.

There is a duty to assess for Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) during development and measures undertaken during removal and disposal should protect site workers and future users, while meeting the requirements of the HSE.

Applicants are reminded that, should groundwater or surface water courses be at risk of contamination before, during or after development, the Environment Agency should be approached for approval of measures to protect water resources separately, unless an Agency condition already forms part of this permission.

4. 1/The applicant is advised that no works associated with the construction of the vehicular access should be carried out within the confines of the public highway without prior consent, in writing, of the Central Bedfordshire Council. Upon receipt of this Notice of Planning Approval, the applicant is advised to contact Central Bedfordshire Council's Highway Help Desk, Tel: 0300 300 8049 quoting the Planning Application number. This will enable the necessary consent and procedures under Section 184 of the Highways Act to be implemented. The applicant is also advised that if any of the works associated with the construction of the vehicular access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) then the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration.

2/ The applicant is advised that if it is the intention to request Central Bedfordshire Council as Local Highway Authority, to adopt the proposed highways within the site as maintainable at the public expense then details of the specification, layout and alignment, width and levels of the said highways together with all the necessary highway and drainage arrangements, including

run off calculations shall be submitted to the Highways Agreements Officer, Highways Contract Team, Community Services, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ .

5. Notwithstanding the granting of planning permission, no enclosure of the land shall take place until such time as the highway rights over the land have been formally extinguished by a formal Stopping Up Order made under Section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1980 or by the application to the Magistrates Court under Section 117 of the Highways Act 1980.
6. Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence."

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item No. 7

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/05230/RM
LOCATION	Land north east of Walnut Close, Blunham, MK44 3NB
PROPOSAL	Reserved Matter: of Outline Application CB/16/4657/OUT, for the residential development of 0.49 Hectares of land to form 9 bungalow/chalet dwellings with associated garaging, parking and other associated works, to include the discharge of conditions no's 2 8 9 12 & 14.
PARISH	Blunham
WARD	Sandy
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Maudlin, Smith & Stock
CASE OFFICER	Donna Lavender
DATE REGISTERED	09 November 2017
EXPIRY DATE	04 January 2018
APPLICANT	Signature Homes MK LLP
AGENT	CMI Architecture Limited
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Ward Member Call in (Cllr P Smith) on the following grounds:

- **Scheme design likely to cause parking problems and restrict access to Walnut Close**
- **Impact of new garage block at entrance to the development and design of chalet style houses**
- **Runs against the principal of low level bungalows as seen in outline application**

RECOMMENDED DECISION	Reserved Matters - Recommended for Approval
-----------------------------	--

Recommendation:

That Reserved Matters be APPROVED subject to the following:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The ground floor window located in the rear elevation of Plot 3 as annotated on drawing no. 008 Rev B of the development hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass of a type to substantially restrict vision through it at all times and shall be non-opening, unless the parts of the window which can be opened is more than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which the window is installed.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of adjoining properties (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 7, NPPF)

- 2 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015, or any amendments thereto, any garage accommodation hereby approved on the site shall not be used for any purpose, other than as garage accommodation, unless permission has been

granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for that purpose.

Reason: To retain off-street parking provision and thereby minimise the potential for on-street parking which could adversely affect the convenience of road users. (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 4 of the NPPF)

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1, Class A & Class B of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions to the buildings hereby permitted shall be carried out without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To control the external appearance of the building/s in the interests of the amenities of the area and in the interest of ensuring appropriate on plot parking provision. (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Sections 4 & 7, NPPF)

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 Class E of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no buildings or other structures shall be erected or constructed within the curtilage of the property without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To control the development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.
(Section 7, NPPF)

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no fences, gates, walls or other means of enclosure shall be erected within the curtilage of the property without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To control the development in the interests of the rural amenity of the area.
(Section 7, NPPF)

- 6 The development shall not be occupied or brought into use until the parking, turning areas, road and footpaths shown on Drawing No. 001 Rev F has been completed. The scheme shall thereafter be retained for this purpose.

Reason: To ensure provision for car parking clear of the highway and appropriate accessibility. (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 4, NPPF)

- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers A17-092-SL001 - Site Location Plan, A17-092-PL001 Rev F - Proposed Site Plan, A17-092-PL002 Rev A - Proposed Plot 1 - House Type A, A17-092-PL003 Rev B - Proposed Plot 2 - House Type B, A17-092-PL004 Rev D - Proposed Plots 4 &

5 - House Type C, A17-092-PL005 Rev C - Proposed Plot 7 - House Type D, A17-092-PL006 Rev C - Proposed Plots 8 & 9 - House Type E, A17-092-PL007 Rev B - Proposed Street Sections, A17-092-PL008 Rev B - Proposed Plot 3 - House Type B, A17-092-PL009 Rev C - Proposed Plot 6 - House Type C, A17-092-PL012 Rev B - Proposed Street Elevations, 28193/61 Rev P2 - Vehicle Swept Path & Forward Visibility, 28193/53 Rev P3- SuDs scheme and calculations dated Feb 2018, WCB-01 Rev C- Landscape Proposals, Design & Access Statement dated 05.02.18 & Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme Nov 2017.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. In accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the reason for any condition above relates to the Policies as referred to in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Core Strategy for North Central Bedfordshire.
2. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.
3. The applicant is advised that the following conditions of the outline planning permission (16/04657) are pre commencement and still require discharge:
5: SuDs Strategy
6. Landscape Management Plan (which should include the SuDs management or any shared provisions)
7. Landscape Details (Timetable for implementation required for full compliance)
11: CEMP
4. This permission is subject to a Legal Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item No. 12

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/04638/FULL
LOCATION	Public Convenience, Duck Lane, Woburn, MK17 9PT
PROPOSAL	Redevelopment of a brownfield site within the infill boundary with a Residential development of 1 new dwelling. Demolition of the existing public conveniences.
PARISH	Woburn
WARD	Aspley & Woburn
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Wells
CASE OFFICER	Stuart Kemp
DATE REGISTERED	27 September 2017
EXPIRY DATE	22 November 2017
APPLICANT	Goldcrest Developments (MK) Ltd
AGENT	Project Design Studio Ltd
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Call in - Cllr Wells 1 - Contrary to Policy - Application contravenes 1 and 2 of the Heritage Statement 2 - Overbearing - It will compromise light and privacy of residents in adjacent properties. The location is not a backwater but is visible from strategic sites within the village. 3 - Proposed dwelling is not in keeping with Georgian Street scene in Woburn
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Recommended for Approval

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be **APPROVED** subject to the following:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 **Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, no work on the construction of the new dwelling, hereby permitted shall take place until samples of the exterior materials proposed to be used in the development hereby approved, including roofing materials, ridge piece and rainwater goods, timber cladding, have been made available on site for inspection and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To control the appearance of the development in the interests of the character, appearance of the Conservation Area. (NPPF 12).

- 3 All new doors and windows should be timber and detailed drawings at a scale of 1:10 of all new doors and windows shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. The works shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To control the appearance of the development in the interests of character, appearance of the Conservation Area. (NPPF, Section 12).

- 4 No development shall take place until a landscaping scheme to include all hard and soft landscaping and a scheme for landscape maintenance for a period of five years following the implementation of the landscaping scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented by the end of the full planting season immediately following the completion and/or first use of any separate part of the development (a full planting season means the period from October to March). The trees, shrubs and grass shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with the approved landscape maintenance scheme and any which die or are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season.

**Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of landscaping.
(Sections 7 & 11, NPPF)**

- 5 The first floor windows in the north facing side elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass of a type to substantially restrict vision through it at all times and shall be non-opening, unless the parts of the windows which can be opened are more than 1.7m above the floor of the rooms in which the windows is installed. No further windows or other openings shall be formed in the side elevations.

**Reason: To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of adjoining properties.
(Section 7, NPPF)**

- 6 No building shall be occupied until the junction of the proposed vehicular access with the highway has been constructed in accordance with the approved details and any surplus lengths of dropped kerb not required in the approved proposed access shall be re-instated to full height kerbs.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway.

- 7 Prior to occupation, the proposed development shall be carried out and completed in all respects in accordance with the access siting and layout, secure and covered long stay cycle parking, refuse collection point, pedestrian visibility splay illustrated on the approved drawing no. 817-L4A and defined by this permission and, notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995, (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) there shall be no variation without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The vision splay so described and on

land under the applicant's control shall be maintained free of any obstruction to visibility exceeding a height of 600mm above the adjoining footway level.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the site is completed insofar as its various parts are interrelated and dependent one upon another and to provide adequate and appropriate access arrangements at all times.

- 8 The proposed vehicular access shall be surfaced in bituminous or other similar durable material (not loose aggregate) as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for a distance of 5.0m into the site, measured from the highway boundary, before the premises are occupied. Arrangements shall be made for surface water drainage from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.

Reason: To avoid the carriage of mud or other extraneous material or surface water from the site into the highway so as to safeguard the interest of highway safety.

- 9 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995, or any amendments thereto, the covered/car port accommodation on the site shall not be used for any purpose, other than as covered/car port accommodation, unless permission has been granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for that purpose.

Reason: To retain off-street parking provision and thereby minimise the potential for on-street parking which could adversely affect the convenience of road users.

- 10 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 817-L1, 817-L2, 817-L3D, 817-L4A, 817-P1F, 817-P2E, 817-P3F, 817-P4E.

Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.
2. In accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the reason for any condition above relates to the Policies as referred to in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Core Strategy for North Central Bedfordshire.
3. The applicant is advised that no works associated with the construction of the vehicular access and re-instatement of any surplus lengths of kerbs should be carried out within the confines of the public highway without prior consent, in

writing, of the Central Bedfordshire Council. Upon receipt of this Notice of Planning Approval, the applicant is advised to follow this link on the Council website <http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx> or contact Central Bedfordshire Council Tel: 0300 300 8301 quoting the Planning Application number. This will enable the necessary consent and procedures under Section 184 of the Highways Act to be implemented. The applicant is also advised that if any of the works associated with the construction of the vehicular access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) then the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration.

The applicant is advised that, under the provisions of the Highways Act 1980, no part of the structure, including boundary foundations and surface water hardware shall be erected or installed in, under or overhanging the public highway and no door or gate shall be fixed so as to open outwards into the highway. The Highway Authority has the power under Section 143 of the Highways Act 1980, to remove any structure erected on a highway.

The applicant is advised that the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 will apply to any works undertaken within the limits of the existing public highway. Further details can be obtained by this link on the Council website

<http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx> or contact Central Bedfordshire Council Tel: 0300 300 8301.

The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with this development should take place within the site and not extend into within the public highway without authorisation from the highway authority. If necessary the applicant is advised to follow this link on the Council website <http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx> or contact Central Bedfordshire Council Tel: 0300 300 8301. Under the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 the developer may be liable for any damage caused to the public highway as a result of construction of the development hereby approved.

The contractor and/or client are to ensure that any mud or building material debris such as sand, cement or concrete that is left on the public highway, or any mud arising from construction vehicular movement, shall be removed immediately and in the case of concrete, cement, mud or mortar not allowed to dry on the highway.

The applicant is advised that all cycle parking to be provided within the site shall be designed in accordance with the Central Bedfordshire Council's "Cycle Parking Annexes – July 2010".

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant at the

pre-application stage and during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item No. 11

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/05250/FULL
LOCATION	Land to South West of Higham Cottages, Higham Road, Higham Gobion
PROPOSAL	Proposed grain store including new access and means of enclosure
PARISH	Shillington
WARD	Silsoe & Shillington
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Ms Graham
CASE OFFICER	Thomas Mead
DATE REGISTERED	31 October 2017
EXPIRY DATE	26 December 2017
APPLICANT	Chamberlain Holdings PLC
AGENT	Tempietton Architects
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Enormous Grain Store with 2 metre steel fence is out of proportion to the open rural site and victorian cottages opposite. 60mph road already has accident liability. 15.400m vehicles need 6 seconds to turn and 6.610m kerb to kerb turning circle. Run off water is to go into existing water course - this brook below the site has native cray fish in it which would be at risk.
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Recommended for Approval

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be **APPROVED**

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 **No development shall take place until a landscaping scheme to include all hard and soft landscaping and a scheme for landscape maintenance for a period of five years following the implementation of the landscaping scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented by the end of the full planting season immediately following the completion and/or first use of any separate part of the development (a full planting season means the period from October to March). The trees, shrubs and grass shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with the approved landscape maintenance scheme and any which die or are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season.**

**Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of landscaping.
(Sections 7 & 11, NPPF)**

- 3 All external works hereby permitted shall be carried out in materials indicated on plan No. 1136/201A.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the completed development by ensuring that the development hereby permitted is finished externally with materials to match the existing building in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.
(Section 7, NPPF)

- 4 **No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation, that adopts a staged approach and includes the provision for post excavation analysis and publication, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby approved shall only be implemented in full accordance with the approved archaeological scheme.**

Reason: This condition is pre-commencement as a failure to secure appropriate archaeological investigation in advance of development would be contrary to paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that requires developers to record and advance of understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) as a consequence of the development.

- 5 The development shall not be brought into use until the junction of the proposed vehicular access with the highway has been constructed in accordance with the approved details, and kerbs have been provided along the frontage of the far-side verge, opposite (north of the proposed access), for the full length of the junction and radii

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and the premises and to avoid overrun of the public highway to the detriment of the highway and users of it
(Section 7, NPPF).

- 6 Before the development is brought into use visibility splays of 2.4m measured along the centre line of the proposed access from its junction with the channel of the public highway and 215m measured from the centre line of the proposed access along the line of the channel of the public highway shall be implemented in accordance with the approved drawing no. 1136/202. The required vision splays shall for the perpetuity of the development remain free of any obstruction to visibility.

Reason: To provide adequate visibility between the existing highway and the proposed access, and to make the access safe and convenient for the traffic which is likely to use it.
(Section 7, NPPF)

- 7 The proposed vehicular access shall be surfaced in bituminous or other similar durable material (not loose aggregate) as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for a distance of 18.0m into the site, measured from

the highway boundary, before the premises are occupied. Arrangements shall be made for surface water drainage from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.

Reason: To avoid the carriage of mud or other extraneous material or surface water from the site into the highway so as to safeguard the interest of highway safety.

(Section 7, NPPF)

- 8 The sliding gate on the approved drawing no. 1136/200B shall be constructed prior to the development being brought into use and shall open away from the highway and be set back a distance of at least 18.0m from the nearside edge of the carriageway of the adjoining highway.

Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off the highway before the gates are opened and for the avoidance of doubt

(Section 7, NPPF)

- 9 The turning space for vehicles illustrated on the approved drawing no. 101 shall be constructed before the development is first brought into use and thereafter retained for this purpose

Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn outside the highway limits thereby avoiding the reversing of vehicles on to the highway

(Section 7, NPPF)

- 10 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 1136_Block Plan with Flood Zone_500_A4, 1136/199B, 1136/200C, 1136/201A, 1136/202A, 101 and the Design and Access Statement.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

- 11 The building hereby approved shall be used only for agricultural purposes as defined in Section 336(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and if at any time the building ceases to be used or required for such purpose it shall be removed and the site re-instated in accordance with a scheme previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the building is used for agricultural purposes only since it lies within a rural area where restrictive planning policies apply and where only that development needed to meet the essential requirements of the locality is permitted.

(Section 3, NPPF)"

INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

2. **Will a new extension affect your Council Tax Charge?**

The rate of Council Tax you pay depends on which valuation band your home is placed in. This is determined by the market value of your home as at 1 April 1991.

Your property's Council Tax band may change if the property is extended. The Council Tax band will only change when a relevant transaction takes place. For example, if you sell your property after extending it, the new owner may have to pay a higher band of Council Tax.

If however you add an annexe to your property, the Valuation Office Agency may decide that the annexe should be banded separately for Council Tax. If this happens, you will have to start paying Council Tax for the annexe as soon as it is completed. If the annexe is occupied by a relative of the residents of the main dwelling, it may qualify for a Council Tax discount or exemption. Contact the Council for advice on **0300 300 8306**.

The website link is:

<http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/council-tax/bands/find.aspx>

3. The applicant is advised that in order to comply with Condition 5 of this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to enter into an agreement with Central Bedfordshire Council as Highway Authority under Section 278/small works of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the satisfactory completion of the access and associated road improvements.

4. You are advised to contact the Highways Agreements Officer, Community Services, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ. E-mail highwaysagreements@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

5. The applicant is advised that the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 will apply to any works undertaken within the limits of the existing public highway. Further details can be obtained by this link on the Council website

<http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx>

or contact Central Bedfordshire Council Tel: 0300 300 8301.

6. The applicant is advised that parking for contractor's vehicles and the storage of materials associated with this development should take place within the site and not extend into within the public highway without authorisation from the highway authority. If necessary the applicant is advised to follow this link on the Council website <http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx> or contact Central Bedfordshire Council Tel: 0300 300 8301. Under the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 the developer may be liable for any damage caused to the public highway as a result of construction of the development hereby approved.

7. The applicant is advised that in order to achieve the vision splays in condition 6 of the permission it may be necessary for vegetation overhanging the public highway to be removed. Prior to the commencement of work the applicant is advised to use this link on the Council website

<http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx>

or contact Central Bedfordshire Council Tel: 0300 300 8301 to request the removal of the overhanging vegetation on the public highway.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant before and during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item No. 13

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/05966/VOC
LOCATION	Former Pig Testing Unit, Hitchin Road, Fairfield
PROPOSAL	Removal of Condition No. 16 of planning permission ref: CB/15/03182/FULL dated 18/12/15
PARISH	Fairfield
WARD	Stotfold & Langford
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Dixon, Saunders & Saunders
CASE OFFICER	Alex Harrison
DATE REGISTERED	20 December 2017
EXPIRY DATE	21 March 2018
APPLICANT	Crest Nicholson Chiltern
AGENT	
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Call in from Councillor Dixon <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Too early to conclude there is no demand• There is significant demand from within Fairfield for these units.
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Variation of Condition - Recommended for Approval

That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

The applicant, by virtue of the information submitted and marketing undertaken, has failed to adequately demonstrate that there is sufficient interest in the occupation of the apartments by people aged 55 and over. The occupation of these units as unrestricted market homes would reduce the mix of homes achieved in the outline consent to an unacceptable degree and mean residents would be provided with substandard garden and amenity space. The occupation of these units as unrestricted market homes would be contrary to the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework, policies DM3 and DM10 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item No. 16

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/18/00077/FULL
LOCATION	Co-Op Supermarket, High Street, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5QT
PROPOSAL	Temporary use of land as car park with minor works, temporary stationing of 2 no. portable buildings for ancillary use as security and shelter and temporary stationing of lighting
PARISH	Houghton Regis
WARD	Houghton Hall
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Mrs Goodchild & Kane
CASE OFFICER	Peter Vosper
DATE REGISTERED	09 January 2018
EXPIRY DATE	06 March 2018
APPLICANT	Whitbread Group PLC
AGENT	Walsingham Planning
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE RECOMMENDED DECISION	Application on Council owned land and objection received from neighbour
	Full Application - Recommended for Approval

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to the following:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The temporary car park use shall cease on 31 July 2018, or another date to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the site shall be returned to its pre-development condition.

Reason: To ensure the redevelopment of this town centre site is not compromised.

(Policy TCS1, SBLPR and Section 2, NPPF)

- 2 The car park gates shall be closed, and the lighting columns and light fittings fixed to the inside face of the hoarding shall not operate, outside of the hours 07:00 to 20:00 Mondays to Fridays and at weekends.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring residential occupants.

(Policy BE8, SBLPR)

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 2014/2272/211 Rev B, 2014/2272/212 and PA01.

Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. In accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the reason for any condition above relates to the Policies as referred to in the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review (SBLPR) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
2. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.
3. The applicants attention is drawn to their responsibility under The Equality Act 2010 and with particular regard to access arrangements for the disabled.

The Equality Act 2010 requires that service providers must think ahead and make reasonable adjustments to address barriers that impede disabled people.

These requirements are as follows:

- Where a provision, criterion or practice puts disabled people at a substantial disadvantage to take reasonable steps to avoid that disadvantage;
- Where a physical feature puts disabled people at a substantial disadvantage to avoid that disadvantage or adopt a reasonable alternative method of providing the service or exercising the function;
- Where not providing an auxiliary aid puts disabled people at a substantial disadvantage to provide that auxiliary aid.

In doing this, it is a good idea to consider the range of disabilities that your actual or potential service users might have. You should not wait until a disabled person experiences difficulties using a service, as this may make it too late to make the necessary adjustment.

For further information on disability access contact:

The Centre for Accessible Environments (www.cae.org.uk)
Central Bedfordshire Access Group (www.centralbedsaccessgroup.co.uk)

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

The applicant and the Council engaged in discussion and negotiation at pre-application stage which led to improvements to the scheme. The applicant and the Council have therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Item No. 8

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/00442/VOC
LOCATION	Land rear of 7 - 37 Barton Road, Gravenhurst, Bedford, MK45 4JP
PROPOSAL	Variation of condition 14 attached to planning permission reference CB/15/04081/OUT dated 17th January 2017 so that landscaping on the south-eastern boundary of the site is carried out in accordance with drawing number WHK20175-11E (Southern Boundary Proposals)
PARISH	Gravenhurst
WARD	Silsoe & Shillington
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Ms Graham
CASE OFFICER	Martin Plummer
DATE REGISTERED	27 January 2017
EXPIRY DATE	28 April 2017
APPLICANT	The RonCon Trust
AGENT	David Coles architects ltd
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Major application - objection from Parish Council
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Variation of Condition - Recommended for Approval

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be APPROVED subject to the signing of a Deed of Variation linking previously approved obligations to this permission and, subject to the following:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 Details of the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, including boundary treatments (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To comply with Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (as amended).
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 4 **No development shall take place until an Environmental Construction Management Plan detailing access arrangements for construction vehicles, on-site parking, loading and unloading areas, materials storage areas and wheel cleaning arrangements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Environmental Construction Management Plan.**

Reason: In the interest of highway safety, to ensure a satisfactory standard of construction and layout for the development and to comply with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

- 5 Any application for reserved matters shall include details of the existing and final ground, ridge and slab levels of the buildings. The details shall include sections through both the site and the adjoining properties and the proposal shall be developed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that an acceptable relationship results between the new development and adjacent buildings and public areas in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

- 6 No above ground building work shall take place until details of hard and soft landscaping (including details of boundary treatments and public amenity open space) together with a timetable for its implementation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved and in accordance with the approved timetable.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development would be acceptable in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

- 7 **Prior to first occupation of the development a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan for a period of ten years from the date of its delivery in accordance with Condition 6 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the management body, who will be responsible for delivering the approved landscape maintenance and management plan. The landscaping shall be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved plan following its delivery in accordance with Condition 6.**

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the site would be acceptable in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

- 8 No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage

scheme, including construction and maintenance plans, for the site based on the agreed Surface Water Drainage Strategy (October 2015) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include provision of attenuation and a restriction in run-off rates as outlined in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy (October 2015). The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed and shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed maintenance plan.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and improve habitat and amenity in accordance with Policy 49 of Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire Revise Pre-Submission Version June 2014.

- 9 **No development shall take place until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Unless otherwise agreed in writing the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any dwelling subsequently approved.**

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and improve habitat and amenity in accordance with policy DM2 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

- 10 **No development shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing how renewable and low energy sources would generate 10% of the energy needs of the development and also showing water efficiency measures achieving 110 litres per person per day. The works shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In the interests of sustainability.

- 11 **No development shall take place until details of the junction between the proposed access road and the highway have been approved by the Local Planning Authority and no building shall be occupied until the junction has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the proposed estate road.

- 12 **No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until visibility splays have been provided on each side of the junction of the access road with the public highway. The minimum dimensions to provide the required splay lines shall be 2.4m measured along the centre line of the proposed access road from its junction with the channel of the public highway and 43m measured from the centre line of the proposed access road along the line of the channel of the public highway. The vision splays required shall be provided and defined on the site by or on behalf of the developers and be kept free of any obstruction.**

Reason: To provide adequate visibility between the existing highway and the proposed access and to make the access safe and convenient for the traffic

that is likely to use it.

- 13 **No development shall take place until detailed plans and sections of the proposed access road, including gradients and method of surface water disposal have been approved by the Local Planning Authority and no building shall be occupied until the section of road which provides access has been constructed (apart from final surfacing) in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure that the proposed roadworks are constructed to an adequate standard.

- 14 Trees not scheduled for removal, as shown in drawing WHK20175-04A shall be protected from damage in accordance with the details shown on approved drawing WHK20175-04A for the duration of the implementation of the development.

Reason: To ensure retention of existing landscape features and to ensure an acceptable appearance of the development in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

- 15 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 15016 (D) 090 and TS/APPENDIX 1 Rev B.

Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

INFORMATIVE NOTE TO APPLICANT

This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Item No. 9

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/02615/OUT
LOCATION	Pinehurst, 17A Ivel Road, Shefford, SG17 5LB
PROPOSAL	Outline application for residential development comprising 31no 2, 3, 4 & 5 bedroom houses, and 6no 1 & 2 bedroom apartments (37no total dwellings) following demolition of existing single dwelling with new access onto Ivel Road and reconfigured parking for existing office.
PARISH	Shefford
WARD	Shefford
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Liddiard & Brown
CASE OFFICER	Martin Plummer
DATE REGISTERED	04 July 2017
EXPIRY DATE	03 October 2017
APPLICANT	
AGENT	BBR Architects
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Major - objection from Town Council
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Outline Application - Recommended for Approval

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be **APPROVED** subject to the applicant entering into a S106 legal agreement to ensure the provision of the above mentioned financial contributions and affordable housing and, subject to the following planning conditions:- :

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority within three years from the date of this permission. The development shall begin not later than two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, if approved on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 **No development shall take place until approval of the details of the appearance, landscaping and scale of the development (herein called "the reserved matters") has been obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To comply with Part 3 Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 2015.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers PL01 A, PL02 B, PL03 H, PL04, E3202/101/C, E3202/102/C, E3202/103/A, E3202/104/A, E3202/105/A, E3202/106.

Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

- 4 No equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought on to the site for the purposes of development until details of substantial protective fencing for the protection of any retained tree(s), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the fencing has been erected in the positions shown on Drawing No 317-02 within the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment 03/05/2017. The approved fencing shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made.

Reason: To protect the trees so enclosed in accordance with Section 8 of BS 5837 of 2012 or as may be subsequently amended.
(Sections 7 & 11, NPPF)

- 5 Visibility splays shall be provided at the junction of the access with the public highway before the development is brought into use. The minimum dimensions to provide the required splay lines shall be 2.4m measured along the centre line of the proposed access from its junction with the channel of the public highway and 25m measured from the centre line of the proposed access along the line of the channel of the public highway. The required vision splays shall for the perpetuity of the development remain free of any obstruction to visibility.

Reason: To provide adequate visibility between the existing highway and the proposed access(es), and to make the access(es) safe and convenient for the traffic which is likely to use it (them).

- 6 No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Traffic Management Plan, associated with the development of the site, has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which will include information on:
- (A) The parking of vehicles
 - (B) Loading and unloading of plant and materials used in the development
 - (C) Storage of plant and materials used in the development
 - (D) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding / scaffolding affecting the highway if required.
 - (E) Wheel washing facilities
 - (F) Measures on site to control the deposition of dirt / mud on surrounding roads during the development.
 - (G) Footpath/footway/cycleway or road closures needed during the development period
 - (H) Traffic management needed during the development period.

(l) Times, routes and means of access and egress for construction traffic and delivery vehicles (including the import of materials and the removal of waste from the site) during the development of the site.

The approved Construction Management Plan associated with the development of the site shall be adhered to throughout the development process.

Reason: In the interests of safety, protecting the amenity of local land uses, neighbouring residents and highway safety.

- 7 Prior to any above ground works, an ecological design strategy addressing compensation and enhancement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include:-
- a) Review of the site potential and constraints;
 - b) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed works
 - c) Detailed working methods to achieve stated objectives including locations of integrated bird and bat boxes to be erected in accordance with RSPB and BCT guidelines on appropriate scale maps and plans
 - d) Details of lighting considerations to prevent disturbance to bats.
 - e) Type and source of materials to be used where appropriate, e.g. native species of local provenance.
 - f) Timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with proposed phasing of development.
 - g) Persons responsible for implementing the works
 - h) Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance.
 - i) Details for disposal of any wastes arising from works
- The EDS shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the proposal delivers satisfactory ecological gains in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the agreed Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (March 2017), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include provision of attenuation for the 1 in 100 year event (+40% allowance for climate change) and a restriction in run-off rates to that outlined by the Independent Drainage Board. Any revisions to the agreed strategy shall be fully justified and approved before the development is completed and shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan. Details of how the system will be constructed including any phasing of the scheme, and how it will be managed and maintained after completion will also be included. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved final details before the development is completed, and shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To ensure the approved system will function to a satisfactory minimum standard of operation and maintenance and prevent the increased risk of flooding both on and off site, in accordance with para 103 NPPF.

- 9 No building/dwelling shall be occupied until the developer has formally submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority a finalised 'Maintenance and Management Plan' for the entire surface water drainage system, inclusive of any adoption arrangements and/or private ownership or responsibilities, and that the approved surface water drainage scheme has been correctly and fully installed as per the final approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the implementation and long term operation of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) is in line with what has been approved, in accordance with Written Statement HCWS161.

- 10 No development shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Anglian Water. No dwelling shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy.

Reason: To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding.

- 11 Prior to first occupation of the buildings hereby approved full details on a suitably scaled plan of both hard and soft landscape works must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, these works shall be in addition to those shown on the approved plans and shall be carried out and retained as approved. The landscaping details to be submitted shall include:-

- a) means of enclosure;
- b) existing and proposed finished levels and finished floor levels.
- c) planting plans, including specifications of species, sizes, planting centres, planting method and number and percentage mix;
- d) details for all external hard surface within the site, including roads, drainage detail and car parking areas.

Reason: The landscaping of this site is required in order to protect and enhance the existing visual character of the area and to reduce the visual and environmental impacts of the development hereby permitted in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

- 12 All planting, seeding or turfing and soil preparation comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following first occupation of the building; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. All landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the guidance contained in British Standards.

Reason: The landscaping of this site is required in order to protect and enhance the existing visual character of the area and to reduce the visual and environmental impacts of the development hereby permitted in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

INFORMATIVE NOTE TO APPLICANT

This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item No. 14

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/06061/FULL
LOCATION	14 Verne Drive, Ampthill, Bedford, MK45 2PS
PROPOSAL	First floor side extension above garage/utility (previous planning permission CB/15/01464/Full)
PARISH	Ampthill
WARD	Ampthill
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Duckett, Blair & Downing
CASE OFFICER	Lauren Rance
DATE REGISTERED	29 December 2017
EXPIRY DATE	23 February 2018
APPLICANT	Mrs L Brown
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE RECOMMENDED DECISION	Applicant is a member of staff within the Development Management team at the council Full Application - Recommended for Approval

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be **GRANTED**.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 All external works hereby permitted shall be carried out in materials to match as closely as possible in colour, type and texture, those of the existing building.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the completed development by ensuring that the development hereby permitted is finished externally with materials to match the existing building in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality. (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and Section 7, NPPF)

- 3 The first floor window in the north facing side elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be permanently fitted with obscured glass of a type to substantially restrict vision through it at all times and shall be non-opening, unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which the window is installed.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of occupiers of adjoining properties.
(Section 7, NPPF)

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 1, 2, 3A, and 4A.

Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

2. **Will a new extension affect your Council Tax Charge?**

The rate of Council Tax you pay depends on which valuation band your home is placed in. This is determined by the market value of your home as at 1 April 1991.

Your property's Council Tax band may change if the property is extended. The Council Tax band will only change when a relevant transaction takes place. For example, if you sell your property after extending it, the new owner may have to pay a higher band of Council Tax.

If however you add an annexe to your property, the Valuation Office Agency may decide that the annexe should be banded separately for Council Tax. If this happens, you will have to start paying Council Tax for the annexe as soon as it is completed. If the annexe is occupied by a relative of the residents of the main dwelling, it may qualify for a Council Tax discount or exemption. Contact the Council for advice on **0300 300 8306**.

The website link is:

<http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/council-tax/bands/find.aspx>

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Item No. 10

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/06001/FULL
LOCATION	Water Lane Farm, Biggleswade Road, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BP
PROPOSAL	The construction of two agricultural barns
PARISH	Northill
WARD	Northill
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Mr Firth
CASE OFFICER	Martin Plummer
DATE REGISTERED	19 December 2017
EXPIRY DATE	13 February 2018
APPLICANT	Maudlin G J & Sons
AGENT	Richard Beaty (Building Design) Limited
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Applicant is related to Cllr Maudlin
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Recommended for Approval

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be APPROVED subject to the following:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 17.43.OSmap, 17.43.01B.

Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

INFORMATIVE NOTE TO APPLICANT

This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Item No. 15

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/17/05981/FULL
LOCATION	203 Biggleswade Road, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BJ
PROPOSAL	Single Storey Rear Extension and Alterations
PARISH	Northill
WARD	Northill
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Mr Firth
CASE OFFICER	Nicola Stevens
DATE REGISTERED	18 December 2017
EXPIRY DATE	12 February 2018
APPLICANT	Ms C Maudlin
AGENT	Richard Beaty (Building Design) Limited
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	The applicant is a Ward Member

RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Recommended for Approval
---------------------------------	--

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be Approved subject to the following:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 All external works hereby permitted shall be carried out in materials to match as closely as possible in colour, type and texture, those of the existing building.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the completed development by ensuring that the development hereby permitted is finished externally with materials to match the existing building in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and Section 7, NPPF.

- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows shall be inserted into the western flank of the proposed extension, without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the privacy of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and Section 7, NPPF.

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 17.48.OSmap, 17.48.01.

Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 28 FEBRUARY 2018

Item 6 (Pages 15-36) – CB/17/05913/FULL – Land at Taylors Road, opposite Aspen Gardens, Stotfold, Hitchin, SG5 4AX

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

External Consultees:

1. Environment Agency (09/02/18) – No Objection, subject to the imposition of conditions for relevant remediation strategies and verifications reports to be supplied.

N.B. These conditions were also recommended by the Councils Pollution Officer and such conditions are included already in the Officers recommendation report to committee.

2. Anglian Water (29.01.18)- No Objection, subject to the imposition of a condition to secure an appropriate drainage strategy and relevant informative.

N.B. This condition has been secured by condition 10 on the original officers report.

Other Representations:

1. 2 Juniper Mead (09.02.18) – Concerns raised that the existing developments by Taylor Wimpey are not yet complete. In addition recommends that the scheme plan for renewable energy opportunities and enhancement to public rights of way. Unconvinced by traffic survey results and concern over parking provision and impact of development on local health services.
2. 73 Astwick Road (07.02.18)- Objects (in summary), due to inappropriate location, increased traffic generation, Strain on local services, insufficient parking, amenity impact and commercial should be retained.

Additional Comments

Amendment required to paragraph 5.3, last sentence of Officers recommendation report which should not have referred to reserve matters. Revised below:

Climate Change

Policy DM1 requires all development above 10 dwellings to deliver 10% of the development's energy demand from renewable or low carbon sources. The proposed development is over the policy threshold. Policy DM2 requires all new residential development to meet CfSH Level 3. The energy standard of the CfSH Level 3 is below standard required by the Part L2013 of the Building Regulations. All new development should therefore as minimum comply with the new Part L2013 of the Building Regulations and deliver 10% of their energy demand from renewable sources to meet requirement of policy DM1. The Councils Sustainability Officer would wish to encourage the developer to achieve a higher energy efficiency standard than this prescribed by the 2013 part L of the Building Regulations, as energy efficient

fabric leads to lower energy demand and smaller renewable energy installation to satisfy the requirement of policy DM1. If the proposal were considered otherwise acceptable, such matters could be controlled by condition. As such, the proposal would conform with policies DM1 & DM2 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 10 of the NPPF.

Additional Informative

6. Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.”

Item 7 (Pages 37-54) – CB/17/05230/RM – Land North East of Walnut Close, Blunham, MK44 3NB

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

1. Anglian Water (12.02.18)- No Comments to make, below the threshold for comment.

Other Representations:

- 2 The Barns (26.02.18) – Objections still retained.

- 3 The Barns (27.02.18)- Objects still retain in respect of the following (in summary):

- First floor accommodation removed from properties along northern boundary but height remains the same, resulting in visual intrusion and not in accordance with outline parameters
- Reduced visitor parking provision to the detriment of existing residents
- Construction related issues
- Concerns over implementation of footpath beyond the site to link to Walnut Close
- Landscape buffer along northern edge insufficient
- No details of maintenance of the buffers

Additional/Amended Conditions

Revision to the following conditions with updated revised plan numbers following minor variation to landscaping and SuDs:

Cond 6:

The development shall not be occupied or brought into use until the parking, turning areas, road and footpaths shown on Drawing No. 001 Rev F has been completed. The scheme shall thereafter be retained for this purpose.

Reason: To ensure provision for car parking clear of the highway and appropriate accessibility. (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 4, NPPF)

Cond 7:

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers A17-092-SL001 - Site Location Plan, A17-092-PL001 Rev F - Proposed Site Plan, A17-092-PL002 Rev A - Proposed Plot 1 - House Type A, A17-092-PL003 Rev B - Proposed Plot 2 - House Type B, A17-092-PL004 Rev D - Proposed Plots 4 & 5 - House Type C, A17-092-PL005 Rev C - Proposed Plot 7 - House Type D, A17-092-PL006 Rev C - Proposed Plots 8 & 9 - House Type E, A17-092-PL007 Rev B - Proposed Street Sections, A17-092-PL008 Rev B - Proposed Plot 3 - House Type B, A17-092-PL009 Rev C - Proposed Plot 6 - House Type C, A17-092-PL012 Rev B - Proposed Street Elevations, 28193/61 Rev P2 - Vehicle Swept Path & Forward Visibility, 28193/53 Rev P3- SuDs scheme and calculations dated Feb 2018, WCB-01 Rev C- Landscape Proposals, Design & Access Statement dated 05.02.18 & Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme Nov 2017.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

Item 8 (Pages 55-70) – CB/17/00442/VOC – Land rear of 7-37 Barton Road, Gravenhurst, Bedford, MK45 4JP

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Informative

This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

Item 9 (Pages 71-86) – CB/17/02615/OUT – Pinehurst, 17A Ivel Road, Shefford, SG17 5LB

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

The Community Spending Officer recommends a financial contribution of £57,728.88 towards refurbishment of Stotfold Town Memorial Association building. The building is undergoing a phased refurbishment and transformation to provide a much needed

hireable space and community facility to service the needs of the Shefford which has experienced significant housing growth over the last few years.

A contribution to Phase 2 of the STMA refurbishment requires initial ground works and 3 pitched rooves. The intention being to re-orientate the space to provide the following

- The front bar will be made into a games room;
- This then frees up the existing snooker room with the intention of creating a family-friendly area consisting of a back bar, a coffee shop and seating area and potentially a small area for 2 or 3 computers/consoles.

Additional Comments

The site is located adjacent to the STMA land and building which is to the west of the site. The development proposal will have impact on existing infrastructure and the Spending Officer has provided adequate justification and projects where this contribution can be allocated. The relevant CIL tests have therefore been satisfied and the applicant has agreed to this contribution.

Additional/Amended Conditions

That, in addition to other financial contributions that this contribution also be secured as part of a S106 agreement.

Landscape Plan

Prior to first occupation of the buildings hereby approved full details on a suitably scaled plan of both hard and soft landscape works must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, these works shall be in addition to those shown on the approved plans and shall be carried out and retained as approved. The landscaping details to be submitted shall include:-

- a) means of enclosure;
- b) existing and proposed finished levels and finished floor levels.
- c) planting plans, including specifications of species, sizes, planting centres, planting method and number and percentage mix;
- d) details for all external hard surface within the site, including roads, drainage detail and car parking areas.

Reason: The landscaping of this site is required in order to protect and enhance the existing visual character of the area and to reduce the visual and environmental impacts of the development hereby permitted in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

Landscape Implementation

All planting, seeding or turfing and soil preparation comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following first occupation of the building; and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of

similar size and species. All landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the guidance contained in British Standards.

Reason: The landscaping of this site is required in order to protect and enhance the existing visual character of the area and to reduce the visual and environmental impacts of the development hereby permitted in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

Informative

This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

Item 10 (Pages 87-92) – CB/17/06001/FULL – Water Lane Farm, Biggleswade Road, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BP

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

The applicant has provided the following additional information in respect of the requirements for the proposed development:-

Barn 1 is part replacement for the two barns which will be demolished to allow it to be built. The existing barns are constructed from cast iron sheeting and in very poor condition and are not secure. The frames are not substantial enough to take the cost of upgrading or would in the end result in a suitable modern building. The proposed building (Barn 1) would be used for maintenance of machinery etc. Currently this is done out in the open.

Barn 2 is to provide storage of modern tractors and equipment that are too big and too high to fit in any of the other sheds available at Water Lane Farm. The remainder of the barn would be used for hay storage, seed and fertilizer. Up to three and half thousand bales of hale are cut on the farm.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Informative

This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

Item 11 (Pages 93-110) – CB/17/05250/FULL – Land to South West of Higham Cottages, Higham Road, Higham Gobion

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Landscape Officer - Having revisited site and surrounds landscape concerns stand regarding submitted proposals and are not acceptable: detrimental visual impact on landscape character and local visual amenity.

No.2 Higham Cottages – “I attach photos of skid marks made this morning which may help clarify my concerns about the omissions from the track plans of this application. The skid marks start near the field entrances and go across the centre line. They start when the driver first reacts to seeing the dustbin lorry stopped at No.1. As with most drivers the first reaction is to swerve across the road and, hopefully, pass the parked vehicle without the inconvenience of stopping. In this case, and many others we have seen over the years, something unseen was coming the other way and forced the emergency braking. This I hope clarifies the poor visibility problem. The last near miss was exactly this when a large and powerful car just managed the swerve by causing the oncoming tractor and trailer to do an emergency stop.”

Additional Comments

Clarification of Call In – Called in by Cllr Alison Graham for the following reason:

“The enormous grain store with 2 metre steel fence is out of proportion to the open rural site and Victorian cottages opposite. 60mph road already has accident liability. 15.400 m. vehicles need 6 seconds to turn and 6.610m kerb to kerb turning circle. Runoff water is to go into existing water course – this brook below the site has native cray fish in it which would be at risk”.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Inclusion of the following informatives as requested by the highways officer:

The applicant is advised that in order to comply with Condition 5 of this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to enter into an agreement with Central Bedfordshire Council as Highway Authority under Section 278/small works of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the satisfactory completion of the access and associated road improvements.

You are advised to contact the Highways Agreements Officer, Community Services, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ. E-mail highwaysagreements@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

The applicant is advised that the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 will apply to any works undertaken within the limits of the existing public highway. Further details can be obtained by this link on the Council website <http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx> or contact Central Bedfordshire Council Tel: 0300 300 8301.

The applicant is advised that parking for contractor's vehicles and the storage of materials associated with this development should take place within the site and not extend into within the public highway without authorisation from the highway authority. If necessary the applicant is advised to follow this link on the Council website <http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx> or contact Central Bedfordshire Council Tel: 0300 300 8301. Under the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 the developer may be liable for any damage caused to the public highway as a result of construction of the development hereby approved.

The applicant is advised that in order to achieve the vision splays in condition 6 of the permission it may be necessary for vegetation overhanging the public highway to be removed. Prior to the commencement of work the applicant is advised to use this link on the Council website

<http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx>

or contact Central Bedfordshire Council Tel: 0300 300 8301 to request the removal of the overhanging vegetation on the public highway.

Item 12 (Pages 111-128) – CB/17/04638/FULL – Public Convenience, Duck Lane, Woburn, MK17 9PT

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Further consultation responses from:

39 Timber Lane
36 Leighton Street
3 Howland Place
5 Bloomsbury Close
3 Timber Lane
3 Duck Lane
Woburn Parish Council

All additional responses received refer to issues which have already been raised by existing neighbour consultation responses and are covered within the report.

Additional Comments

Revised recommendation as follows: Recommended for Approval subject to the consultation not raising any new issues.

Consultation period is due to expire 05/03/2018.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 13 (Pages 129-142) – CB/17/05966/VOC – Former Pig Testing Unit, Hitchin Road, Stotfold

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

1 further neighbour objection received from a purchaser of one of the apartments:

- Having bought one of the apartments last year partly on the basis that we would be in an environment of a similar age group we are disappointed to learn that the developers are going ahead with an application to remove this restriction. No one from the developers has either informed us of this action or indeed asked us for our views. Similarly we've had no contact from anyone at Central Beds and as we don't live in the area yet we weren't likely to see any published public notices.
- The developers application claims that the age restriction is hindering sales but why go ahead with that part of the development in the first place if you weren't confident of the market. We have literally bought into the concept - why shouldn't the developers continue to do so.

Additional Comments

The removal of the age restriction condition brings the 19 apartments into the open market, allowing occupation by any who choose to purchase. The original application was subject to a S106 agreement requiring obligations for local infrastructure, in respect of education contributions these units would not have been included due to the occupation requirements. Should permission be granted and the condition removed the apartments would likely have increased impact on education infrastructure and therefore it is considered necessary to require financial contributions for education projects as a result.

On the basis of these 19 apartments, education contributions amount to the following:

EY	£11,925.27
Lower	£39,750.90
Middle	£39,999.02
Upper	£49,049.40
Total	£140,724.59

These contributions are considered appropriate and necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. Therefore the recommendation is altered to require the completion of a Deed of Variation to include the Education Contributions.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 14 (Pages 143-150) – CB/17/06061/FULL – 14 Verne Drive, Ampthill, Bedford, MK45 2PS

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 15 (Pages 151-158) – CB/17/05981/FULL – 203 Biggleswade Road, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BJ

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 16 (Pages 159-170) – CB/18/00077/FULL – Co-Op Supermarket, High Street, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5QT

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

This page is intentionally left blank