

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 4th January 2017

Item 6 (Pages 17-57) – CB/16/04369/OUT – Land South of Barford Road, Blunham

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Internal Consultees:

CBC MANOP Team (08/12/2016) – No new comments. The needs of older people should be considered as part of this proposal and, should approval be given, we would support a proportion of houses in the scheme being suitable for older people.

CBC Waste Services (23/12/2016) – No new comments.

CBC Housing (16/12/2016) – No new comments. No objection.

CBC Sustainable Growth Officer (15/12/2016) – No new comments. No objection subject to conditions.

CBC Ecologist (14/12/2016) – Support the landscape revisions and planting mixes upon indicative landscaping scheme which would create essential wildlife corridors through the site and wider countryside. As previously advised I would also like to see integrated bat and bird boxes provided in the fabric of dwellings on the south and western boundaries of the site.

CBC SuDs Team (19/12/2016) – No new comments. No objection subject to conditions.

CBC Green Infrastructure (21/12/2016) – My previous concerns remain, in relation to SuDs methods proposed in respect of environmental gain, lack of detail in relation to the realigned drainage ditch and fragmented and poorly designed greenspaces. I do not consider that the design of open space or the SuDs are sufficient to demonstrate the required net gain of green infrastructure benefit. I therefore would not support the application.

CBC Highway Authority (21/12/2016) – There is a need to increase traffic calming measures along Barford Road for Highway Safety reasons, it is considered that a raised table junction as additional traffic calming measure would be effective as part of an overall scheme for traffic calming. This element of traffic calming due to its nature as part of the access to the site would be secured via condition; it is considered that such a condition, is necessary, reasonable and relevant. Additional traffic calming measures will be secured via financial obligations.

CBC Early Years Officer (20/12/2016) – request contribution for the enhancement/expansion of Early Years facilities.

CBC Education Officer (20/12/2016) - John Donne is the lower school within Blunham. The school has a planned admission number of 24 and is unlikely to be able to manage the impact of this development without expansion.

The middle school is Alban Academy and the upper school is Sandy Upper.

Alban is within Bedford Borough and schools here are currently going through a re-organisation to 2-tier. Alban is becoming a 1FE Primary and middle school with some central beds pupils staying until year 8. Bedford Borough have requested middle school contributions to help the school continue to accommodate CBC children.

Sandy Upper School has sufficient existing capacity to manage the pupils from this development.

The methodology used to understand the level of contribution required from any development over 10 dwellings is as follows:

Pupil yield (assessed as 0.04 pupils per dwelling, per year group) * 2009 DfE cost multiplier (inclusive of a location factor)

The use of DfE multipliers to understand the cost per pupil place is an approach taken by a number of local authorities, and allows for the total financial contribution to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Early Years	£30,418.08
Lower	£101,393.60
Middle	£102,026.50
Total	£233,838.18

The Early Years contribution would go towards the enhancement or expansion of Harpers Early Years setting in Blunham.

The lower school contribution would go towards the expansion of John Donne Lower School, to accommodate pupils from this development.

The middle school contribution would go to Alban Academy.

External Consultees:

IDB Bedford Group of Drainage Boards (08/12/16) – No comments to make regarding this planning application.

Great Barford Parish Council – Great Barford Parish Council objects to planning application CB/16/04369/OUT. An additional 44 dwellings on Barford Road will greatly increase the volume of traffic passing through Great Barford; a village which is already congested. Long queues of traffic are seen on a daily basis waiting to cross Great Barford Bridge from Barford Road. Great Barford Bridge is an ancient monument and this must be taken into account when considering increasing the regular volume of traffic using it.

Neighbours:

One petition with 339 signatures, received objecting to the application for the following reason:

We, the undersigned, while recognising the need for building houses in appropriate places and in appropriate numbers, consider the two proposed developments on Barford Road, Blunham and the one behind Walnut Close, Blunham to be inappropriate in terms of scale and location.

We petition the Council to turn down these proposed developments.

Further Neighbour representations objecting to the development have been received from the following:

- 35 Jubilee Close, Blunham
- 50 Barford Road, Blunham
- 60 Blunham Road, Moggerhanger
- 2 Jubilee Close, Blunham
- 50 Barford Road, Blunham
- 111 Grange Road, Blunham

Raising the following objections and concerns (in summary):

1. Development would affect on street car parking for visitors and locations of skips for No. 50 Barford Road due to the location of the junction. Potential for on plot car parking to the front of the dwelling is restricted by covenants upon the property and the narrow gap between neighbouring dwellings restricts parking to the rear.
2. Loss of hedgerow to frontage of site would cause negative impact upon No. 50 Barford Road.
3. Headlights on vehicles will disturb occupiers at No. 50 Barford Road.
4. Concern in relation to debris on the road from construction vehicles.
5. There is a lack of infrastructure that is required to support ongoing residential developments, including social, health, schools and transport infrastructure. It is irresponsible not to provide such infrastructure in rural locations prior to the expansion of small villages.
6. The scale of development (10% increase to the existing number of dwellings in Blunham) is disproportionate and would potentially impact the character of the village.
7. The approval of the application would contravene a number of elements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
8. There does not appear to be any traffic calming measures.
9. Concerns in relation to volume of traffic and speeds of vehicles in excess of speed limits.
10. Loss of view from No. 50 Barford Road.
11. Loss of privacy, light and overbearing impacts upon No. 50 Barford Road.
12. The value of No. 50 Barford Road would be negatively affected.
13. No. 35 Jubilee Close is not allowed to plant trees or build higher fences leaving occupiers in an exposed position.

Additional Comments

In respect of the additional comments, The Green Infrastructure Officers continuing objection in relation to the indicative layout are noted however no objection has been made by the SuDs Team (Lead Flood Authority) subject to Conditions within the recommendation and layout is a reserved matter which would be addressed at that stage.

In respect of highway works the need has been identified for the provision of a raised table on Blunham Road to provide traffic calming in this area. The provision of a raised table is seen as necessary to increase highway safety in this area and is considered to be a reasonable requirement for the applicant to provide. In order to provide this a new condition will be included in the recommendation as a replacement for the originally drafted access condition. The developer has agreed to this condition.

In respect of the requested Early Years, Lower and Middle School contributions it is considered that such obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Replacement Condition 8

Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted plan, no development shall commence until details of the estate road access onto Barford Road which shall take the form of a raised table junction, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access shall be constructed and completed in full accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted.

Reason: Details are required prior to the commencement of development to ensure the provision of appropriate access arrangements and associated off-site highway works in the interests of highway safety.

Item 7 (Pages 61-91) – CB/16/04323/OUT – Land at Barford Road, Blunham

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Neighbour Responses:

One petition with 339 signatures, received objecting to the application for the following reason:

We, the undersigned, while recognising the need for building houses in appropriate places and in appropriate numbers, consider the two proposed developments on Barford Road, Blunham and the one behind Walnut Close, Blunham to be inappropriate in terms of scale and location.

We petition the Council to turn down these proposed developments.

Ecologist

The orientation of the homes in the west is better as they look out to the boundary and the road / hedge is in the public realm. They need to apply this to the eastern side also though as the current layout shows no such buffer to any landscaping that will be provided by the adjacent scheme. As we discussed in our meeting this could jeopardise any landscaping proposed by that scheme as they will question the need to do anything if this (2960) scheme isn't.

Landscape Officer

As my key objections relate to the extent of the valley top land removed from being the agricultural setting to Blunham, and that urban form would join with the Cemetery and dominate this sensitive south-west view, I would still strongly maintain my objections.

However, the revised scheme has a stronger landscape content – a more robust western boundary which would aid integration, the preferred style of layout with houses facing the landscaped edge and the countryside (although garages at the edge have a smaller scale of outline).

More consideration has been given to the street tree planting and proposals for the amenity spaces – including a new open space to help create a link with the proposed boundary planting for the “inset “ site and the trees around the Cemetery – this would create the essence of a green corridor.

So I do think the revised scheme has brought visual improvements but the scale would impact significantly on the landscape character of the Ouse valley setting and the views from the Sandy Country Way – where many people walk and cycle in the countryside.

Education Officer

John Donne is the lower school within Blunham. The school has a planned admission number of 24 and is unlikely to be able to manage the impact of this development without expansion.

The middle school is Alban Academy and the upper school is Sandy Upper.

Alban is within Bedford Borough and schools here are currently going through a re-organisation to 2-tier. Alban is becoming a 1FE Primary and middle school with some central beds pupils staying until year 8. Bedford Borough have requested middle school contributions to help the school continue to accommodate CBC children.

Sandy Upper School has sufficient existing capacity to manage the pupils from this development.

Contributions requested.

EY	£54,614.28
Lower	£182,047.60
Middle	£183,183.94
Total	£365,231.54

The Early Years contribution would go towards the enhancement or expansion of Harpers Early Years setting in Blunham.

The lower school contribution would go towards the expansion of John Donne Lower School, to accommodate pupils from this development.

The middle school contribution would go to Alban Academy

Additional Comments

In respect of the additional comments from The Landscape Officer and Ecologist the continuing objection are noted although it is acknowledged that the amended indicative layout has improved the proposal as an attempt to address the originally raised issues. The landscape and environmental impact of this proposal is such that it renders the case finely balanced in terms of assessing the benefits against the impacts.

In respect of Education comments additional contributions requested are considered to be CIL compliant and will form part of the heads of terms for an agreement for this application if Members resolve to approve the proposal.

In respect of highway works the need has been identified for the provision of a raised table on Blunham Road to provide traffic calming in this area. The provision of a raised table is seen as necessary to increase highway safety in this area and is considered to be a reasonable requirement for the applicant to provide. In order to provide this a new condition will be included in the recommendation as a replacement for the originally drafted access condition.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Replacement Condition 7

Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted plan, no development shall commence until details of the estate road access onto Barford Road which shall take the form of a raised table junction, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access shall be constructed and completed in full accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted.

Reason: Details are required prior to the commencement of development to ensure the provision of appropriate access arrangements and associated off-site highway works in the interests of highway safety.

Replacement Condition 8

Any subsequent reserved matters application shall include the following;

- Estate roads designed and constructed to a standard appropriate for adoption as public highway.
- The provision of a footway on the South side of Barford Road along the entire highway frontage of the site.
- Vehicle parking and garaging in accordance with the councils standards applicable at the time of submission.
- Cycle parking and storage in accordance with the Council's standards applicable at the time of submission.
- A Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing access arrangements for construction vehicles, routing of construction vehicles, on-site parking and loading and unloading areas.
- Materials Storage Areas.
- Wheel cleaning arrangements.

The works shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the site is completed to provide adequate and appropriate highway arrangements at all times.

Item 8 (Pages 95-118) – CB/16/04460/OUT – Land opposite the Playing Field, Mill Lane, Potton

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Internal Consultees:

CBC Waste Services (12/12/16) – Additional details required at the detailed application stage such as bin storage and collection points. *N.B. This condition was imposed in the original officer's report and as such no update to this condition is required.*

CBC Sustainable Transport Officer (22/12/16) – No Objection, subject to the imposition of a condition to secure an appropriate travel plan.

CBC Strategic Landscape Officer (21/12/16) - Objection retained

CBC Rights of Way Spending Officer (12/12/16) – Requests contribution towards surfacing of bridleway directly in front of the development site. The applicant has agreed to include this contribution in the heads of terms.

External Consultees:

CRPE (12/12/16) –Retains objection

CCG Bedfordshire – Notwithstanding the comments within the officer's report, a contribution will be sought towards local GP provisions.

Neighbours:

Further objections received from the following:

- Eagle Farm, 128 Everton Road (08/12/16)
- 18 Mill Lane (x2) (17/10/16)
- JMJ Plant (14/12/16) – See additional comments
- Potton Residents for Sustainable Growth (16/12/16), (19/12/16) & (21/12/16)
- 67, 78 Newtown
- 16 The Ridgeway
- 35 (x2), 37 Mill Lane
- West Acres, Deepdale

On the following grounds (in summary):

1. Inadequate road and traffic calming
2. Increased traffic generation
3. Safety of children using park

4. Concerns over pedestrian safety
5. Adverse impact on the open character of the area and landscape impact
6. Liable for fly tipping problems
7. Ecological mitigation concerns
8. More permeable layout would be more appropriate
9. Better SuDs strategy required
10. Refutes a number of points in agents rebuttal, specifically in relation to the sustainability of the Potton, the previous extant permission, housing needs and transport information
11. Previous permission should not be relevant
12. Recommends deferment of committee
13. Regard should be had to appeal decisions for refusals in locality

Additional Comments

In terms of the additional neighbour representations, matters above listed 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10 & 11 have been addressed previously in the officer's report. Item 6 in relation to fly tipping is not a material planning consideration. Items 8 and 9 refer to specifics of the layout which is not the subject matter of this application but would be a matter determined at the reserved matters stage. In respect of item 12, only the committee can defer the application. In respect of item 13, each application is determined on its own merits.

Following a number of comments in respect of the requirement for larger vehicle access to businesses along Mill Lane including most specifically JMJ Plant, the highway calming plan was updated to demonstrate that access would still be viable with the proposed build outs. For the avoidance of doubt, the built outs are a proposed change in surface and not the physical presence of barriers. The highways condition has been updated accordingly to reflect the minor changes to the signage and the proposed painting of white lines on the surface of the road.

In addition to this change a road safety audit has been employed.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Substitution of Cond 13 to the following:

"Prior to first occupation of the development the off-site highway works shown for indicative purposes on plan 17537/MILL/5/500H shall be constructed in accordance with full engineering details which must be first submitted in writing to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved technical specification and thereafter retained for its purpose.

Reason: To ensure the provision of appropriate access arrangements and associated off-site highway works in the interests of highway safety. (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 4 of the NPPF)"

Substitution of Cond 19 and renumber as condition 20 to the following:

"The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 17537/MILL/5/503 (Site Access), 17537/MILL/5/500H (Calming Feature) and 17625/1000A (Site Location Plan).

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

Additional Condition:

19. The development shall not be occupied until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the council, such a Travel Plan to include details of:

- Predicted travel to and from the site and targets to reduce car use.
- Details of existing and proposed transport links, to include links to both pedestrian, cycle and public transport networks.
- Measures to minimise private car use and facilitate walking, cycling and use of public transport.
- Timetable for implementation of measures designed to promote travel choice.
- Plans for monitoring and review, annually for a period of 5 years.
- Details of provision of cycle parking in accordance with council guidelines.
- Details of marketing and publicity for sustainable modes of transport to include site specific travel information packs, to include:
 - Site specific travel and transport information
 - Details of relevant pedestrian, cycle and public transport routes to/ from and within the site
 - Copies of relevant bus and rail timetables
 - An Action Plan listing the measures to be implemented and timescales for this.

No part of the development shall be occupied prior to implementation of those parts identified in the travel plan. Those parts of the approved Travel Plan that are identified as being capable of implementation after occupation shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure suitable details are in place to encourage alternative methods of resident movement in the interests of Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

Item 9 (Pages 121-146) – CB/16/03283/OUT – Land west of Pastures, Upper Caldecote

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Leisure Officer

There are no Leisure contributions sought from this application.

One neighbour letter raising the following objections.

Traffic

The junction from the proposed development is on a bad corner with poor visibility. There is already a lot of traffic on the pastures road which is exacerbated on days when sports events occur on the Sports field. The exit to Biggleswade road is also problematic, on exiting my drive on Biggleswade road just east of the pastures exit I have been nearly hit on several occasions from cars speeding out of the Pastures. Furthermore Biggleswade road is oversubscribed with speeding traffic and is now a rat run to the A1; this has increased since the Speed camera on Hitchin Road as cars attempt to avoid that route. The Biggleswade junction to the A1 is very poor and high risk, the increase in housing and traffic would increase the risks significantly at junctions above and along Biggleswade Road.

Location

The location proposed is surrounded by amenity spaces and walks, the character and amenity of which would be severely impacted to the detriment of the village. The area proposed is also outside the settlement area and should not be developed.

Density

The number of houses proposed is high at 40 and a high density development, this is out of character with the rest of the village. It also is an 8% increase on the some 500 houses in the village and as a single increase is detrimental to the life and character of the village and out of proportion to the expected requirement for Housing. The East of England A1 Feasibility study shows the following in the report regarding population. "Central Bedfordshire Current Population 269,100 Expected Population 306,900 (2031) Annualised Increase 0.8%". Clearly a sudden 8% increase is way in excess of the expected demand for housing.

Planning

This development is likely to be in contradiction to the Neighbourhood development plan and should not be approved prior to the completion of the plan otherwise it potentially sets a precedent for development anywhere in Upper Caldecote and Central Beds. There was a proposal in 2008 for this site and the conclusion was such a development could not be supported. There is also concern that local amenities such as the village school will not be able to support an 8% increase in pupil numbers. The school is already in crisis mode with many of the staff leaving and such an increase is unsustainable at this time.

Environmental

The proposed development will impact the demands on the sewage system which is already at capacity and there have been effluent overflow/flooding issues in the recent past. There is also an increased risk of flooding; again there have been recent issues, some five years ago, of flooding in the adjacent road, water lane.

Additional Comments

None

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 10 (Pages 149-xx170) – CB/16/03885/OUT – Land at East Lodge, Hitchin Road, Fairfield

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Conservation Officer

Despite the assertion in the DandAS (August 2016) that the application site is considered to be beyond the setting of the main hospital complex of buildings and the church (both Grade II listed buildings), the relative proximity, given the dominant scale/ massing of the former lunatic asylum and the prominence of the church- the site must be within the *wider setting*. It is clearly within the setting of the former Isolation Hospital (Grade II listed- now known as Fairfield Mews). Development of the site must, inevitably, reduce the significance, character and setting of the listed former Isolation Hospital- in that it would become less isolated, hemmed in by modern housing. Fortunately, there is still some (albeit limited) separation from the gardens/ space around the former Isolation Hospital.

The proposed 18 no. 2 storey dwellings- if the principle of this form of development is acceptable in policy terms of the Fairfield overall planning framework and wider planning policy, then the layout- although a relatively simple grid arranged around a central rectangle of grass- has some degree of interest and discrete variety and could be the basis of an acceptable approach- with decent materials appropriate for this relatively sensitive location.

Additional Comments

Para 5.1 is unclear in its wording and the point it is making. The paragraph is repeated below with the rephrasing emboldened:

- 5.1 *No objection is raised by the Highways Officer to this scheme. Although access is a reserved matter the application is required to indicatively show how it would be achieved. The access is proposed from North Drive which is an unadopted road. The applicant has confirmed they have a right of access and therefore it can be achieved in principle. There is no objection to the access location and it is considered **preferable** to create access from an alternative location to Hitchin Road bearing in mind that Hitchin Road is a busier highway. Reserved matters would secure the detail of the access but the principle of its location is considered to be acceptable.*

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 11 (Pages 173-183) – CB/16/04082/FULL– 1 Fen End, Stotfold

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

1. CBC Housing Development Officer (19/12/16) – No Objection, below the threshold for affordable housing contributions.
2. CBC Highways Officer (30/12.16) - Concerns expressed over the collection of waste from within the site, as the tracking diagrams don't appear to accommodate council owned refuse vehicles and furthermore the private nature of the road dictates that council owned refuse vehicles will not enter the site. Matters pertaining to access and parking can be controlled through conditions if minded to approve as confirmed by the Councils Highways Officer. A suitable waste management scheme would also need to be agreed by condition if minded to approve.

Additional Comments

Updated summary of representations:

“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 design of the scheme however the amendments were not sufficient to outweigh the reason for refusal. The applicant was advised of their right to withdraw the application to avoid a recommendation for refusal however they declined. 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.”

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Item 12 (Pages 187-205) – CB/16/04657/OUT – Land Adj Walnut Close, Blunham

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Consultee responses:

1. CBC Strategic Landscape Officer (14/12/16) – Supports proposals for 3 metre landscape buffer around the site.
2. CBC Pollution Officer (19/12/16) – No Objection, subject to the imposition of a condition to secure a Construction Management Plan. *N.B. This condition was imposed prior to this advice and no update is required to the condition already recommended in the Officers report.*
3. CBC Waste Officer (15/12/16) – No Objection, subject to the imposition of a condition to secure bin storage and collection. *N.B. This condition has been captured in Cond 8 as recommended in the Officers report.*

Neighbour Responses:

One petition with 339 signatures, received objecting to the application for the following reason:

We, the undersigned, while recognising the need for building houses in appropriate places and in appropriate numbers, consider the two proposed developments on Barford Road, Blunham and the one behind Walnut Close, Blunham to be inappropriate in terms of scale and location.

We petition the Council to turn down these proposed developments.

Further objections received from the following:

- 2 The Barns (x2)
- 8 Walnut Close
- 15 Walnut Close
- 3 The Barns

On the following grounds (in summary):

1. Concerns that some highways works are on land outside of the applicants control
2. Prohibition on covenants of existing houses to prevent parking on common driveway
3. Increased traffic and parking congestion
4. Erosion of the landscape
5. Construction disturbance
6. Concern for pedestrian footpath adj 15 Walnut Close
7. Inaccuracies in drawings, access road would not be wide enough to pass two cars
8. Long term maintenance of landscaping

Additional Comments

In terms of item 1, highways works can be carried out on land within highways control, which is the case in this instance. In terms of item 2, the covenants which exist are a civil matter and are not a material planning consideration. In terms of items 3, 6 & 7 the highways Officer has concluded that these matters are acceptable in highways safety terms and is addressed in section 4 of the officer's report. In terms of item 4, no objections have been sustained by the Councils Landscape Officers in this regard and in respect of item 5, this matter is controlled through condition 11 in part and through other public protection legislation. In terms of item 8, this matter would be addressed by way of condition as recommended in the officer's report – Condition 6.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Item 13 (Pages 221-231) – CB/16/04522/FULL – 9 Coppice Mead, Stotfold, Hitchin, SG5 4JX

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None

Additional Comments

None

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 14 (Pages 209-217) – CB/16/04456/FULL – Land adjacent to 2 Havelock Road, Biggleswade

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None

Additional Comments

None

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 15 (Pages 235-239) – CB/16/04527/FULL – 16 Dickens Boulevard, Stotfold, Hitchin, SG5 4FD

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None

Additional Comments

None

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 16 (Pages 241-264) – CB/16/04840/REG3 – Croft Green Sheltered Housing, Croft Green, Dunstable

Revised plans, a revised Design and Access Statement, Arboricultural Statement, Tree Protection Plan and Site Compound Layout Plan have all been received which show two of the cypress trees that were originally marked for removal being retained and to demonstrate that there is no longer any conflict between the Tree Protection Plan and the Site Compound Layout Plan.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

The Tree & Landscape Officer has provided the following response to the revisions:

“Following my previous comments, I have examined the revised Arboricultural Statement (Document Ref No. CBA10277 v5- dated December 2016) and Tree Protection Plan (Drawing No. CBA10277.03C TPP - dated December 2016) as prepared by CBA Trees, which now shows the additional retention of Trees 16 and 21. It is understood that no further "B" Category trees can be retained as there is a need to provide compound facilities within the central green area, whilst residents are still accommodated on site. I also refer to the revised "Site Compound Layout Plan" (Rev C.DOCX), which forms part of the document "Traffic Management Plan" prepared by Glenman, and confirm that there is no longer any conflict with the site compound and tree protection barrier positions.

In recognition of the two extra trees now being retained, and the compatibility of the revised drawings I am prepared to withdraw my earlier objection, subject to the following condition being imposed:-

Prior to development, including demolition and the installation of the site compound, all tree barrier protection shall be erected and positioned in strict accordance with Arboricultural Statement (Document Ref No. CBA10277 v5- dated December 2016) and Tree Protection Plan (Drawing No. CBA10277.03C TPP - dated December 2016) as prepared by CBA Trees. The protective barrier fencing shall then remain securely in position throughout the entire course of development, and all tree protection methodology, and all working practices, shall comply with the requirements stipulated in the Arboricultural Statement, at all times throughout the course of development works.

REASON

To ensure that a satisfactory standard of tree protection is undertaken in respect of all retained trees during development activity, in the interests of visual amenity

The indicative plant list, as being shown on the revised Design and Access Statement, now excludes the two species considered to be inappropriate, and instead includes a fastigate Field Maple. Whilst there is a net loss of one tree species from this list, I no longer raise this as an objection. As the planting being shown is indicative only, a standard landscaping condition will need to be imposed in order to secure the planting design aspirations. “

Additional Comments

None

Amended Conditions

2. All construction activities shall take place in accordance with the Construction Environmental Method Statement Rev B dated November 2016, the Traffic Management Plan dated 7th November 2016 (as amended by the revised Croft Green Site Compound layout Plan received on 21 Dec 2016) and the Method Statement dated 7th November 2016, all by Glenman Corporation.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential premises. (Sections 7 and 11, NPPF and Policy BE8 SBLPR).

10. The development shall not be occupied or brought into use until the parking scheme for cars and scooters shown on Drawing No AA5060-2009 A has been completed. The scheme shall thereafter be retained for this purpose.

Reason: To ensure provision for car parking clear of the highway and the provision of adequate cycle and scooter parking/storage. (Policy BE8, SBLPR and Section 4, NPPF)

12. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers AA5060-2001, AA5060-2002 A, AA5060-2003, AA5060-2009 A, AA5060-2010 B, AA5060-2011 A, AA5060-2012 A, AA5060-2013 A.

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

Additional Conditions

13. Prior to development, including demolition and the installation of the site compound, all tree barrier protection shall be erected and positioned in strict accordance with Arboricultural Statement (Document Ref No. CBA10277 v5- dated December 2016) and Tree Protection Plan (Drawing No. CBA10277.03C TPP - dated December 2016) as prepared by CBA Trees. The protective barrier fencing shall then remain securely in position throughout the entire course of development, and all tree protection methodology, and all working practices, shall comply with the requirements stipulated in the Arboricultural Statement, at all times throughout the course of development works.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory standard of tree protection is undertaken in respect of all retained trees during development activity, in the interests of visual amenity (Policy BE8, SBLPR and Sections 7 & 11, NPPF)

Item17 (Pages 267-279) – CB/16/05250/FULL – The Paddocks, Springfield Road, Eaton Bray

None