

## Item No. 6

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>                | <b>CB/16/00860/REG3</b>  |
| <b>LOCATION</b>                          | <b>Land at Dunton Lane, Biggleswade</b>  |
| <b>PROPOSAL</b>                          | <b>Regulation 3: New use of land as new traveller site incorporating 10 permanent pitches with studio buildings, 2 transit pitches with studio buildings, a site managers office and a sewage treatment plant.</b> |
| <b>PARISH</b>                            | <b>Biggleswade</b>   |
| <b>WARD</b>                              | <b>Biggleswade South</b>   |
| <b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>                  | <b>Cllrs Lawrence &amp; Woodward</b>   |
| <b>CASE OFFICER</b>                      | <b>Alex Harrison</b>   |
| <b>DATE REGISTERED</b>                   | <b>07 March 2016</b>   |
| <b>EXPIRY DATE</b>                       | <b>06 June 2016</b>  |
| <b>APPLICANT</b>                         | <b>Central Bedfordshire Council</b>  |
| <b>AGENT</b>                             | <b>BM3 Architecture</b>  |
| <b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b> | <b>Parish Council objection to an application for major development<br/>Council's own development with outstanding objections</b>  |
| <b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>              | <b>Full Application - approval recommended</b>   |

### Reason for recommendation

The proposed development is in a sustainable location and would provide permanent and transit pitches towards the Councils 5 year supply of gypsy and traveller accommodation needs in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. The proposal would not result in significant harm to the character of the area or an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties to the extent that it would outweigh the benefit of providing pitches at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply. It is acceptable in terms of highway safety therefore by reason of its size, design and location, is in conformity with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Management Policies, November 2009; and The National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Policy for Traveller.

### Site Location:

The application site is a Council owned greenfield site beyond the settlement boundaries of both Biggleswade (0.9m) and Dunton (0.7m) in open countryside. The site is within the Biggleswade parish but is immediately adjacent Dunton Parish.

The site is currently arable farmland and Dunton Lane runs adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. There is existing tree and hedge planting consistently apparent on the northern boundary. An existing wooded area lies immediately adjacent to the east and the southern and western boundaries are currently open.

## **The Application:**

Full planning permission is sought for the development of the site as a new gypsy and traveller site incorporating 10 permanent pitches with studio buildings, 2 transit pitches with studio buildings, a site manager's office and a sewage treatment plant.

Each permanent and transit pitch would have a single story studio building and have space for two trailers and two vehicles to park. It would be enclosed and is arranged to front a central landscaped island which provides additional unallocated parking and an equipped play area. A separate unallocated van and truck parking area is also proposed within the site.

Access is proposed to be gained directly onto Dunton Lane with a priority junction arrangement. A second access is proposed to serve the sewage plant. The layout plans indicate the provision of a bus stop for buses travelling towards Biggleswade although it is noted that this plan is annotated to state that this is still to be discussed with the bus service provider.

The application has had additional information submitted since its original submission in the form of revised landscaping and a plan showing access visibility splays. This additional information is currently being consulted upon at the time of drafting this report but will the period will expire prior to the meeting and any additional comments received will be updated in the late sheet.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012)**

#### **Core Strategy and Development Management Policies - North 2009**

CS5 (Providing Homes)

CS14 (High Quality Development)

CS16 (Landscape and Woodland)

DM3 (High Quality Development)

DM4 (Development within and beyond Settlement Envelopes)

DM14 (Landscape and Woodland)

### **Mid Bedfordshire Local Plan Review December (2005)**

Saved policy - HO12 - Gypsies

### **Draft Gypsy and Traveller Plan**

In June 2014, Central Bedfordshire Council submitted the Gypsy and Traveller Plan to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination after a long process of preparation and consultation.

In August 2014, the issues and matters that the Inspector wished to discuss were received. In doing so, he raised significant issues on a substantial number of matters and asked the Council to undertake a considerable amount of additional work prior to the commencement of the Examination hearings.

Following considerations of these matters Officers concluded that it was unrealistic for the Council to respond within the proposed timescale and recommended to Members (via Executive on 19th August 2014 and subsequently at Council on 11th September 2014) that the plan was withdrawn. This document therefore carries little weight in the determination of this application. However for the purpose of assessing a planning application for the suitability of a proposed site, the policies contained within the document are considered to be useful guidelines as to whether a proposal is considered to be acceptable for its intended purpose.

Those policies thought to be relevant are:

GT5 (Assessing planning applications for Gypsy and Traveller sites)

## **Development Strategy**

At the meeting of Full Council on 19 November 2015 it was resolved to withdraw the Development Strategy. Preparation of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan has begun. A substantial volume of evidence gathered over a number of years will help support this document. These technical papers are consistent with the spirit of the NPPF and therefore will remain on our website as material considerations which may inform further development management decisions.

## **Supplementary Planning Guidance/Other Documents**

Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (March 2014)

## **Relevant Planning History:**

None

## **Consultees:**

Biggleswade Town Council Raised no objections

Dunton Parish Council The Principle of the Proposed Development  
(adjoining) In considering the principle of the proposed development, the policy context above sets out a clear hierarchical approach to planning for and accommodating Gypsy and Traveller development/sites.

Whilst the NPPF sets out a general presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is also clear that a plan led approach to decision making is key to achieving sustainable development. Paragraph 12 of the NPPF states that *'it is highly desirable that local planning authorities should have an up to date plan in place'*.

Whilst there is currently no adopted local policy which relates to the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites, the applicant's submitted Design and Access Statement places great weight on the GTLP and specifically refers to detailed policies, none of which currently carry any weight

in the decision making process. There is no reference to the withdrawal of the plan which the Parish Council considers to be misleading. There is no policy basis for this application.

The principle of development should therefore be assessed against current national policy on the basis that the site is located within open countryside, in an area which is not allocated for development.

The PPTS sets out within Policy H, at paragraph 25, that new traveller site development in the open countryside or outside areas allocated in the development plan should be very strictly limited.

Based on the local policy approach taken by the applicant, the submitted application fails to fully address the national policy considerations and no justification is given as to why the proposal has come forward in advance of the GTLP and the proper plan making process.

The approach to the application site is therefore considered to be premature. The Council's 'call for sites' process has only very recently been undertaken as part of the preparation of the Local Plan, a process which is unlikely to be concluded until the end of the year.

In coming forward in advance of the proper plan making process, the local community and Dunton Parish Council have not had adequate opportunity to consider and make representations as to the suitability of the site and the impact on the local community and local services. Concern in relation to the adequacy of public consultation, specifically in relation to this site, was also raised by the Planning Inspector at the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan Examination in 2014. The submission of the application is therefore perceived by the local community as an approach to bypass the plan making process.

As such it is unreasonable and unjustified to make assumptions at this stage, through the premature submission of a planning application that alternative sites within more sustainable urban locations would not come forward. This point is particularly pertinent given the

concerns expressed by the Inspector on the LPA's evidence base with respect to assessing need.

Through this process, the LPA is required, in accordance with policy A of the PPTS, to use a robust evidence base to inform the preparation of local plans and make planning decisions.

The LPA's assessment of need has not been clear or consistent throughout the process with reference being made to different base dates for assessment. The whole approach to the provision of sites for Gypsy and Travellers (including Travelling Show People) is considered to lack sound evidence to demonstrate a clear and justified need set against the requirements of the revised PPTS. This recent submission by Central Bedfordshire Council further confuses and undermines the proper plan making process.

Specifically in relation to the application site, the Draft Pre-Submission Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan (January 2014) allocates this site (Site 26) for 15 pitches. Whilst this policy carries no weight, the information is nonetheless in the public domain. There is also some confusion as to whether this site, is precisely that put forward within the pre submission plan.

The current application now submitted by the Council proposes 10 pitches, 2 transit pitches and a manager's office adding further confusion and lack of credibility to the position in terms of need and the Council's evidence base, particularly from the point of view of the local community.

The current submission does not address this issue and no reference is made as to whether the current proposals in fact meet the revised definition of Gypsies & Travellers, the Council's perceived level of need, or whether there may be a need to extend the site again in the future resulting in further confusion for the local community as to the extent of the proposals and the future requirements for Gypsy and Traveller development within this location.

Given the contents of paragraph 5.1 of the Design and Access Statement, it would appear that no specific occupiers of the site have been identified. This raises

further doubt about the need for the development and whether the site is suitable to meet the future occupiers personal circumstances.

On this basis, Dunton Parish Council consider that the applicant is unable to adequately demonstrate a considered or justified need for this or any Gypsy and Traveller development at this location. There is no sound or adopted local policy justification to view the principle of development within this location favourably and national policy would lead the local planning authority to refuse the application on policy grounds.

#### Other Planning Considerations

Notwithstanding the unacceptability of the application in policy terms, there are a number of detailed issues which would also result in adverse and detrimental impacts. These are also considered by the Parish Council significant enough to warrant refusal of the application as set out below.

It is necessary to set out at this stage however that it is difficult to make a comprehensive assessment of the development given the lack of supporting technical information submitted with this application. As set out above, no policy justification has been provided for the development, with the submitted Design and Access Statement referring to the withdrawn GTLP as a means for justifying the proposals. As set out above this is clearly misleading as there is no planning policy basis for this development.

No detailed justification has been provided with regards to flood risk, drainage, transport and access, with the application appearing to focus solely on the aesthetics of the proposed buildings and 3d visualisations. This further reinforces the public's perception that this is an ill conceived application.

#### Visual Impact and Landscaping

The visual impact of the proposals within this open countryside location is of significant concern. The surrounding area is currently of an open nature, characterised by agricultural land (the site itself being Grade 2 agricultural land) made up of large fields with limited field boundaries of low native hedgerow. The

proposed development incorporates significant landscaping to the site which is out of character with the open nature of the area. In particular an earth bund is proposed to the boundary of the site, involving substantial earthworks and the formation of a feature which would appear prominent and out of character within this open countryside location. Whilst native tree and shrub planting is proposed, unless the bund is properly constructed and managed, the compressed nature of an earthwork bund and poor quality soil and inappropriate tree and shrub species generally results in a poor solution to screening an unsightly development and the bund itself becomes an eyesore within any setting.

Any attempt to screen the development, as set out in the submitted landscape plans, will only become effective in the medium to longer term in any case and the effectiveness of any screening by way of tree and hedgerow planting would be questionable due to the seasonal nature of any suitable native planting proposals.

These concerns reflect national policy H of the PPTS which requires that sites are well planned or landscaped in such a way to positively enhance the environment and increase its openness. It is clear that the current proposals fail to comply with this policy.

The provision of a 1.8m high close boarded fence around the site also adds to concerns relating to visual impact. On this matter, policy H also specifically requires that sites should not be enclosed with so much hard landscaping and high fences that the impression may be given that the site is deliberately isolated from the rest of the community. Landscaping should be used as a means of assimilating appropriate development, not screening inappropriate development.

In addition, the contemporary design of the proposed structures within the site has also not taken consideration of the rural nature of the site and how built form within the development may be best assimilated into that setting.

The visual impact of the development and its impact on the character and appearance of the area will be further exacerbated by lighting within the site creating a form of development that is at odds with its surroundings.

The above concerns on visual impact and the conflict with policy H of the national PPTS demonstrates the Parish Council's well founded concerns that this is the wrong location and wrong site for development.

#### Sustainability

Aligned with this is a significant concern relating to the sustainability of this location, some distance from the local community and local services and the pressure that development at this location would bring to that local community and those local services. In particular the local lower school in Dunton which is already experiencing issues associated with over subscription.

The application provides no information on the demographic of the population of the proposed development, therefore the impact on Dunton Lower School cannot be assessed. Notwithstanding the capacity of the Lower School, any occupiers of the new development will be highly unlikely to walk small children the significant distance to and from Dunton or Biggleswade every day, resulting in significant additional traffic movements and congestion in the vicinity of the site raising concerns of highway safety.

Policy H of the PPTS is clear that new traveller sites in open countryside should be strictly limited, referring in particular to instances where they are located away from existing settlements and therefore unacceptable distances from local services. Allowing development such as that which is proposed, in an inappropriate open countryside location would result in an unsustainable increase in car movements to access services some distance from the site. This would be contrary to the aspirations of the overarching policies of the NPPF in promoting sustainable development.

The sites isolated location is made worse by the fact that there are no footways or street lighting between the site and the village, or to Biggleswade to the west, meaning that residents will be totally reliant on the use of the private car, with each plot likely to generate several two way vehicle movements throughout the day. No details of vehicle movements, or a demonstration that the access arrangements will operate safely, having regard to all



types of vehicles, touring caravans and also twin unit/static caravans which would require transportation onto and off site using large HGV's, has been provided.

Following a recent site visit with members of the Parish Council, there is particular concern about visibility to the east given a significant bend in the road. Concern is also expressed about the access arrangements for serving the sewage treatment plant which has a separate access located closer to the aforementioned bend and would again require access for substantial vehicles.

Further, the proposal for a bus stop appears ill conceived and no technical details have been provided to demonstrate that a bus stop located only to the south of Dunton Lane can be safely operated, particularly by buses approaching from the west which will have to cross over the highway. No firm details have been provided to demonstrate that service operators will be prepared to stop at the site. More fundamentally however only a limited (every 2 hour) bus service is provided which makes reliance on public transport generally unfeasible.

#### Drainage

No details have been provided with regards to drainage of what is a substantial greenfield site. How will surface water be dealt with? There is no detail as to whether ground conditions support the use of the sewage treatment facility outlined in the submission.

#### Conclusion

It is considered by Dunton Parish Council, taking into consideration all of the issues raised above, that this is simply the wrong location for development. The character of the area being one of open landscape and the location of the site a significant distance from local services and the local community, would result in a development which would cause unacceptable harm to the landscape character and would clearly be unsustainable.

It has been clearly demonstrated that the application is premature in advance of the Local Plan and that there is no policy basis or reasoned justification or any other material consideration which could lead the local planning authority to view the application favourably in principle. On this basis the Parish Council would question the

legality of any decision to grant planning permission on this site.

The submission of a planning application appears to be an attempt by the applicant to disregard its own plan making process and overlook the specific concerns raised by the Local Plan Inspector in relation to the application site and deny the local community the opportunity to make representation through adequate consultation on the proposal. The submitted application makes no reference to the comments made by the Inspector in 2014 and the submission clearly makes no attempt to address any of the issues raised.

The application site and the area around it comprises an important gap between the urban settlement of Biggleswade and the rural village of Dunton and any development within this area would erode that separation. Dunton Parish Council are gravely concerned that granting planning permission for the proposed development would leave the LPA open to challenge on further development within this open countryside location, particularly when there is currently no sound policy justification based on clearly evidenced need for such development within the open countryside.

For these reasons Dunton Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed development and urges the local planning authority to refuse the application and allow the proper consideration of Gypsy and Traveller development through the Local Plan process, with proper engagement and consultation with the local community.

Cllr Adam Zerny  
(adjoining Ward  
Member)

Please note my objection to the above planning application non the following grounds:

- Lack of educational facility
- Lack of healthcare
- Lack of pavements to nearby settlements
- Land in question floods frequently
- Removal of prime agricultural land
- Required residential units to far from the A1 along winding roads

Highways

Initial submission

A new main vehicular access is shown to be created onto Dunton Lane to serve the proposed site and a second access is shown to be created to serve the proposed

adjoining sewage treatment plant.

A new footway is shown to be created across the site frontage between the two new access points together with provision of a new bus lay-by.

The submitted plans state that 2.4m x 215m visibility splays (commensurate with the national speed limit in place on Dunton Lane) are provided at the points of access.

However these are not shown on the submitted plans and given the horizontal alignment of the road, it is not apparent that the requisite visibility splay can be achieved to the east without crossing third party land.

Would you therefore please ask the applicant to submit the appropriate plans to demonstrate that adequate visibility splays can be provided at both points of access and re-consult me on receipt?

Unless and until an amended plan is submitted, the application cannot be considered acceptable in highway terms.

LDF Team

This site was one of the six put forward for allocation in the GTLP 2014 having been selected through a long and detailed 3 stage process in 2013/2014, which included extensive consultation. A number of sites were considered in the south/east of Biggleswade area and this site, Site 26, was eventually put forward in preference to the others, including Site 55 which was a short distance (500 m) to the west. This was because it was considered to be at an acceptable distance from the nearby settlements (i.e. not too near or too far); it was capable of being effectively screened within the open countryside as a result of its specific siting adjoining an established copse; it was deliverable in the required timescale to meet the accepted need and it would be managed effectively by the Council themselves.

There were a number of specific objections raised to the proposed allocation of this site at the time of the GLTP, including the fact that on the selection criteria the site as with others, scored relatively lowly. This was in part due to its location and the relative distance to available services and facilities to support the occupiers. Issues such as bus provision and the safety of the highway access have largely been addressed in the detailed design of the application and will be commented on by statutory consultees. A particular issue is therefore whether this site can be considered sustainable within the terms of the NPPF and PPTS.

The CBC Planning policy approach in the now withdrawn GTLP – Part 5 Consideration of New Sites stressed that a sustainability approach required access to a variety of community services including health; schools; local shops and employment opportunity.

Para. 5.3 acknowledged that whilst proximity to existing settlements is the Council's first preference, it is often the expressed preference of the gypsy and traveller community to live in the countryside and indeed that of the nearest settled community that there should be more separation between the two forms of housing.

Policy GT5 proposed a criteria-based approach to assessing planning applications, which included ensuring "satisfactory and safe vehicular access to and from the public highway".

Para. 5.9 confirmed this as "essential" and adds "Access to local services by foot, cycle or public transport should ideally be available, to reduce the reliance on private vehicles."

This issue has been addressed by inspectors on appeal on a number of occasions both locally and nationally. Increasingly the view is emerging that sustainability does not necessarily equate solely to being in walking distance of facilities, particularly if to do so would raise safety issues, and that a wider interpretation should be employed. Examples of this approach locally include Twin Acres, Arlesey (Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/W/15/3004755), where the Inspector concluded:

"However, there is no requirement in national policy to provide pedestrian links to gypsy and traveller sites. Government policy envisages such sites in rural areas, where providing footpath links will often be impractical or inappropriate. Paragraph 29 of the Framework acknowledges

that "different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas".

The inspector went on to quote a further appeal ref APP/J0405/C/13/2193582 concerning a site at Slapton in Buckinghamshire (the Slapton appeal) in illustration:

"In the Slapton appeal, the site was in the countryside some 800m from a hamlet with no services, 1.5km from the village of Slapton, 2 - 3 km from the larger village of Cheddington and 5km from the town of Leighton Buzzard,

where most amenities essential for day-to-day living were located. The Inspector found that the occupants would rely on private motor vehicles to reach most amenities and that it would be unpleasant, if not hazardous to walk to the nearest bus stops or the railway station, as there was no footway and only an overgrown verge and fast moving traffic. She nevertheless found that the site was not unduly far from local services and it is not unusual for country dwellers to rely on the private car. The same conclusion applies with even greater force in this case, where the site is much closer to significant services.”

This view is not new however and [*was reflected*] in the Woodside appeal, Hatch SG19 1PT. The decision letter came in the same month as the revised PPTS, August 2015, APP/P0240/A/11/2156395/NWF.

The site is proposed to provide two transit pitches. Central Bedfordshire has no specific transit site provision at the current time and this creates difficulties in dealing with unauthorised encampments when there is a legal need to provide adequate transit or emergency sites in order to effect Section 62A of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994. Access to the adjoining A1 corridor is not immediate but achievable in both directions within a few minutes and this is clearly a considerable locational advantage for such a facility. The provision of two pitches will provide for the northern part of the authority area and will have on-site management.

Landscape Officer

Landscape and Visual - This Application for a Gypsy and Traveller site is within an area of open countryside, although the site is adjacent to a farm woodland established by the local authority. I am concerned that the site will urbanise the countryside - the site is within the Landscape Character Area 5G - Dunton Clay Vale. This landscape is characterised by the open arable farmland, limited woodland and expansive views. Settlement between villages is typically limited to individual farmsteads. Positive key characteristics include the remaining hedgerows, particularly where they strengthen character and provide enclosure by the roadside. The guidelines for new development and landscape management also focus on the importance of hedgerows.

I appreciate the difficulty in securing sites and so do not object to the Application. I welcome the commitment to the high levels of planting within the development and to achieve a wooded setting. However, to create a site more in keeping with local landscape character I would

like to see amendments to the positioning of the development in terms of setback from Dunton Lane and also some changes to the landscape proposals :-

1. Can the development be set further back from Dunton Lane to help safeguard the important tree and hedgerow edge and rural character of Dunton Lane. The development will include the installation of a 2m wide pavement and a bus pull in, which will result in the loss of verge and trees at this point. I am not sure from the Landscape Proposals how much of the existing hedge will be retained. More information is required about the treatment of the site frontage e.g. it appears that a beech hedge might be used to enclose native hedge planting. if so, this would not be in keeping - the road frontage needs to restore a hawthorn based hedge.

It is really important to maintain space for a restored line of the existing hedgerow. To achieve this it would help if the development to be set a further 2m into the site to provide more space for strengthening the landscape screen at this sensitive location.

I welcome the additional planting at the entrance of the site, which is necessary to integrate the two traveller pitches.

## 2 .Suggested changes to the Landscape Scheme

### Tree Species

Acer "Crimson King" is not an acceptable tree for the rural location – this needs to be changed for a green leafed tree- alternative choices include Lime, Norway Maple, Turkish Hazel. Wild cherry (Prunus avium) or winter flowering cherry (Prunus subhirtella) or amelanchier would provide some seasonal blossom and autumn colour.

Birch - I suggest this is planted in groups to gain the beauty of the trunks.

Ash should not be planted at this time due to disease. (in planting H3d)

Whitebeam - please reduce the quantities - or preferably replace with rowan or crabapple (whitebeam broad crowned and a rather suburban tree, not ideal for rural

screening ) ( H3a)

Orchard trees used to be more frequent in this area- some fruit trees could be planted to provide a variety of fruit for residents.

#### Use of Bunding

I have not seen any detail of the proposed bunds - but generally their use should be avoided. They are not required for screening purposes - the tree screen will achieve this and the stock will establish better in the natural soil level, especially if the soils are ripped to remove the pan created by regular ploughing. I would like to see details of the proposed bunding.

#### Beech hedging

Whilst I think it attractive to establish hedges between the plots, I note that they will be grown beside 1.8m high close boarded fences. The narrow strip of ground between the surfaced plots will create difficult growing conditions. I would prefer hornbeam or field maple hedges as I think these species would suit the soil better - but would like the type of hedge to be agreed with the new residents. Some ornamental hedging might be preferred. More detail of the hedge specification would be helpful .

Are such tall fences essential as they will have a strong landscape impact for many years.

#### Ornamental planting

I cannot see Pachysandra surviving as a groundcover - the planting would need to be more robust.

#### New Woodland Screen and Woodland to South

I welcome the scale of screening to the west but would have preferred a larger woodland to the south; a rectangular shape would reflect the agricultural landscape . The woodland planting needs to become a valuable resource for the residents and I hope that they will become involved in the planning and management of the wood. It could be useful e.g. - supplying material such as hazel or other firewood. Will the residents need a "glade" ? There have been many instances of ponies being tethered within woodland - if this is a possibility - then an open grassed area needs to be planned for.

#### The adjacent Woodland Belt

It is my understanding that the current managers ( CAS ) recommended that this farm woodland was incorporated within the gypsy and traveller site . I am very concerned about the long-term health of this woodland- it is important as a landscape feature and wildlife habitat. How will this woodland be managed and protected from damage? Will an additional budget be made available to the Housing Services team . Do they have the scope to manage native woodland and who will the work be subcontracted out to? The woodland edge beside the site is in good condition but some thinning and managing of the woodland is required.

Both areas of woodland need to be managed as a screen but also as a productive woodland . A woodland planting scheme and a management plan will be required.

#### Trees and Landscape

The site is currently arable land with a maturing woodland edge on the east of the site.

Supplied with the application is a Proposed Landscape Plan, drawing D900 Rev D. This identifies all areas of planting and includes a proposed bund around the west and south boundaries. I am unsure where the red line boundary for the site is. Proposed Site Plan DO1 Rev E shows this bund and planting area as being within the red line boundary, however Proposed Landscape Plan seems to show two red lines one of which excludes this area of bund and planting and does not seem to show detail of this on the Key.

Planting detail 01 on the same plan indicates a post and wire fence and a screening fence along with different linear planting schemes but does not suggest which side of the detail is the existing woodland. The Proposed Landscape Plan does not indicate either fence. The Proposed Site Layout Plan also does not show this detail.

Four tree species are shown on the Proposed Landscape Plan including *Acer platanoides*, *Prunus avium*, *Betula pendula*, *Populus tremula*. This is a rural site and I would suggest that *Acer platanoides* Crimson King is not in keeping with the surrounding countryside and should be replaced with a tough hardy native species. *Betula pendula* indicated for play areas would be fine except that it has a thin peeling bark and many times when this



species is planted in this environment it tends to be vandalised. Populus tremula is fine, it will become a tall and fast growing tree but I would suggest that for screening purposes at the front of the site near the treatment plant it would be advisable to interplant with something with a lower growing denser habit, maybe Acer campestre.

We need more clarity on this landscape and boundary treatment proposal

Ecologist

I have no objection to the proposal but support the comments made by the tree officer in relation to the tree species used.

Sustainable  
Drainage Officer

Urban

The application is for a site 2.3 ha and is classified as a small major.

Under CBCs validation list, all major development must provide a Surface Water Drainage Strategy in order for an assessment to be made of the suitability of the proposed surface water drainage system in line with Paragraphs 103, 104 and 109 of NPPF and its supporting guidance.

We therefore request a Surface Water Drainage strategy be provided. This should demonstrate that flood risk will not be increased on or off site as a result of the development going ahead and that priority has been given to the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) where appropriate.

The Strategy should include details of the:

- Site information relating to the proposed development and the existing hydrological and hydro-geological context of the site and its adjoining land.
- Existing and proposed run off destination and discharge points.
- Existing and proposed peak flow rate & discharge rates.
- Existing and proposed discharge volumes and storage requirements.
- Allowances for climate change and urban creep in design.
- The design of SuDS and how they will work in sequence.
- Vested drainage bodies and any additional consents or permits that may be needed.
- Management of system exceedance.

- Construction of the system.
- Maintenance of the system.
- Plans and drawings.
- Water quality, ecology and social objectives of the site and its drainage.

We note that the proposed development is for a small scale major, and we therefore expect the above information will be appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposed development.

If the proposed development is not considered to change the existing drainage regime of the site we will still require details to establish changes to the impermeable area and how the site will be drained to assess the viability of the proposed surface water drainage system.

Failure to provide any of the information requested will likely result in the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) making recommendation for refusal of the planning application on grounds of insufficient information.

More information on what to include is available online or upon request.

Please also note that a Flood Risk Assessment has not been provided, under NPPF a Flood Risk Assessment is required for any development site over 1ha in size and located within Flood Zone 1, or all proposals for new developments located in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The proposed site is 2.3 ha. A Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Strategy should inform one another and may form part of the same document where applicable.

Internal Drainage Board      The board notes that the intended method of storm water disposal is to an Anglian Water sewer.

Confirmation should be sought form Anglian Water that a suitable sewer exists and can satisfactorily accommodate the additional flows from the site.

Please also note that the nearby watercourses are under the control of the Board. As Dunton Lane experiences frequent flooding; the Board will not accept any un-attenuated discharge to the nearby watercourse.

Anglian Water      No comments received

Pollution Team      Had no comments to make

Private Sector Housing      We believe that the site plans and the separation distances proposed are appropriate and generous. It is

understood that there will be at least 6m between the pitches and that as these are family pitches the statics and tourers will be spaced accordingly.

## Other Representations:

### Neighbours

#### Letters received from

- M22, Stratton Park Drive, Biggleswade
- West Sunderland Farm Cottages, Biggleswade
- The Lodge, Dunton Lane, Biggleswade
- The Elms, Stratton Park, Biggleswade
- 141, 240, 3 Stratton Farm Cottages, London Road, Biggleswade
- 57 Ivel Gardens, Biggleswade
- Lawrence Road, Biggleswade
- 23 Clover Close, Biggleswade
- 6, 8 Neptune Road, Biggleswade
- 2 Mitchell Green, Biggleswade
- 12 Bluebell Close, Biggleswade
- 20 Walton Grove, Biggleswade
- 6, 15 Coltsfoot, Biggleswade
- 17, 53 Foxglove Drive, Biggleswade
- 10 Gilbert Avenue, Biggleswade
- 38 Mercury Lane, Biggleswade
- 7 Hazel Walk, Biggleswade
- 35 Dells Lane, Biggleswade
- 7 Lavender Way, Biggleswade
- 49 Osprey Road, Biggleswade
- 138 Holme

110 letters have been received. Of these 107 are in objection to, or make comments on, the scheme and raise the following planning issues:

- There are no footpaths to Dunton or Biggleswade from the site to access facilities.
- Poor visibility for vehicles leaving the site.
- Dunton Lane is national speed limit with no street lights.
- Bus stop only shown on one side of the road. No sustainable public transport services.
- The site places sole reliance on the private.
- No facilities or utilities at the site.
- There is no doctors surgery at Dunton and development would put an unfair burden on the village facilities and utilities.
- Development would dominate the community.
- Healthcare and education facilities in this area are already stretched.
- Inappropriate development in the open countryside and would change the historical character and harm views from nearby rights of way.
- Development is contrary to the advice in the government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS).
- Site has previously been regarded as unacceptable, why is it acceptable now?
- Location would not allow residents to integrate into the community.
- Add to coalescence between settlements
- Site should be nearer to Potton
- Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land
- Loss of protected wildlife species.
- Council should look at brownfield sites in the first instance.
- Council has not been transparent in the process and should have consulted when choosing the site.
- No archaeological survey has been carried out.
- Question whether the proposed sewage plant can accommodate the numbers of potential residents and visitors.
- Site holds water and could have flooding/drainage issues.

- Court Ave,  
Biggleswade  
19 Apollo  
Gardens,  
Biggleswade
- 17 Planets Way,  
Biggleswade
- 7 Tulip Close,  
Biggleswade
- 4 Watkin Walk,  
Biggleswade
- 39 Venus Ave,  
Biggleswade
- 6 Poppy Field,  
Biggleswade
- 2, 8, 12, 19  
Chapel Street,  
Dunton
- 2 Springfield,  
Dunton
- 4, 6, 7 Kings  
Pond Close, Dunton
- 1, 1b, 19, 23,  
25, 27, 31 Boot  
Lane, Dunton
- 2, 6, 8, 9, 15  
Horseshoe Close,  
Dunton
- 1, 5, 12, 29, 31,  
1 + 2 Old Bakery  
Yard, Waterworks  
Cottages,  
Cambridge Road,  
Dunton
- 4 Millow,  
Dunton
- 1, 10, 15,  
Sharrow,  
Wheatsheaf  
Cottage,  
Biggleswade Road,  
Dunton
- 1, 3 Magdalene  
Close, Dunton
- 7 Hallside,  
Dunton
- 1, 5, 6 Newton,  
Dunton
- 28 Lees Close,  
Dunton
- 4, 14, 16, 29, 33  
Fen Reach, Dunton
- 3, 6, 11, 12, 19  
Greenfield Way,  
Dunton
- 1, 1A, 2, 6, 7A  
High Street, Dunton
- Dunton Lower  
School
- 4A, 13 High  
Street, Eyeworth
- 14 Clifton Park,  
Clifton

Objections relating to cost or use of Council money, while prominent in resident's minds, are not planning considerations and should not be given weight in determining this application.

- Letters received from 2 letters of support have been received enquiring about taking up pitches and a further letter has been received enquiring about becoming site manager.
- 7 Hazel Walk
  - Lawrence Road

### **Determining Issues:**

The main considerations of the application are;

1. Principle
2. Affect on the Character and Appearance of the Area
3. Neighbouring Amenity
4. Highway Considerations
5. Planning Balance
6. Other Considerations

### **Considerations**

#### **1. Principle of Development**

- 1.1 The site lies outside of any settlement, almost halfway between Dunton and Biggleswade. In policy terms it is within the open countryside where there is a general presumption against the granting of planning permission for new development as set out by Policy DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (2009). There are no dwellings or other buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- 1.2 Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 (PPTS) guidance sets out that Local Authorities should ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally. The guidance requires that Local Planning Authorities carry out a full assessment of the need of Gypsies and Travellers in their area and identify a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against their locally set targets.
- 1.3 Paragraph 25 of the PPTS sets out that if a local authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five-year supply of deliverable sites, this should be a significant material consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary consent.
- 1.4 Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Provision  
A Central Bedfordshire-wide Gypsy and Traveller Plan (GTP) was prepared to deliver the pitch requirement for Central Bedfordshire to 2031 and was subject to public consultation following approval at full Council in February 2014. The Plan was later submitted to the Secretary of State in June 2014, however as noted earlier the Inspector raised a number of questions regarding the Plan and the Plan was later withdrawn. The Plan therefore carries very little weight in the determination of this application.
- 1.5 In preparation of the Plan the Council had a new Gypsy, Traveller and Showperson Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) undertaken, dated January 2014. This Assessment is considered to be up to date and highlights that there

are a small number of unauthorised pitches, temporary consents, concealed households and people on waiting lists for the Council-run sites which are considered to represent the backlog of need within the area.

1.6 The need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches to 2031 is set out in the GTAA update and Full Council agreed on 30th January 2014 that the GTAA be endorsed and that the specific sites identified are taken forward to deliver 66 Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

1.7 While the current version of the GTAA identifies that Council has allocated sufficient sites to provide the required number of pitches to deliver a 5 year land supply the plan has been withdrawn and therefore the 5 year supply cannot be demonstrated. Nevertheless, pitches delivered through applications on existing sites or new unallocated sites would contribute to the number of windfall pitches provided.

1.8 Sustainability

The PPTS states, in para 14, that:

*14. When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community.*

However, para 25 of that document also states that:

*25. Local planning authorities should very strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate, the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.*

1.9 The site is isolated within the open countryside. The content of the PPTS seeks to ensure sites are sustainable in their location but also acknowledges that sites can be in rural locations. A 2015 appeal decision at Woodside, Hatch provides guidance into the location of sites and distances from services. It noted that there were sizeable settlements close by, explicitly listing Sandy (1.4 miles), Upper Caldecote (2 miles) and Northill (1.3 miles). This application site is closer to both Biggleswade and Dunton than that appeal site in hatch and therefore it is considered that there should be no objection to the location of the site away from any established settlement in this location.

1.10 The site had been previously intended to be allocated under the Central Bedfordshire Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan however as stated this has been withdrawn and its former intention to be allocated should be given no weight in determining the individual merits of this application. However by the same token,

the fact that a site is not allocated is not reason to refuse an application. There is no substantive need for a site to be formally allocated to be found suitable for gypsy and traveller use. It is open to site owners and / or promoters, including members of the travelling community and the Council themselves, to bring forward sites as they become available and for the local planning authority to consider each proposal against established need following full and proper consultation.

1.11 The issue of need.

In a recent appeal decision at Twin Acres, Arlesey the Inspector noted:

*"Although the Council prepared the Central Bedfordshire Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan, that plan has been withdrawn and there are no allocated sites."*

This decision has previously been referred to in reports to this Committee. The Inspector went on to say:

*"It is clear there is a significant unmet, immediate need for gypsy and traveller pitches" and again to say "As a matter of policy the absence of an up to date five year supply of deliverable sites is a significant material consideration in applications for temporary permission by virtue of paragraph 25 of the PPTS. However, this factor is capable of being a material consideration in any case and with another appeal ref APP/P0240/A/12/2179237, concerning a site within Central Bedfordshire, the Secretary of State concluded that the need for sites carried considerable weight and the failure of policy was also afforded significant weight. That must remain the case today."*

1.12 Recent planning permissions and appeal decisions over the last year have granted consent for a number of additional pitches, including making permanent some temporary pitches. Current site provision in Central Bedfordshire is continually being reviewed through monitoring and site visits including the bi-annual caravan count. The Council has therefore commissioned a further GTAA, which will have a baseline updated to 2016 and a new 5 year supply period to 2021. It will necessarily reflect the provisions of the revised PPTS, including the new "planning" definition of gypsies and travellers which requires consideration of the extent to which their "nomadic habit of life" is continuing (Annex 1 para.2).

1.13 In the meanwhile, the Council accepts that whilst the immediate backlog may well now have been resolved, there remains an unmet, albeit currently imprecise, need going forward resulting in the lack of a 5 year supply of suitable accommodation to 2019. This application for ten permanent additional gypsy and traveller pitches on a new, architect-designed, Council managed site would make a substantial contribution towards meeting the outstanding shortfall in supply to meet this need.

**2. The effect on the character and appearance of the area**

2.1 Currently the site lies outside of any recognised settlement envelope. It is screened from the public realm by existing tree planting on the northern boundary but views into and through the site are afforded from the public realm regardless. The character of the site and views from the wider area will materially change as a result of this proposal. The open nature of the site will be permanently lost.

2.2 When considering planning applications, paragraph 26 of the PTSS states:

*26. When considering applications, local planning authorities should attach weight to the following matters:*

- a) effective use of previously developed (brownfield), untidy or derelict land*
- b) sites being well planned or soft landscaped in such a way as to positively enhance the environment and increase its openness*
- c) promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles, such as ensuring adequate landscaping and play areas for children*
- d) not enclosing a site with so much hard landscaping, high walls or fences, that the impression may be given that the site and its occupants are deliberately isolated from the rest of the community*

2.3 Development of the site will materially alter the character and appearance of the area. Built form will be introduced onto the site in the form of , manager's office, single storey studio building for each permanent plot, a single storey studio building for both transit pitches, a sewage treatment plan, play area and boundary enclosures between the plots and around the entire site as well. This built form will affect the character of the area and although significant landscape buffers are proposed element of the site will be visible from the public realm. The provision of the landscaping buffer also contributes to the impact on the character of the area however it is noted that there are wooded areas within the vicinity of the site.

2.4 The planting of significant landscape buffers would soften the impact of the development and accord with para 26 of the PTSS. The buffer would help screen a development that proposes what is regarded as low-scale buildings and its associated development. The PPTS states that, in considering applications weight should be given to not enclosing a site with so much hard landscaping, high walls or fences, that the impression may be given that the site and its occupants are deliberately isolated from the rest of the community (para 26). The landscape buffers avoid a need to consider this type of enclosure.

2.5 The plans have been amended following landscape comments to propose a more sympathetic species mix for the buffers and, subject to confirmation from the Tree Officer, this is considered to have improved the proposal. The change to the character of the area is material and of course not in keeping with the open arable nature of this immediate vicinity. However the landscape itself contains no specific feature or character that would warrant its retention in perpetuity and given the significant efforts to soften the impact of the development the impact on the character of the area is not considered to be detrimental to the extent that it would amount to significant and demonstrable harm that would justify a refusal of planning permission on the grounds of harm to the character and appearance of the area.

2.6 On the basis of the considerations above the impact on the character and appearance of the area is considered to not be detrimental to the extent that it would warrant a refusal of planning permission when considered as part of the individual merits of the scheme.

### **3. The Impact on residential amenity**



### 3.1 Existing residential amenity.

There are no residential dwellings located close to the application site and therefore the scheme will not have any harmful impact on existing amenity.

### 3.2 Proposed Residential Amenity.

The proposed layout shows that the pitches are spaciouly sited with adequate room for two trailers as well as a studio building. Each pitch also has suitable space around these provisions and the proposal is therefore considered to provide suitable space for future residents. Additionally the layout shows a central landscaped area or amenity space which includes an equipped play area. The spacing between pitches and nature of development are considered to ensure suitable amenity and privacy levels would be established for residents of the proposed development.

3.7 There is no objection from the Council's Pollution Team to this application. Consideration should be given to the location of the proposed sewage treatment plant. No objection is raised to this as it is expected the Council maintained site would ensure that this plant operates without causing harm to residential amenity.

## **4. Highway Considerations**

4.1 The site is proposed to be access from Dunton Lane with a priority junction arrangement. A second access is proposed which would serve the proposed sewage treatment plant. The final highway works proposed alterations to Dunton Lane to provide a bus stop for buses travelling towards Biggleswade. Following comments from the Highways Officer additional information has been provided showing the required visibility splays at the principal junction to demonstrate it would be a safe access in light of this part of Dunton Lane being subject to the national speed limit. At the time of drafting this report the splays were subject to consultation with the Highways Officer and formal views will be updated to Members as part of the late sheet.

4.2 On the assumption that he visibility splays are acceptable to the highways Officer there is no objection to the proposed access arrangement. It has been designed to take account of the road speeds on Dunton Lane and also the size and nature of vehicles that would turn into and out of the site. The proposal is therefore not considered to result in detriment to highway safety or convenience.

4.3 In terms of on site provision the report has advised that each pitch provides suitable space for two trailers. In addition to this there is allocated space for two cars on each plot with a further twelve visitor spaces located at the central landscape island. Furthermore there is a parking area to cater for up to five van/trucks in the site. The on-site parking provision is therefore considered to be generous and acceptable as a result.

4.4 On the basis of the information provided the application is not considered to cause any concerns regarding highway impacts that would warrant a reason to refuse planning permission.

## **5. Planning Balance**

5.1 The Council is unable to demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of sites. Therefore significant weight should be afforded to sites subject to planning applications that would contribute to this supply. The PTTS states that proposals

should be assessed in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The report has concluded that the site is considered to be in a sustainable location for a gypsy and traveller site and would be suitably close to services and facilities within Biggleswade. While the site is not in accordance with government advice requiring sites to be located close to communities the rural location is such that it would not dominate any existing settlement, which does accord with government advice. The site would provide G&T accommodation at a time when there is a need for pitches and this application would contribute to its growth. The principal impact of the scheme is that it amounts to development in the open countryside and there would be a loss of openness and rural character in this area.

- 5.2 Taking account of the above points the site is considered to be acceptable in light of the three strands (social, environmental and economical) of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF and can therefore be regarded as such.
- 5.3 In terms of the impacts resulting from the scheme, they should be weighed against the benefits as perceived. In this instance the report has highlighted that there will be material impacts as a result of this scheme but not impacts that result in significant and demonstrable harm. The concerns regarding its isolated location are noted however it is clear that gypsy and traveller provision in rural locations can be accommodated.
- 5.4 In considering the previous appeal decision at Twin Acres and at Woodside it is considered that the weight that should be attributed to the provision of pitches is significant to the extent that it should outweigh the impacts of the scheme.

## **6. Other Considerations**

### **6.1 Loss of agricultural land**

Development of this site will result in the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land. This is an acknowledged impact and the NPPF advises that development should be directed to the areas of poorer land. The loss of land is an impact of the development and forms part of the considerations into the planning balance. In this instance there is a clear need for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and the benefit of such development should be given significant weight. It is considered that the benefit of the development outweighs the impact of the loss of this agricultural land in this instance.

### **6.2 Flooding**

Objection is raised on the grounds of flooding and the Drainage Officer has noted that the application should have been accompanied with a Drainage Strategy and has requested it be provided prior to determination. The site does not lie in an area of flood risk and therefore an assessment was not required to be submitted.

- 6.3 A Drainage Strategy to show how surface water would be dealt with should have been submitted with the application. The site will be expected to sustainably deal with surface water in accordance with the council's Sustainable Drainage Guidance SPD. While it is unfortunate no strategy was submitted with the application or provided when requested, it is considered that this omission alone would not warrant a sustainable reason to refuse planning permission and therefore a condition is proposed to address this issue. It is noted that the Internal Drainage Board raise no objection and no comments have been

received from Anglian Water on the matter.

6.4 Archaeological concerns.

A number of objections were raised locally over the archaeological value of the site and that it would be lost if developed. The site does not fall within an archaeological notification area and therefore in planning terms is not considered to be an issue. Therefore no investigation or evaluation into archaeology at the site was required or submitted.

6.5 Education and Healthcare provision

A number of objections have been raised on these grounds. The development proposed does not include specific provision of this infrastructure. The report has previously referred to the location of the site in relation to Biggleswade and Dunton and that, while not at the edge of the settlement the distances of less than a mile are considered to be close enough to provide access to existing facilities. Surgeries in Biggleswade are considered to be registering new patients. The Education Officer has been consulted on the application and comments are awaited in respect of school availability. Any comments received will be updated to Members in the late sheet.

6.5 DCLG referral

Upon validation the Secretary of State received a request to consider call-in of this application. As a result the Dept. of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) contacted the Council to request that, if the Committee are minded to approve the application, that planning permission not be issued until the Secretary of State has had the opportunity to consider the application. Therefore this request will be adhered to if Members resolve to grant planning permission.

6.6 Human Rights and Equality issues:

Based on the information submitted there are no known issues raised in the context of Human Rights/equalities Act 2010 and as such there would be no relevant implications with this proposal.

**Recommendation:**

That Planning Permission be granted subject to referral to DCLG and the following conditions:

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS / REASONS**

- 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 site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, August

2015, or any subsequent guidance.

Reason: To limit the use of the site to gypsies and travellers as the proposal is justified on addressing a need for such accommodation in accordance with the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015.

- 3 No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.

Reason: In order to ensure appropriate development in the open countryside and to protect the amenities of local residents in the interests of policies DM3 and DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

- 4 **No development shall take place, notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, until details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs of the development hereby approved have been submitted to 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 building in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.  
(Section 7, NPPF)

- 5 **Notwithstanding the details in the approved plans, 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 landscaping scheme shall be submitted as part of a revised site layout showing a planting strip running the length of the southern boundary. 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)

- 6 **Notwithstanding the details in the approved plans, no development shall take place until details of the proposed walls and means of enclosures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme before the use hereby permitted is commenced and be thereafter retained.**

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the completed development and the visual amenities of the locality. (Section 7, NPPF)

- 7 **No development shall take place on site until a detailed scheme for the provision and future management and maintenance of surface water drainage, together with a timetable for its implementation, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetable and shall be retained thereafter.**

**Reason: To ensure suitable drainage is provided and maintained in the interests of flooding and high quality development.**

- 8 The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the sewage works hereby approved have been constructed and are fully operational.

Reason: To ensure that the development is appropriately serviced for residents in the interests of policies DM3 and DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

- 9 Pitches 11 and 12 as identified on approved drawing number D01 Rev F shall be retained and used as transit accommodation only. Neither pitch shall be occupied until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of the proposed maximum length of stay intended for transit pitches and use of pitches 11 and 12 shall be done in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the pitches remain transit in the interest of providing such accommodation in accordance with the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015.

- 10 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, drawing numbers D01 Rev F, D02, D03, D04 Rev C, D07 Rev B, D08 and D900 Rev F.

Reason: For the avoidance of 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 5, 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.

## **DECISION**