

## LATE SHEET

### DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – Date 2/3.

#### ***Item 6 (Pages 15 – 44) – CB/16/04658/FULL – Land north of Potton Road, Biggleswade***

##### Consultation responses

Biggleswade Town Council has objected to the planning application for the following reasons:

- Loss of Prime Agricultural Land
- Outside the development envelope
- Lack of Infrastructure
- Roads unsuitable to sustain increase in traffic created by proposed development.
- Community Facilities inadequate, doctors Schools etc.
- Feasibility Study needs to be carried out on proposed Northern Bypass before any development proposals come forward.
- Application premature as no Local Plan in place.

The Town Council objection provides a further reason for the application being determined by Development Management Committee.

A further 40 letters of objection have been received (plus further correspondence from some residents reinforcing or repeating certain points). These largely repeat concerns previously raised but are summarised here for completeness:

- The report is inaccurate
- The report was published whilst the consultation period was open
- The Council does have a 5 year land supply
- The adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits
- The development would not be sustainable in NPPF terms
- The site is prime agricultural land
- The development conflicts with various development plan policies
- There is planning history at the site and it has been promoted for allocation in the past
- Biggleswade Town Council has objected

- Biggleswade cannot accommodate additional growth because its infrastructure (including social) is inadequate
- Objections have not been fully or accurately summarised
- The Council was aware that this application was going to be submitted
- Community Engagement has been lacking
- Biggleswade has grown a great deal in recent years
- The impacts of the development on the highways network would be significant and harmful – the ERR would not assist
- Inspectors have previously found Potton Road unsuitable for additional growth
- Unwelcome intrusion into the open countryside
- Footpaths are too narrow
- The planning application is inaccurate
- The site would be urban sprawl
- There would be health and safety risks because of the proximity to the school
- There is a lot of parking on the highway in the roads in the town
- Public transport is inadequate
- There would be harm to local ecology
- The size and character of the town would be harmfully changed
- Biggleswade has taken too much development
- The amendments to the scheme do not overcome fundamental concerns
- There is not enough parking in the town centre
- The applicants have an option on land to the north of the site
- There is not enough local employment
- The countryside would be spoiled
- There would be a loss of privacy
- Noise pollution has risen dramatically
- It is wrong to build over a bridleway
- The site has recreational value that would be lost
- Crime has gone up
- There are sewage problems
- Affordable homes are not truly affordable

### Highways summary/corrections

The following information relating the trip generation should replace that set out in the report. The conclusions relating to the highways impacts of the development set out in the report are unchanged:

Residential (233 units)	Vehicle Trips - 2016 Transport Assessment						Daily (07.00-19.00)
	AM Peak (08.00-09.00)			PM Peak(17.00-18.00)			
	In	Out	Two-Way	In	Out	Two-Way	Two-way
Total	36	84	120	82	50	132	1137

Source	Transport Assessment Directional Splits			
	AM Peak		PM Peak	
	To / from Biggleswade	To / From North	To / from Biggleswade	To / From North
Transport Assessment	36 x 2 way 30%	84 x 2 way 70%	40 x 2 way 30%	92 x 2 way 70%

However local data from the David Wilson Homes development serves to suggest that there will be an additional 52 trips in the AM peak and additional 26 in the PM peak traffic going to/from Biggleswade.

Consequently the junction assessments have been revisited to test for this potential scenario For those junctions tested:

Potton Rd/Drove Rd – still operating within capacity.

London Rd /Drove Rd – still operating within capacity.

Sun Street/Shortmead St – over capacity in the PM peak without development but development impact is negligible(extra 5 vehicles only)

Sainsbury's access/Shortmead St - still operating within capacity.

### Planning history

Planning permission was refused under references MB/87/00983/FA and MB/90/00262/FA for residential development on the southern part of this site in 1987 and 1991 respectively. Given the passage of time and the changes in material circumstances at and around the site and the changes in the national and local planning policy position since those decisions were made, they have limited relevance to this planning application.

The planning permission for development at the adjacent site was varied under reference CB/15/04897/VOC. This reduced the number of units to 300 and accommodated various internal layout changes.

### Planning conditions

The following planning conditions should be included added:

17. No development shall commence at the site before detailed plans of roads, footways, footpaths, cycleways, surface water drainage, landscaping and street lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. All construction works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory development of the site and suitable standard of highway design and construction in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (2014).

18. No development shall commence at the site before technical details of the proposed emergency access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include a road safety audit, details of any repositioning of street furniture, and traffic regulation orders where appropriate.

Reason: In interests of road safety in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

The list of drawing numbers should be corrected to read:

100E, 101F, 102E, 103C, 104C, 105C, 107C, 108C, 109C, 121A, 124A, 125A, 126A, 138A, 139A, 140A, 141A, 142A, 143A, 144B, 160A, 161B, 164A, 165A, 166B, 171A, 172A, 173A, 174B, 175A, 176B, 177A, 178A, 179A, 180A, 181A, 182B, 120A, 190A, 191B, 192A, 193A, 194A, 203A, 204A, 205B, 206A, 207A, 208A, 209A, 212A, 215A, JYY8443-001 REV E, 210, 211, JBA 15\_292\_01 REVC, JBA 15\_292\_02 REV C, JBA 15\_292\_03 REV C, JBA 15\_292\_04 REV C, JBA 15\_292\_05 REV C, JBA 15\_292\_06 REV C, JBA 15\_292\_07 REV C, JBA 15\_292\_08 REV B, JBA 15\_292\_09 REV B, JBA 15\_292\_10 REV B, JBA 15\_292\_11 REV B, 106, 110, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 235, 236, 237, 183, 184, 185, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 220, 221, Design and Access Statement rev B dated September 2016, Planning Statement dated September 2016, Noise Assessment dated August 2016, Archaeological Evaluation and Assessment dated March 2016, Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation dated March 2016, Phase 1 Habitat Survey dated November 2015, Transport Assessment dated September 2016, Travel Plan dated September 2016,

Arboricultural Impact Assessment dated 17 June 2016 and Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy dated September 2016

Condition 17 should be re-numbered as condition 19 and updated accordingly.

Condition 14 should refer to Plots 14-17.

### Planning obligations

The following additional financial contributions would be secured through a legal agreement:

£30,000.00 towards public rights of way improvements in the area.

£48,500.00 towards town centre car parking and associated infrastructure and management in Biggleswade.

### ***Item 7 (Pages 45-68) – CB/16/5887/OUT – Land Opposite The Lane & Lombard Street, East of Marston Road, Lidlington, MK45 2JQ***

#### **Additional Consultation Responses**

##### Network Rail

Network Rail has confirmed that its objection is withdrawn subject to a contribution of £60,000 being secured towards level crossing improvements.

One further consultation response has been received, which is set out below:

*Is there no end to the amount of green space being promoted as suitable for housing? first there is the housing granted to be build adjacent to butler drive, then there is the increase in railway traffic and now this. Why is such a small village being raped of its natural beauty for the sake of profit and gain for the big building companies.*

*I would like to see the areas surrounding the decision makers in this council application and be made aware of how many new developments have been approved in their back yard. i suspect elitism rules and would result in a big, fat, juicy ZERO.*

*This is not a game of Sims, this is not a hobby that you are making decisions on, it is the home of real life human beings. surely anyone can see that this is a ridiculous idea and should be stopped.*

*I would also loose the open space that i walk my beloved pet dog. why should he suffer for others gain?*

*yours sincerely,*

*the Tax payer, paying your wages.*

**Amended recommendation:**

The following clauses should be added to the recommendation:

In the event that a s106 agreement securing the heads of terms set out in the report, including a Build Rate Timetable and a Network Rail contribution, is not completed within a period judged to be reasonable by the Head of Service, officers are authorised by the Development Management Committee to refuse planning permission using delegated powers.

***Item 8 (Pages 69-96) – CB/16/01420/FULL – Land west of High Street, Arlesey***

Amended conditions:

**Condition 2** – list of approved drawings – add following drawing numbers:-

17341/105A Type 1458 Elevations, 17341/104A Type 1458 Plans, 17341/103A Type 1520 Elevations, 17341/102A Type 1520 Plans, 17341/101A Type 1738 V1 Elevations, 17341/100A Type 1738 V1 Plans, 17341/111A Type 1120 Elevations, 17341/110A Type 1120 Plans, 17341/109A Type 1203 Elevations, 17341/108A Type 1203 Plans, 17341/107B Type 1190 Elevations, 17341/106B Type 1190 Floor Plans, 17341/1008A Location Plan

**Condition 5** – delete requirement for ground investigation works to determine infiltration capacity as these have already been undertaken and informed the Environmental Statement. To be reworded as follows:-

No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the agreed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA dated September 2016 prepared by Woods Hardwick Infrastructure LLP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion. The scheme shall include provision of attenuation and a restriction in run-off rates as outlined in the FRA. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved final details before the development is completed and shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.

Reason: To ensure the approved system will function to a satisfactory minimum standard of operation and maintenance and prevent the increased risk of flooding both on and off site, in accordance with para 103 NPPF. This is a pre-commencement condition as the detailed design of the drainage systems needs to be approved prior to construction of the dwellings and then installed accordingly.

**Condition 6** – delete, as it duplicates part of the detail of condition 5.

**Condition 9** – tree protection – the details are already provided, so the condition should require the protection to be 'in accordance with' rather than to be submitted. To be reworded as follows:-

No equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought on to the site for the purposes of development until protective fencing for the protection of any retained trees as set out in drawing JBA 15-350 TP01 Rev C shown in appendix 2 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment ref JBA 15/350 AR02 Rev C, has been installed in the locations indicated. The approved fencing shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made.

Reason: To protect the trees in accordance with Section 8 of BS 5837 of 2012 and Sections 7 and 11 of the NPPF

**Informative 1** – to add 19 to the missing condition number.

***Item 9 (Pages 97-116) – CB/16/01608/OUT – Land at White Horse Field, Arlesey***

Amended condition, which currently reads as:

**No development shall take place until details of the junction between the proposed estate road and the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No building shall be occupied until that junction has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the proposed estate road. (Section 4, NPPF) This is a pre-commencement condition as the junction is required to be installed prior to construction of the dwellings.**

Amend to add 'including details of raised table at the junction with the High Street' in brackets after the word highway.

***Item 10 (Pages 117 - 130) – CB/17/00301/REG3 Unit A Station Approach, Steppingley Road, Flitwick***

***No Update***

***Item 11 (Pages 131 - 146) – CB/16/4703/FULL – 14 Dunstable Street, Ampthill, Beds***

**Additional Consultation Response**

Highways

Based on the submitted TRIC's data it is estimated that the previously approved care home use would have generated approximately 140 daily traffic movements.

It is estimated that the proposed 24 apartments would generate approximately 66 daily movements.

**Additional Conditions**

Any external lighting to be installed on the building or within the site shall be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall only be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

***Item 12 (Pages 147 - 158) – CB/16/5883/FULL – Centre Parcs Woburn Forest Holiday Village***

***No Update***

***Item 13 (Pages 159 - 168) – CB/17/00053/FULL – Wren House, Station Road, Ampthill***

***No Update***

***Item 14 (Pages 169 - 202) – CB/16/5241/FULL – The George, High Street, Silsoe***

**Additional Consultation Responses**

1. CBC Economic Development Team (24/03/17)- We welcome a more diverse and robust business opportunity to the site. The hotel has not been viable for a period of at least 7 years based on the information supplied. The additional residential space would provide opportunities to regenerate the community facilities of the pub and an additional restaurant and as such we support the approach.

**Additional Neighbour Comments**

1. Silsoe Community Society Ltd (22/03/17 & 27/03/17)- Concerns expressed about why viability reports are not made public and the reliability of the viability report content. In addition concerns that the proposal would lead to the demise of the



community asset listing and the long term use of the building as a public house/community facility.

**Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**