

## **Item No. 07**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/16/04323/OUT</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>Land at Barford Road, Blunham, Bedford, MK44 3NE</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Outline Application: residential development of up to 79 dwellings including provision specifically for over 55s with all matters reserved except access.</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Blunham</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Sandy</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllrs Maudlin, Smith &amp; Stock</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Alex Harrison</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>02 November 2016</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>01 February 2017</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Larkswood Design Ltd</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	<b>Woods Hardwick Planning</b>
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	<b>Call in by Cllr Smith</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Constitutes a 40% increase combined with adjacent development of 44 houses</b></li><li>• <b>Development has the potential to make existing traffic congestion worse and cause safety issues.</b></li></ul> <b>Parish Council objection to a major application</b> <b>The development is a departure from the development plan.</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Outline Application - Approval recommended</b>

### **Reason for Recommendation**

The proposal is contrary to Policy DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document; however the application site is closely related to the existing settlement boundary in Blunham which is considered to be a sustainable location for planning purposes. The proposal would have an impact on the character and appearance of the area however this impact is not considered to be harmful given that there are other dwellings in this area adjacent to the open countryside already. There is a loss of Grade 1 agricultural land however the provision of housing is considered to outweigh this impact. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of highway safety and neighbouring amenity and therefore accords with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document (2009) and the Council's adopted Design Guidance (2014). The proposal would provide policy compliant affordable housing and the whole scheme would contribute to the Council's 5 year housing supply as a deliverable site within the period. These benefits are considered to add weight in favour of the development and therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable

## **Site Location:**

The application site is part of an arable land parcel which partly abuts the settlement envelope for Blunham. For planning purposes the site is located within the open countryside.

To the north lie residential properties forming a ribbon of development fronting Barford Road. To the west of the site lies Hanger View Farm which contains a dwelling and commercial business. Immediately to the east lies the remaining part of the land parcel which is currently subject to application ref CB/16/04369/OUT, which seeks consent for 44 dwellings and is also on this agenda. Further eastwards lies the Jubilee Close residential development. To the south lie open countryside and the village cemetery at the south eastern corner.

## **The Application:**

Outline planning permission is sought for the development of the site to provide up to 79 dwellings. The provision will include accommodation specifically for occupiers aged 55 and over and will also include bungalows. The scheme proposes 6 over 55 units and 9 bungalows.

All matters are reserved aside from access which is proposed as a priority junction arrangement onto Barford Road.

Among the submitted application details is an indicative layout which shows how the scale of development could be accommodated. Since its original submission this layout has been amended to incorporate stronger landscaping features into the layout. The application also showed detail of the proposed access arrangement along with proposed highway works to provide a pedestrian crossing on Barford Road. The amended layout plan shows development providing 75 dwellings.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

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

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

- CS1 Development Strategy
- CS5 Providing Homes
- DM1 Renewable Energy
- DM2 Sustainable Construction of New Buildings
- DM10 Housing Mix
- DM4 Development Within & Beyond the Settlement Envelopes
- CS14 High Quality Development
- DM3 High Quality Development
- DM13 Heritage in Development
- CS7 Affordable Housing
- CS2 Developer Contributions
- CS15 Heritage

#### **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 on this site but of relevance is the following application, also on this agenda:

Application Number	CB/16/04369/OUT
Description	Outline Planning Permission for development of 44 dwellings at land immediately east of this application site.

Decision	Also on this agenda.
----------	----------------------

### **Consultees:**

Blunham Parish Council	Blunham Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:
------------------------	---

- This development is excessive & far too large for this village.
- It will have a detrimental visual impact on the rural landscape - especially from the cemetery. The development is unsympathetic to the rural landscape on the edge of the village.
- Noise from the haulage business next door makes this development unsustainable. Having residential dwellings so close to a haulage business that operates with heavy vehicles 24/7 is not appropriate. The average decibel levels recorded at the site are well above the stated maximum for a residential area. The suggestion in the Noise Assessment that the residents of the new properties should simply "shut their windows", is impractical as a sustainable solution through all weathers, & surely be deemed unacceptable.
- The drainage assessment seems to be old data before Jubilee Close was built. This is inadequate. Pooling of water at the bottom of The Hill is already evident since Jubilee Close was built.
- Our Housing Needs Survey did not identify a housing need for over 55's. Indeed, the survey clearly shows that Blunham has an aging population with well above average numbers of older people in comparison to the average in Central Beds. Providing additional housing

for older people will only compound this problem further. The survey only identified a need for 6 small family homes.

- Providing housing for older people at the top of a steep hill is inappropriate. These residents would need to go up & down a steep the hill to reach all village amenities. In addition to this they would have to cross this busy road with evidenced speeding problems to reach most of these amenities. The recent traffic studies reveal that despite traffic calming measures being installed, speeding is still an issue (see item 9). There is no pedestrian crossing. Many village amenities are on the opposite side of this busy road including the children's play area, the sports field, BMX Track, village shop/post office, fish & chip shop & village hall (where most community activities take place). It is unwise to increase the population on this side of the road - especially homes for older people & families.
- The public transport links in Blunham are very poor, & evidence shows older people are more likely to be dependent on public transport. It is likely from the new Passenger Transport Strategy we will be left heavily reliant on Community Transport.
- The impact on our rural cemetery is of great concern. This is a place of peaceful reflection & having a development of family homes adjacent it, is completely inappropriate. The row of "homes for the elderly" proposed directly adjacent to the cemetery is insensitive, & given that there is no need for this type of housing, seems only to be there to push back the family homes away from the cemetery. Additionally, the cemetery boundary/gate at this area is of an unacceptable standard if housing were to be added. The plans do not show a substantial wooded area between the development & the cemetery, which would be essential in order to respect the privacy of mourners, & preserve the necessary peace & quiet. This would also protect the residents from witnessing interments & exhumations, which may be distressing for them.
- The resulting increase in traffic is a great concern, on a road with known speeding issues. This is evidenced by 2 recent surveys. This continued speeding problem is despite traffic calming measures being installed, & a Vehicle Activated Speed Sign added. The traffic count was done during school holidays so was lighter than usual. Blunham is a well-known rat run to the A1 in both directions. This will have an impact on the whole village as well as the obvious impact on Barford Rd & The Hill. The impact on Station Rd is of particular concern as well, as this road has already been

identified as priority for traffic calming by Highways, & this development will make this problem even worse. The surrounding minor road network is already over capacity.

10. The impact on our school is of great concern. Lack of parking at the school is already a known issue, & this development will make this situation worse. When Jubilee Close was built (36 homes), the school anticipated needing to accommodate 5/6 extra children. It actually turned out to be 18. The impact of this development will create the need for significant development at the school. The school is currently in consultation to change its status from "Lower" to "Primary" (with children leaving at age 11 rather than age 9) and for the village school to feed into Sandy rather Great Barford. Results of this consultation will not be known for a few weeks but, if approved, would indicate a larger increase in child numbers at the school. (please see further comments below under "cumulative impact").
- Safe access in & out of the development is of great concern. Access for service vehicles has not been addressed & looks to be challenging.
- There is no detail about Heads of Terms for S106. There are a number of highways challenges that will need to be addressed including traffic calming in Barford Rd & Station Rd, a pedestrian crossing, yellow lines, parking at the school, & parking at the sports field. The cemetery capacity is of concern, & a significant contribution would be required to find land to build an extension to the cemetery. The current cemetery boundary will also need to be significantly improved.
- Sewerage waste is stated as being covered under reserved matters. This is a fundamental issue that should be addressed in the outline application.
- 79 homes represent overdevelopment of this site, & would not allow space for adequate parking provision. Squeezing 79 homes into this space would not leave enough open green spaces within the site to stop it having such an urban feel.
- Insufficient local infrastructure, in particular public transport links are very poor (see item 7).
- The Ecological Survey reports some significant sightings, which make development of this site very concerning. Firstly, the report of Brown Hare is very important as this hare is undergoing a disastrous decline, & one has not been spotted in Blunham for several years. The fact that one was sighted on this land is highly significant & probably indicates breeding for the first time in many years. Common Whitethroat was also noted as being present. Until very recently

this was graded amber, & it remains a very important local species in our Parish.

- As CBC is now reaching its 5-year housing targets, it is not necessary to rush into permitting a site that is so obviously unsustainable. When the Parish Council carried out a detailed sustainability review of the sites put forward in Blunham for the call for sites, unsurprisingly this site did not rank highly. It has far too many challenges to make it a sustainable option for a development of this type.

Cumulative impact of three planning applications at the same time, two side by side, CB/16/04323/OUT & CB/16/04369/OUT, plus a third directly opposite, CB/16/04657/OUT, totalling 132 homes

These three applications combined represent a 30% housing increase in one hit - this is simply not sustainable. Three developments in one go would have a significant impact on resident's lives. We specifically raised these points with the two larger developers at pre-planning consultation. We would urge you to seriously consider the impact of three sites starting up simultaneously with three dangerous site access points in close proximity, plus duplication of all deliveries and subcontract labour.

Such a large urban extension to the village changes its character completely.

There are limited details of Heads of Terms for S106 agreements & there would need to be considerable budget allocated to this for these applications, in light of the overwhelming impact delivering these three developments at once would have. This includes the impact on the highway, the school, the level of amenities in the village & land for a cemetery extension.

Education is a particular concern, & we would ask that Officers are rigorous in their assessment of the impact these developments will have. John Donne School anticipates it will need an additional classroom to accommodate this sudden growth, & has written to you separately on this matter. Blunham children are in Alban school catchment which is within Bedford Borough Council, & therefore operating a two-tier system. As there is considerable development close to Alban school, & the places are allocated on a distance basis, we are extremely concerned that Blunham children will not get a place.

There are no doubt many other infrastructure impacts

which have yet to be identified such as drainage & sewerage improvements. The cost of the S106 provision to make these three developments sustainable could make them unviable.

Great Barford Parish Council (adjoining)

Great Barford Parish Council would like to make you aware of its concerns about planning application CB/16/04323/OUT Barford Road, Blunham. An additional 79 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.

Highways

I am also considering the impact of the similar outline application for residential development on the adjacent site reference 16/4323. Which I have to say is a shame that they were not submitted as a joint scheme that could have provided just a single point of access onto Barford Road. Nevertheless there is no reason why each site cannot be developed independent of each other and therefore I will consider each site on their individual merits.

Looking firstly at the principle I can confirm that there is no overriding highways reason to object to residential on this site. The proposal has been the subject of pre-application discussion and I am able to confirm that the current submission accords with those discussions. The application is supported by a robust Transport Assessment detailing the traffic generation and distribution that confirms that the access and surrounding highway network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the traffic movements from the new development.

The submission includes details of the proposed estate road junction onto Barford Road that accords with current design criteria. There is also a suggestion that a pedestrian crossing would be provided together with additional traffic calming features. Given that this site is effectively at the edge of the village accessing onto a road where traffic speed is clearly a concern I agree that off-site works to supplement and build upon the existing speed reduction features installed by the authority will be desirable it would be preferable if monies could be obtained by means of a S106 contribution of £79000 (£1000 per dwelling) to enable a comprehensive scheme

to be developed by the highway authority rather than a piecemeal scheme provided by the developer of this and the adjacent site.

However and in addition to the above I consider it is essential for the development to provide a 2.0m wide footway along the whole frontage of the site linking up with the existing provision at the junction of the recent Bellway Homes residential development at Jubilee Close. In this eventuality a link to the school would be provided without the need to cross the main road through the village on two occasions. I have included a requirement to provide the footway within my suggested conditions.

#### Trees and Landscape

Site consists of agricultural land with boundary hedgelines and trees. We will require with a full application an Arboricultural Impact Assessment to indicate trees on and off site that could be affected by the proposals and how these affects could be mitigated.

Illustrative site layout indicates the intention for a landscape buffer around much of the boundaries which I would consider important bearing in mind the sites location on the edge of open countryside. Site layout appears to include this buffer as being within plot boundaries which would mean that there would be little to prevent them being removed after 5 years. I would prefer to see greater separation of properties from the boundaries and allow a decent landscape buffer to be retained in the public realm.

Planting of the landscape buffer should incorporate suitable native tree species and hedge planting.

Landscape and boundary treatment conditioned.

#### Ecologist

Having looked at this application in connection with one for the adjacent site (CB/16/4369) I am concerned about the lack of overall vision for the development in this area. It is accepted that the existing arable field (which appears as a singular management unit across the two applications) has little ecological interest associated with it and that a new development could deliver a net gain for biodiversity but it is essential that any works to achieve such gains are complimentary between sites. Hence new hedgerows and green corridors on one site should be protected and enhanced on adjacent sites to achieve



maximum benefit.

Reserved matters should ensure site layout recognises such aspirations and I would like to ensure that the future landscaping scheme includes locally native species which are nectar and berry rich so bringing the maximum benefit for biodiversity. I would also like to see integral bat and bird boxes provided in the built fabric of dwellings on the south and western boundaries of the site.

Landscape Officer

I have major concerns about the scale of this development, for up to 79 dwellings, on this elevated site which forms the western approach to Blunham. The site also needs to be considered in association with Application 16/04369 which lies between this proposal and the relatively recent development of Jubilee Close.

Unfortunately I was not involved in PreApp discussions and was also not approached to comment on potential viewpoints or other landscape issues by the Applicant. Although I agree that the main zone of impact is within the first 2 km and particularly the visual impact for local residents and users of the Cemetery, I would have wanted an additional viewpoint from the Sustrans Route / Sandy Country Way which lies to the south. In my opinion the view through the trees bordering the former railway track, across the arable land towards the Cemetery is one of the most critical.

I am disappointed with the LVIA as I do not think it brings a sufficient understanding of the local landscape character area of the Ouse valley and the location of the site itself, on the narrow plateau between the Ouse valley and the Ivel valley. The site is open arable land, with few features apart from those associated with the Cemetery or Hanger View Farm. However, the roadside hedge is in good condition and not a "broken vegetative boundary" as described. The roadside verge is also important in terms of the village character. The LVIA also places too great an emphasis on "manmade structures" eg pylons, telegraph poles, lighting in the description of the general area - this is a productive agricultural field. The main urban fringe influence is the poorly integrated edge of Jubilee Close.

In my view, the development would result in a significant loss of the landscape setting of Blunham- the agricultural approach contributes to the local character and allows views to the south of the tree lined Cemetery and the vegetation marking the route of the Sandy Country Way/ Sustrans cycleway. Although the attenuation pond area would reduce the impact of urban growth on Barford Road, the development would still lead to visual enclosure at this gateway. Construction of a footway over the current grass verge would also urbanise the entrance to the village.

The development would also detract from the isolated quality of the Cemetery. At present this is a prominent site extending into the landscape, the mature trees surrounding it creating an attractive landmark. Views from the Cemetery have changed with the development of Jubilee Close, but are still dominated by the open rural character of the surrounding landscape. This proposal would result in development extending from the northern edge - albeit of bungalows, which would detract from the setting and sense of tranquillity currently experienced. I note that the layout presented to the Parish council proposed public open space to form a more sympathetic setting. The views to the Cemetery from the Country Way are significant, but as stated have not been considered - the view of the mature trees and the trees at Hanger View farm are of key features of this landscape. To extend urban growth and remove the open setting would detract from the visual quality of these features.

The LVIA judges the site to have low sensitivity to change as a consequence of it having few traditional features or landscape structure. I consider it to have a high sensitivity to change as it has an elevated position, has limited vegetation to aid integration.

The Illustrative Sketch Layout does not show sufficient space to enable effective landscape mitigation to the south and east. It is also a concern that planting will become part of the gardens, which poses a risk to the long-term management and survival.

Although the Suds feature could be attractive, the site needs to be multifunctional. Although there are local play

facilities nearby, the open space needs to create a village gateway landmark.

I object to this development as I consider it would detract from landscape character, as it would extend unacceptably into the elevated plateau above the Ouse Valley, which forms the setting for the village and the cultural feature of the Cemetery. The development is out of scale and would be unacceptably intrusive in both near and distant views. Night time impact is a further concern. As such it is contrary to Policies 14 and 16 of the Development Plan.

#### Green Infrastructure

This site is adjacent to another current planning application, CB/16/04369/OUT. The application material makes no mention of this, so it is assumed that the adjacent sites have been developed without an awareness of each others proposals. This is disappointing, as the opportunities for improving green infrastructure through complementary plans for green space, landscape buffering and surface water management have been missed.

Notwithstanding the above comments, the design for green infrastructure across the site itself is disappointing. There are two areas of adjacent green space, one which appears to be wholly dominated by an attenuation pond, and another area separated by a road. For a development of this scale, one, multifunctional green space would be preferable. The area including the attenuation pond needs to be designed to deliver amenity and biodiversity benefits, demonstrating that the area has been designed with safe, public access, and a range of habitats.

Proposals for sustainable drainage across the site fail to maximise green infrastructure benefits. The pipe and pond solution does not demonstrate a water treatment train, and doesn't relate to the existing drainage character of the area, with open ditches. CBC's Sustainable Drainage SPD requires the replication of drainage and the use of surface conveyance over pipes. There is also no mention within of what appears to be existing drainage ditches on the northern edge of the site, and the eastern edge abutting the farm.

Overall, I would conclude that the application design does not demonstrate a satisfactory approach to green infrastructure, with proposals for SuDS failing to meet local requirements set out in the SPD, and the design of the green spaces failing to deliver multifunctional benefits.

Sustainable Drainage	Urban	We consider that outline planning permission could be granted to the proposed development and the final design, sizing and maintenance of the surface water system agreed at the detailed design stage, if planning conditions are included
Internal Drainage Board		The Board has no comments to make
Anglian Water		<p>Section 1 – Assets Affected</p> <p>1.1 Our records show that there are no assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.</p> <p>Section 2 – Wastewater Treatment</p> <p>2.1 The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Tempsford Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.</p> <p>Section 3 – Foul Sewerage Network</p> <p>3.1 The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We will then advise them of the most suitable point of connection.</p> <p>Section 4 – Surface Water Disposal</p> <p>4.1 From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse.</p>

Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

## Section 5 – Trade Effluent

### 5.1 Not applicable

Pollution Team

The site is located adjacent to a working farm and may be impacted by noisy activities on that farm as well as vehicular movements on and around it and the Barford Road. It will therefore be necessary to ensure as with any development that the end users are protected from industrial and traffic noise and therefore I recommend the following conditions to ensure that facade, window and room layout, glazing and ventilation requirements are adequate.

Housing Development  
Officer

I support this application as it provides for 28 affordable homes which reflect the current affordable housing policy requirement of 35%. The supporting documentation however does not indicate the proposed tenure split of the affordable units. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) indicates the tenure requirement as being 73% rent and 27% intermediate tenure from sites meeting the affordable threshold. This would make a requirement of 20 units of affordable rent and 8 units of intermediate tenure (shared ownership) from this proposed development. I would like to see any of the affordable element of the designated over 55's units and any of the bungalows within the affordable housing element to be built to mobility standards. This will help to future proof them for changing requirements of occupants.

I would like to see the affordable units dispersed throughout the site and integrated with the market housing to promote community cohesion & tenure blindness. I would also expect the units to meet all nationally prescribed space standards. We expect the affordable housing to be let in accordance with the Council's allocation scheme and enforced through an agreed nominations agreement with the Council.

CPRE

Provided extensive comments, summarised as follows:

- Agricultural land should be given protection.
- Concern this and the adjacent site will not be

considered together.

- Existing policies are in line with the NPPF and the housing land supply has been broadly addressed. DM4 should be afforded weight.
- Site does not meet any strand of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF. Development fails the environmental strand, does not show how other means of transport can serve the development, no CIL to provide economic sustainability.

## Sustainable Growth

The proposed development should comply with the requirements of the development management policies: DM1: Renewable Energy; DM2: Sustainable Construction of New Buildings; and Core Strategy policy CS13: Climate Change.

Policy DM1 requires all new development of more than 10 dwellings to meet 10% energy demand from renewable or low carbon sources. The proposed development is above the policy threshold and therefore all dwellings should have 10% of their energy demand sources from renewable or low carbon sources.

Policy DM2 requires all new residential development to meet CfSH Level 3. The energy standard of the CfSH Level 3 is below standard required by the Part L2013 of the Building Regulations. The development should therefore as minimum comply with the new Part L2013 of Building Regulations and deliver 10% of their energy demand from renewable sources. In terms of water efficiency, the development should achieve 110 litres per person per day as this is the closest standard to the Level 3 of the CfSH.

Policy CS13 requires that all development takes into account climate change and its impacts on the development. The development therefore should be designed with climate change in mind taking account of increase in rainfall and temperature. The development should minimise hard standing surfaces and increase green, natural areas to allow rainwater infiltration and minimise heat island effect through evaporation and tree shading. Light colour building and landscaping materials

should be prioritised over dark coloured which absorb more sun light and retain heat increasing urban heat island effect.

The Design and Access Statement proposes that the dwellings will be constructed in line with the Building Regulations and the following sustainability measures will be considered at the detailed design stage: thermally efficient fabric, controllable building services, including from renewable sources; water efficient fittings and appliances, water butts. Provided information is insufficient to determine if the development is likely to meet policy requirements and expect that more detail information to be submitted with a reserved matters planning application. It should cover: energy and water efficiency, renewable energy contribution, climate change adaptation measures to minimise risk of overheating in dwellings and proposed ventilation method.

Should permission be granted for this development I would expect the following conditions to be attached to ensure that policies CS13, DM1 and DM2 requirements are met:

- 10% energy demand of the development to be delivered from renewable or low carbon sources;
- Water efficiency to achieve water standard of 110 litres per person per day;
- Development to include climate change adaptation measures to minimise risk of overheating and flooding.

Waste Officer

No comments received, Members will be updated.

Adult Social Care

Demand

The proposed development falls within the Ivel Valley locality and the Sandy ward. Ivel Valley has a total population of 84,900 and 5,800 of these residents are aged over 75 years. This is forecast to rise to 10,180 by 2030. Delivering accommodation suitable for older people is therefore a priority for Central Bedfordshire Council.

In 2013 the Sandy ward had a population of 13,100 and 16% of this was over 65 years old<sup>1</sup>. For the same area 11.2% of households consist of one person of 65 years of age and over and 7.7% of households have all occupants aged 65 and over<sup>2</sup>. In 2011 13.2% of the population in

this ward were retired, which is about average for Central Bedfordshire (13.5%) and England (13.7%).

The number of older residents in this ward and the substantial predicted rise in the people over 65 in the Ivel Valley area demonstrates that there is likely to be significant demand for mainstream housing that is specifically designed for older people and for specialist accommodation for older people, such as residential care homes and housing with care and support available such as extra care developments.

If older people live in accommodation that does not meet their needs it can have an adverse impact on their health and well-being. In 2011 in the ward of Sandy 6.7% of residents stated that their day to day activities were limited a lot due to a long term health condition or disability and 8.7% of residents were limited a little<sup>4</sup>. This highlights the need to have more accommodation available for older people that enables them to live independently within the community.

It would therefore be beneficial that, as proposed, a proportion of the dwellings proposed were designed to be suitable for older people, taking into account their needs, expectations and aspirations.

#### Design and layout

With good design, mainstream housing can be suitable for older people at little or no additional cost to the developer. Indeed where housing is designed to be specifically for older people it may be acceptable to have reduced provision in some aspects such as outdoor amenity space.

The following design characteristics are based on national research and local practitioners' views and are what older residents look for in a new home:

- The ability to live on the ground floor and avoid the use of stairs. If stairs are unavoidable then residents need provision for a future stair lift or space for a platform lift.
- Smaller homes that are easy to manage, with a minimum of two bedrooms and outdoor amenity space that is accessible but small and easy to



maintain.

- En-suite bathrooms and/or an easy route from the main bedroom to the bathroom.
- Level access throughout the ground floor.
- Layout, width of doors and corridors to allow for wheelchair access and turning circles in living rooms.
- Walls able to take adaptations such as grab rails.
- Sockets, controls etc. at a convenient height.
- Low window sills to maximise natural light levels and so that people in bed or a wheelchair can see out.
- Sufficient sized parking space with the distance to the parking space kept to a minimum.
- Bathrooms to include easy access shower facilities.
- Level or gently sloping approach to the home and an accessible threshold.
- Energy efficient and economical heating system to help to keep energy costs as low as possible.

The indicative layout shown places the accommodation for older people at the south east corner of the site which places it away from the main road and access to local facilities and transportations links. The applicant may therefore wish to consider if it would be preferable for the older person's accommodation to be placed elsewhere on the site nearer to the Barford Road.

#### Summary

Our view is that 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, by incorporating some or all of the design features mentioned above.

#### 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 Middle 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. It is not yet clear how this will affect

the capacity at Alban, or what the knock-on effect of the changes in Beds will be to schools in the Sandy area. At this moment in time only lower school contributions are required.

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

Leisure Officer

Additional residential development will generate additional children and no onsite play provision is proposed. Existing play area is inadequate to accommodate additional demand, the play area requires upgrading.

As above, additional children will result in demand for outdoor sport facilities, especially football. Team generation rates for football minis & juniors in CB are among the highest in the country. Outdoor sports facilities upgrade required.

## **Other Representations:**

Neighbours

55 letters have been received raising the following objections or points:

- Development is too large and would increase the size of the village by a quarter (also stated; 9% 10%).
- Layout is out of character with the village.
- Loss of agricultural land
- Will increase flood risk in the village.
- Village does not have the infrastructure to accommodate the growth proposed, particularly doctor surgeries at Barford and Sandy.
- Traffic will increase on the village roads, including on historic bridges and there are speeding problems in the village which is used as a rat run to the A1.
- Additional traffic calming measures will make matters worse as current measures are ineffective and counter productive..
- Middle schools will not be able to cope with more children.
- Rural development destroys villages.
- Air and noise pollution from additional residents.
- Impact on privacy of the bungalows at The

Avenue.

- New dwellings will affect the transport business from Hanger View Farm by disturbing residents and affecting the access.
- Question whether sewer system can cope with the increase.
- Harmful impact on natural wildlife.
- Village should have smaller development with smaller houses. Village does not need large 4 bed houses and needs 2/3 bed homes.

### **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. Other Considerations
6. Sustainable Development
7. Planning Balance.

### **Considerations**

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

- 1.1 The site lies outside of the settlement envelope of Blunham and is therefore located on land regarded as open countryside. The adopted policies within the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009 limit new housing development on unallocated sites to within settlement envelopes (Policy DM4). Blunham is designated as a large village where Policy DM4 limits new housing development to small scale development. On the basis of Policy DM4 a residential proposal outside of the settlement envelope would be regarded as contrary to policy. However it is necessary for the Council to consider whether material considerations outweigh the non-compliance with Policy.
- 1.2 At the time of writing this report the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land. This means that under the provisions made in paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, policies concerned with the supply of housing (including DM4, DM14, and CS16 of the North Core Strategy) must be regarded as 'out-of-date', and that permission should be granted unless the harm caused "significantly and demonstrably" outweighs the benefits.
- 1.3 However, recent case law and legal advice advises that these policies should not be disregarded. On the contrary, 'out of date' policies remain part of the development plan, and the weight attributed to them will vary according to the circumstances, including for example, the extent of the five year supply shortfall, and the prospect of development coming forward to make up this shortfall.
- 1.4 At the time of writing the Council can demonstrate a supply of at least 97% of the five year requirement. The Council is confident that there is sufficient development coming forward in the short term to make up this shortfall. In this

context it is reasonable to afford Policy DM4 a level of weight proportionate to this supply when considering the planning balance.

- 1.5 The site is in parts adjacent to the Blunham Settlement Envelope. To the north and west the site directly adjoins existing built form that is apparent inside and outside of the settlement envelope. The proposal does extend the built form into the open countryside however the applicant has shown on the indicative layout that robust landscaping can be included in the site to soften the impact and help to reduce the impact on the character of the area. This is addressed in greater detail further in the report.
- 1.6 Blunham is a large village that has a number of services available to residents including a lower school, play group, shops, public house, community facilities and a bus service. Blunham is, for planning purposes, considered to be a sustainable location in principle.
- 1.7 Affordable Housing  
The proposal would provide 35 % Affordable Housing in accordance with Policy CS7. Of the 28 affordable homes 73% would be for affordable rent and 27% intermediate tenure secured via a S106 Agreement. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this respect. The scheme also proposes 6 dwellings that would be specified for occupation by persons aged 55 years and over. The applicant has also committed to providing 9 bungalows as part of the housing mix. Weight can be given to these as benefits of the scheme as development would provide a greater housing mix, accommodating elderly occupiers.
- 1.8 Additional material planning considerations may contribute towards the benefits and the dis-benefits of the development and can impact of the final planning balance. These are considered in the report below.
- 1.9 One such consideration is that the adjacent site to the east is the subject of an application and also on this agenda. The deliberations on this adjacent scheme will be pertinent to the consideration of this application, particularly if the former scheme is determined by the time this current one is discussed. While it is a material consideration this current application is still required to be determined on its individual merits. The report will consider a character impact in the event of the adjacent application being approved or refused.

## **2. Impact on the character of the area.**

- 2.1 Development of the site will increase the built form in the area and results in a loss of open countryside and this is considered to be an adverse impact. Aside from hedgerow and planting on the northern boundary fronting Barford Road the site is open and visually presents a typical open countryside location. However it is also acknowledged that the site is closely related to the existing settlement. While the site is within the open countryside it is not an isolated location. Development will not spread past the eastern boundary of Hanger View Farm and does not spread south beyond the northern extent of the cemetery.
- 2.2 The nature of the site and its extent are such that it would be a prominent addition to the open countryside and objections/concerns have been raised for neighbouring residents as well as the Council Landscape Officer.

- 2.3 If the adjacent eastern site is consented and built out, this application proposal would continue built form westwards. If the adjacent site application were to be refused this application is considered in the context that it would leave a gap between the eastern development Jubilee Close. This gap would also be entirely surrounded by built form due to the nature of this application site and the existing village. While this would not result in an ideal scenario it is considered that the individual merits of this site and its relationship with the village and surrounding features are such that that impact, while harmful, would not be significantly adverse to the extent that it would warrant a refusal.
- 2.4 With regards to the residential scheme, detailed design considerations will be left for any subsequent reserved matters layout. A revised indicative layout was submitted which shows the development providing a mix of dwelling types within the site. Little weight is given to this layout with this outline application but it does indicate that the site could accommodate the quantum of development proposed along with robust landscaping. Any reserved matters proposed would expect to provide a high quality development that is designed in accordance with the Council's adopted design guide and this would likely affect the indicative layout as garden and parking standards are taken account of.

### **3. Impact on neighbouring amenity**

- 3.1 Detailed design considerations are a reserved matter and this makes it difficult to ascertain specific impacts on neighbouring properties. It is considered that any subsequent reserved matters application would design a scheme that takes account of neighbouring properties to ensure there would be no harmful impact to existing residents.
- 3.2 The location of the site and the indicative layout show that a proposal could be designed that does not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. The closest adjacent dwelling would be Hanger View Farm to the west. The proposal could have an impact on this dwelling and it would be important that any reserved matters application take this into account in its design. Properties to the north should not be subject to any significant impact given that Barford Road runs between these and the application site. Considerations into the site to the east would have to take account the status of any consent or application that may be apparent at the time of consideration. At the south-eastern extent a number of existing bungalows would abut the application site and it would be necessary to protect the amenity of these residents. The Council would ensure that there would be no harmful amenity impacts between the two sites. On this basis it is considered that the site can be developed without adversely affecting the amenity of existing residents.
- 3.3 In terms of providing a suitable level of amenity for potential occupiers, any detailed scheme would be expected to be designed in accordance with the Council's adopted Design Guide and this guide includes recommendations to ensure suitable amenity levels are provided. Therefore it is considered that the adopted policy can ensure that a suitable level of amenity could be provided for new residents.
- 3.4 Consideration has been given to a possible impact on the site from the existing commercial business running from Hanger View Farm. The Pollution Team has

reviewed this and acknowledged that an impact could be apparent. However it is also acknowledged that robust planting on the common boundary and measures adopted in the development of the site can mitigate such an impact. These can be secured through condition on any consent granted.

- 3.5 As a result of the above consideration the proposal is considered to not have an adverse amenity impact that would justify a reason to refuse planning permission.

#### **4. Highway Considerations**

- 4.1 The Highway Officer has considered the scheme and raised no objection to the application. The priority junction arrangement onto Barford Road is considered to be able to accommodate the traffic generated from this development without harming safety and convenience of highway users and pedestrians. The Highway Officer has also considered the impact on the road network within and beyond the village in making these conclusions.
- 4.2 In terms of parking the residential scheme will be required to meet the design guide parking standards for both residents and visitors but this is a design detail that would be considered at reserved matters stage. The indicative layout indicates that suitable parking arrangements can be achieved.
- 4.3 The application proposes a number of off-site highway works on Barford Road amounting to a new footway on the southern side and a zebra crossing which would take pedestrians to the footway on the northern side of Barford Road. These proposed works and the works proposed at the adjacent site do not align and would affect the ability of the schemes to actually be implemented. It is acknowledged that works are required to offset the impacts of this and the adjacent development however given the problems between the two schemes it is considered better to require a financial contribution towards a scheme that the Council could determine was the most appropriate to implement in this location.
- 4.4 As a result there are no objections on the grounds of highway safety and convenience.

#### **5. Other Considerations**

##### **5.1 Drainage**

In terms of drainage, if a scheme were considered acceptable in principle it would be subject to ensuring details of suitable drainage systems are proposed and in place to accommodate drainage impacts. The application included details of sustainable urban drainage details and there are no objections to this in principle. It is necessary to condition the approval of drainage details on the outline consent to ensure the specifics of a scheme are acceptable in accordance with the Council's adopted Sustainable Drainage SPD and to ensure appropriate management and maintenance is secured. In terms of sewerage Anglian Water have raised no objections, going so far to say that the system will be able to accommodate the development.

##### **5.2 Ecology**

Objections have been received relating to the impact on wildlife. The application included an Ecological Survey and this has been considered by the Council Ecologist and a number of points were made. Concerns made related to provision of biodiversity gains rather than impacts on existing wildlife. Members will be updated on any additional comments that the Ecologist make on the revised layout but it is presumed that any requirements for enhancement can be secured through condition.

### 5.3 Cumulative Development

A number of the objections received have made reference to other applications in Blunham. Most notably is the previously referred to site immediately east of this site which is under consideration for up to 44 dwellings (CB/16/04369/OUT) however reference is also made to a site off Walnut Close for a development of 9 houses (CB/16/4657/OUT). Cumulative impacts are a material consideration and the status of each application, i.e. whether a scheme is consented or not affects the weight that could be attributed to it. The scheme and recommendations have considered the other applications and the recommendation is not affected whether these other schemes are permitted or refused.

### 5.4 Loss of agricultural land.

In terms of the loss of agricultural land, the land is graded as Grade 1 under the land classification system. The system classifies land into five grades, with Grade 3 subdivided into Subgrades 3a and 3b. The best and most versatile land is defined as Grades 1, 2 and 3a by policy guidance. This is the land which is most flexible, productive and efficient. The development will result in the loss of the highest grade of agricultural land. In this instance, while the loss is far from ideal, weight has to be given to the provision of housing. While the NPPF seeks to direct development to the areas of lesser quality it is not definitive in its stance on development on the areas of higher value. This is a balanced consideration and in this instance the provision of housing is considered to outweigh the loss.

### 5.5 S106 agreement

Spending Officers were consulted and comments returned from Education and Leisure. NHS England were consulted on the application but no comments were received. The following contributions are requested and shall form heads of terms for the legal agreement that would be required if Members resolve to grant consent.

#### Education:

Lower school - £182,047.60

To help with the connectivity of the site and its relationship to the existing village and any highway works an obligation for a financial contribution will be included towards appropriate highway works as identified by Council Officers resultant from this development.

An obligation will be required to provide a footway link from the south eastern part of the site through to The Avenue on the eastern boundary

#### Leisure and Open Space.

Based on on-site play requirement for 79 dwgs i.e. LEAP/LAP play area @£75k

which can be reduced on a percentage basis when number of 55+ homes are confirmed.

Outdoor sports contribution on the basis of the Sport England Playing Pitch Calculator of £25,012 to upgrade facilities within Blunham.

Timetable for delivery of housing:

In order to demonstrate that the development will contribute houses towards the Council's 5 year land supply the agreement will include a clause requiring the applicant/developer to submit a timetable for the delivery of the houses which will be agreed with the Council. Failure to enter into such an agreement will result in the application being refused on the grounds that it is not demonstrated that the site is deliverable.

## **6. Whether the scheme is Sustainable Development**

6.1 The application has been submitted with the argument that the Council is unable to demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land. Therefore the scheme is proposed to meet an assumed housing need in the area. However, at the time of writing the Council considers that it is close to being able to demonstrate such a supply. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF still applies and states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is at the heart of the NPPF, for decision-making this means:

1. *approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and*
2. *where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:*
3. *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
4. *specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted*

As such consideration has to be given to this scheme with the proviso that the Council's housing supply policies, including Core Strategy policy DM4, are not up to date. The wording of policy DM4 limiting residential development to small schemes within the settlement envelope should therefore be given some weight as it is noted that recent caselaw advises that the nearer an Authority gets to having a deliverable supply, the greater weight can be applied to policies such as DM4. This has been considered and in this instance the benefit of providing housing through this scheme, making a significant contribution towards the completion of a deliverable 5 year housing land supply is considered to outweigh the fact that the site is outside the settlement envelope bearing in mind its relationship with the existing settlement.

6.2 Consideration should still be given to the individual merits of the scheme in light of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development; economic, social and environmental. The scheme should therefore be considered in light of these.



### 6.3 Environmental

The encroachment of built development beyond the settlement envelope results in a loss of open countryside which is a negative impact of the proposal as is the loss of agricultural land. The development would sit close to existing residential properties while not entirely adjacent the settlement envelope and while materially altering the character of the area will not appear isolated, relating well to the existing settlement, and it is considered that this is an instance where the impact of developing adjacent the settlement envelope does not result in significant and demonstrable harm.

### 6.4 Social

The provision of housing is a benefit to the scheme which should be given significant weight. As is the provision of affordable housing. Both of these considerations are regarded as benefits of the scheme. Additionally this scheme proposes accommodation for those aged over 55 years and also a number of bungalows.

The site is close to an existing bus route and the village is served by existing footways making the site accessible to the village core. The accessibility from the site is improved through the provision of footpath links to the north and the ability to link to the east where development joins The Avenue. The report has detailed that Blunham should be regarded as a sustainable settlement and it is considered that it offers the services and facilities that can accommodate the growth from this scheme.

### 6.5 Economic

The economic benefits of construction employment are noted. As mentioned above financial contributions will be secured for education projects at schools in the catchment area of the site to help accommodate the level of growth anticipated from this scheme which is considered to be a benefit.

## **7. Planning balance.**

- 7.1 In this case, the provision of housing, the provision of policy compliant affordable housing units, over 55s accommodation and bungalows would be significant benefits, contributing to the 5 year supply and housing stock. The site is considered to relate to the existing settlement and is not isolated. The loss of open countryside and high quality agricultural land is considered to be an adverse impact. It is considered that the benefits are considered to outweigh the adverse impact on the character of the area that would occur from developing land in the open countryside. In light of the comments made above it is considered even though the development is contrary to policy DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009 the individual merits of this scheme are such that the proposal can be regarded as sustainable development in the eyes of the NPPF. There have been no significant and demonstrable impacts identified that would outweigh the benefits and, as such, the application should be supported.

## **Recommendation:**

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and the following:

## RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS / REASONS

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

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

- 2 Details of the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, including boundary treatments (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To comply with Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 (as amended).

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

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

- 4 **No development shall take place until details of the existing and final ground, ridge and slab levels of the buildings hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include sections through both the site and the adjoining properties. Thereafter the site shall be developed in accordance with the approved details.**

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

- 5 **No development shall take place until details of hard and soft landscaping (including details of robust planting schemes at the southern and northern boundaries, boundary treatments and public amenity open space, Local Equipped Areas of Play and Local Areas of Play) together with a timetable for its implementation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved and in accordance with the approved timetable.**

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

- 6 **No development shall take place until a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan for a period of ten years from the date of its delivery in accordance with Condition 5 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the management body, who will be responsible for delivering the approved landscape maintenance and management plan. The landscaping shall be maintained and managed in accordance with the approved plan following its delivery in accordance with Condition 5.**

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

- 7 Prior to occupation of any dwelling approved as part of any reserved matters application the means of access shall be constructed in accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan

Reason: To ensure the provision of appropriate access arrangements and associated off-site highway works in the interests of highway safety.

- 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 and extending to link with the existing footway at Jubilee Close.
  - Vehicle parking and garaging in accordance with the councils standards applicable at the time of submission.
  - Cycle parking and storage in accordance with the councils 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.

- 9 **No development shall take place (including ground works or site clearance) until a method statement for the creation of new wildlife features such as hibernacula and the erection of bird/bat boxes in buildings/structures and tree, hedgerow, shrub and wildflower planting/establishment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The content of the method statement shall include the:**
- a) purpose and objectives for the proposed works;**

- b) detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) necessary to achieve stated objectives (including, where relevant, type and source of materials to be used);**
- c) extent and location of proposed works shown on appropriate scale maps and plans;**
- d) timetable for implementation, demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of construction;**
- e) persons responsible for implementing the works;**

**The works shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter**

**Reason: To ensure development is ecologically sensitive and secures biodiversity enhancements in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.**

- 10      The details required by Condition 2 of this permission shall include a scheme of measures to mitigate the impacts of climate change and deliver sustainable and resource efficient development including opportunities to meet higher water efficiency standards and building design, layout and orientation, natural features and landscaping to maximise natural ventilation, cooling and solar gain. The scheme shall then be carried out in full in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure the development is resilient and adaptable to the impacts arising from climate change in accordance with the NPPF.

- 11      **No development shall take place until a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings from noise from commercial activities adjacent to the proposed development has been submitted and approved by the local planning authority. None of the dwellings shall be occupied until such the scheme has been implemented in accordance with the approved details, and it shall be retained in accordance with those details thereafter.**

**Reason: To ensure an acceptable level of amenity is achieved for occupier of the development in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.**

- 12      **No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the agreed Flood Risk Assessment (17628/FRA 04/09/2016) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of a site specific ground investigation report (in accordance with BRE 365 standards) to determine the infiltration capacity of the underlying geology and ground water level, as well as 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 to agreed rates. 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.**

- 13 No dwelling shall be occupied until the developer has formally submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority a management and maintenance plan for the surface water drainage and that the approved surface water drainage scheme has been checked by them, has been correctly and fully installed as per the approved details. 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 that the implementation and long term operation of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) is in line with what has been approved, in accordance with Written statement - HCWS161.

- 14 The development hereby approved shall include the provision of a minimum of 9 bungalows across the site. These shall be detailed in any reserved matters application.

Reason: To ensure a suitable housing mix across the development in accordance with policy DM10 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

- 15 Any subsequent reserved matters application shall include the provision of 6 residential units for occupation by people aged over 55 years. Each of the units hereby approved shall be occupied only by :
- a) persons aged 55 or older; or
  - b) a widow or widower of such a person or persons, or
  - c) any resident dependant or dependants of such a person or persons, or
  - d) a resident carer of such a person or persons.

Reason: In view of the need for elderly accommodation in the area and in accordance with the NPPF.

- 16 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 17626/1001A, 17628/BARF/5/500 (insofar as it proposes the development access arrangements only).

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

## **INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT**

1. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other

enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

2. AN1/. The applicant is advised that in order to comply with Condition ... of this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to enter into an agreement with Central Bedfordshire Council as Highway Authority under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the satisfactory completion of the access and associated road improvements. Further details can be obtained from the Highways Agreements Officer, Highways Contracts team, Community Services, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ

AN2/. The applicant is advised that if it is the intention to request Central Bedfordshire Council as Local Highway Authority, to adopt the proposed highways within the site as maintainable at the public expense then details of the specification, layout and alignment, width and levels of the said highways together with all the necessary highway and drainage arrangements, including run off calculations shall be submitted to the Highways Agreements Officer, Highways Contracts team, Community Services, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ. No development shall commence until the details have been approved in writing and an Agreement made under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 is in place unless otherwise agreed.

AN3/. The applicant is advised that no highway surface water drainage system designed as part of a new development, will be allowed to enter any existing highway surface water drainage system without the applicant providing evidence that the existing system has sufficient capacity to account for any highway run off generated by that development. Existing highway surface water drainage systems may be improved at the developers expense to account for extra surface water generated. Any improvements must be approved by the Development Control Group, Development Management Division, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ.

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

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

**DECISION**

.....  
.....

.....  
.....