

## **Item No. 6**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/16/02069/OUT</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>Land Off Greenfield Road, Flitton</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Outline: Development of up to 13 residential units</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Flitton/Greenfield</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Westoning, Flitton &amp; Greenfield</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllr Jamieson</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Lisa Newlands</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>13 May 2016</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>12 August 2016</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Ms Kakar</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	<b>DLP Consultants</b>
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Major application with Parish Council objection</b>
	<b>Outline Application - Recommended for Approval</b>

### **Summary of Recommendation**

The proposed development is outside of the settlement envelope for Flitton and Greenfield. In light of the recent appeal decision on the site and the reduced scale of the proposal it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant and demonstrable harmful impact on the character of the area. It is considered that the proposal would be a sustainable form of development in terms of the NPPF and the impacts of the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the framework taken as a whole.

### **Site Location:**

The site lies at the southern end of the village of Flitton on the western side of Greenfield Road. The site comprises open countryside, it is a roughly rectangular parcel of agricultural land. It is bound on three sides by mature hedgerow and trees.

There is an existing agricultural track access directly from Greenfield Road. There are existing residential properties opposite the site in a linear form of development. To the south of the site is an employment use - Oakley Brothers Bacon and curing and wholesale unit, to the north are several disused farm buildings and to the west is open countryside.

### **The Application:**

Outline planning permission is sought for a residential development of up to 13 dwellings plus associated open space and landscaping. All matters are reserved except access.

### **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

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

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

#### 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:

<b>Application:</b>	Planning	<b>Number:</b>	CB/15/03958/OUT
<b>Validated:</b>	16/10/2015	<b>Type:</b>	Outline Application
<b>Status:</b>	Decided	<b>Date:</b>	14/01/2016
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Decision:</b> Outline Application - Refused		
<b>Description:</b>	Residential development of up to 24 dwellings plus associated open space and landscaping		

Following a delegated refusal - application CB/15/03958/OUT was allowed at appeal subject to conditions (27th September 2016). The Inspector concluded *that whilst the proposal would encroach upon the countryside, it would not harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area. Although the proposal would encroach upon the countryside, the weight to be afforded to the settlement boundary established by policy DM4 is reduced for the reasons given above (within the report). I find that the adverse impacts of the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. I therefore conclude that the proposal would amount to sustainable development in the terms of the Framework and that the principle of the proposal is acceptable.*

#### Consultees:

Parish/Town Council

Objection on the following grounds:

The Parish Council considered this outline application at the Planning Sub Committee on Weds 15th June 2016 and the meeting included local residents wishing to raise their objections. It is clear that this is a most unpopular and unwanted application and has created a strong local feeling of opposition which we expressed the last time (November 2015), when the proposal was for more houses. We will not repeat all the points made then and trust you will take these into account again for this application.

This time the number of houses is less (24 to 13), but the size of the site has reduced considerably, meaning that the actual density is higher than it was before and not in

keeping with the character of other neighbouring properties or the village as a whole.

First and foremost, the site is outside the Flitton Settlement Envelope and is within the open countryside. It creates an important open space in this linear village and reflects the farming and market gardening heritage of the village, being one of the few remaining fields along the street front. It is currently a fallow meadow site consisting of good quality agricultural land, used in the past for vegetable growing and market gardening and backing on to existing farmland. None of our former comments about the environment or ecological aspects of the site have changed and we would refer you to our letter dated November 2015 to reiterate this. Local residents felt very strongly that the natural and unaffected quiet calm of this site was integral to living in a rural area and part and parcel of a way of life many had deliberately chosen in this small village.

The site is bordered by mature hedgerows on all sides and these act as a good screen to the whole area and sanctuary for wildlife and should be retained at all costs. There is no indication from the proposal about whether a hedge would be planted or what other sympathetic treatment may be made to the rear of the site to shield a view of housing from the open countryside and these landscaping details would have been desirable at this early application stage. A lack of any landscaping details does make consideration of the proposal difficult and there would be a series of proposals and conditions which we would wish to make at any future stage of this application. In fact we cannot understand how such an important application can be considered by you or us without the landscaping and additional details to demonstrate that the principle of development is acceptable. We feel as though we are commenting on a concept and our concerns about density, design and sustainability are not addressed at all.

It is clear to the Parish Council that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area by extending built development in to the countryside. The natural spaces between houses in this village are important and help to retain a country feel. This site is a particularly important feature emphasising the separation between the two villages of Flitton and Greenfield, albeit joined as one Parish, but with a strong local feeling to retain the demarcation. The new houses could overwhelm the small villages and bring about further coalescence which is opposed.

The Council also feels that the plans would be over

development of the site. Most of Flitton is built up along a linear pattern with development on one side and open space opposite. This site would break up this pattern and we still feel that the density is in excess of what we would expect in a small village environment and should be reduced. If this infilling were to be granted planning permission, there is huge concern locally that it would create a precedent for further creeping development in other gaps between existing housing. We are also concerned should permission be granted, that development may be proposed in future to the rear of the site (as was the previous application) and we would want to see some restrictions in place to prevent this.

The outline nature of the application means that the indicative access and layout of the site could change again, if the principle of development is granted, there is huge concern that a final design may differ in number and style of properties. Again we would want conditions on access, maintaining existing hedgerows and trees and be sure that this can all be fitted into the space available. There is current concern that one property is proposed in the shade of an ancient oak tree, which we would want to see preserved (along with the other trees), despite any problems with future light issues.

The land is particularly low lying and is bounded by open ditches taking overflow from the drainage systems from the Pulloxhill direction and we have experienced flooding in the vicinity on more than one occasion in the past. The field itself is susceptible to flooding and is currently very wet ground. An Anglian Water team recently could not take their vehicles onto site because of the boggiess. There are no details yet about how draining will be handled. If the ditches are piped then there will be nowhere for runoff and if they are left open, they may be a danger to pedestrians as they will have to take even more water runoff from the site. The use of tanking which is mentioned is not an environmentally friendly method of drainage and even though the attenuation ponds have been removed this time, they would have encouraged wildlife and provided a more natural habitat

The Parish has already been forced to instigate speed reduction measures as the main road through the villages is busy and fast and used as a rat run between the M1 and A6/A1. There is a 7.5 tonne HGV limit, but this is flagrantly ignored as evidenced by our own Local Speed Watch volunteers. More development, therefore more traffic is likely to make this worse. The accesses from the site onto the main road are at a particularly fast part of the road, where no traffic calming measures have been installed. The slope leading away from the site combined

with a footpath directly adjacent to the road will create a difficult and dangerous egress and The Council would be very worried about the safety of pedestrians using the footpath. The PC has made a major investment into the footpath and a safe walking route to the school, including the Village Hall and Playing Field and would want to know that pedestrians safety is protected.

The issues of village sustainability have also not changed since our last objection, we like our small village categorisation, which works well for a lowly populated area where residents are already aware of the limitations and have chosen a rural way of life. The PC would not want to see anything which changed this. As far as we are aware the school is still at capacity and the dreadful access and parking problems there have not changed at all.

The Council is aware of the position that Central Beds Council currently finds itself in regarding the Development Strategy (DS). In reality as a small village, the DS had assumed a max of 15 houses to be acceptable (windfall sites or maybe exception sites) and Flitton was not included specifically in any plans within the DS. The current application and that of another pending for Greenfield would in theory have been considered in competition to each other and one would have been excluded anyway, if not both in terms of the numbers involved.

In addition the result of the CBC Call for Sites has just been published and this contains a vast number of sites within the village which the Parish Council would all like to be seen considered on an equal footing, without this one site or the pending site in Greenfield, being treated separately. The same can be said for the ongoing work on the Neighbourhood Plan which has reached its first consultation stage and therefore we feel any decision to permit development on this site would be premature.

The Council is also concerned about the future of the long standing family run smokery next to the site, which employs 11 local people. We understand that environmental testing is taking place, but we would hate any new resident to move in to a neighbouring new property and have any grounds to object about the business. We support local businesses and would not want to put that company in jeopardy from the development in any way. In addition we cannot see any economic benefit to the villages or surrounding area as the developers of this site will not be contributing to the community in any way. With no CIL in place there will be no contribution being paid directly to the Parish to

mitigate the effects of the development. This makes this site unsustainable in terms of economic benefit.

Finally on p-18 of the Design and Access Statement there is a statement which suggests that the plans have been developed to take the PCs views into account and this is certainly not true and should be removed from the document.

In summary, this development would completely alter the character of the small village of Flitton, which is not what local residents or the Parish Council want. The density is too high for the local area and we fear even more back land development in the future. The landscaping details are inadequate at this stage for any meaningful comments and we oppose it very strongly.

LDF Team	No comments received
Landscape Officer	No objection - as much of the hedge to the front of the site needs to be retained as possible.
MANOP	No comments received
Ecology	No objection, subject to conditions
Green Infrastructure	Unacceptable as favours underground drainage rather than the use of SUDs.
Highways	No objection subject to conditions
Affordable Housing	Support as the provision is policy compliant
Leisure	No comment to make
SUDs	No objection subject to conditions
Tree and Landscape Officer	No objection subject to conditions
IDB	No objection - land drainage consent will be required from the IDB.
Anglian Water	No objection
CPRE	Objection
Public Protection	Objection - noise and odour from adjacent business.
Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Service	Request for fire hydrants

### **Other Representations:**

#### **Neighbours**

49 letters of objection have been received raising the following issues:

- denser scheme than previously proposed
- how would the levels work given the level change from the road to the site.
- what will happen to the remainder of the site - access is retained to the rear part of the site.
- not in-keeping with the ambience of small village
- no thought given to integration
- historical evidence of flooding is available
- neighbouring bungalows have suffered flooding in the last few years
- drainage insufficient to cope with prolonged rain
- overtopping of the open ditch that currently cross the site will exacerbate the problem

- the extra traffic will exacerbate the existing traffic issues
- implications for pedestrians - potentially 4 new accesses on to the highway network
- infrastructure not in place to accommodate an increased occupancy
- bus service limited
- local school and pre-school are full to capacity
- outside the existing settlement envelope
- Flitton is a small village - developments of this nature run counter to objective of maintaining small villages
- would set a precedent for other development
- degree of deep infill would be out of character for the whole village
- No amenities in the village - question sustainability
- Adjacent to Oakley Bros Smokehouse - significant amount of smoke generated by their day to day operations
- The Flit Valley is a recognised peat bog of historical and environmental significance and covers a much wider than the current course of the river which has been diverted in its time. The general wetness of the land means that there is little capacity to absorb surface water of any volume throughout the valley
- inappropriate scale and design - not in keeping with the character of the village
- not in keeping with the density of the surrounding properties and would be overdevelopment of the site
- it would remove an important green boundary that separates the villages of Flitton and Greenfield
- impact on the historic heart of the village
- No contribution made by this development to the local community or the local economy
- the access road would cut across the only footpath that small children travel across to get to school safely
- completely fundamental step change visually and in the landscape for Greenfield Road
- Doctors and dentists are oversubscribed
- the site is currently agricultural land and is imperative to the rural feel of the village
- the village has already had a significant amount of new housing over the past 5-10 years - with a lack of infrastructure
- This field is very close to Flitton Moor and provides a natural habitat for wild animals and other wildlife
- does not respect linear nature of the village
- infill open land between the two villages
- The employer next door employs 11 local staff - concerned that a housing estate so close could have implications for future business
- it will cause loss of views to properties along Greenfield Road; adverse impact on residential amenity - loss of light, noise, disturbance and overlooking
- loss of a good wildlife site
- no consultation with local residents
- the proposed private drives running parallel with Greenfield Road would introduce an incongruous feature
- how will visitor parking be accounted for in the proposal
- land low lying continued risk of flooding
- increased volume of traffic
- sewage system unreliable

- land is good quality agricultural land

2 letters of support has been received highlighting the following:

- it will bring much needed housing to the village and go towards meeting the Governments targets for housing growth
- excellent development within the village

### **Determining Issues:**

The main considerations of the application are;

- 1.Principle
- 2.Affect on the Character and Appearance of the Area
- 3.Indicative Layout and Scale Parameters
- 4.Access and Transport
- 5.Trees and Landscape
- 6.Ecology and Biodiversity
- 7.Other Considerations

### **Considerations**

#### **1.Principle**

- 1.1 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area. Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs. For decision making this means that planning permission should be granted where the development plan is absent, silent or out-of-date (para 14). Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing targets (para 49). There should be an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moving forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land (para 47).
- 1.2 The Council currently cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing. Whilst we are in a position where we are getting closer to being able to demonstrate this requirement. An appeal decision for this site was issued on 14th November 2016. The proposal the subject of the appeal was for outline permission for up to 24 dwellings and associated open space and landscaping. The appeal was allowed and permission granted subject to conditions. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would deliver a high quality design and would not harm the character and appearance of the settlement and would comply with Policies CS14 and DM3. The Inspector was also of the opinion that there would be sufficient space within the site to accomodate the proposed number of dwellings and the adequate maintenance of any future drainage system. As with this application, Public Protection objected to the application on the grounds of noise and odour issues in relation to the neighbouring smokehouse. The Inspector was satisfied that the smokehouse would not have a significant effect on the living conditions of future residents.

In terms of the 5 year housing supply and paragraph 14 of the NPPF, the



Inspector gave little weight to policy DM4 and stated that whilst the proposal would encroach upon the countryside, it would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Inspector concluded that the adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

- 1.3 The Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) form part of the Local Development Framework and development plan. It sets out the strategy for providing homes and jobs in Central Bedfordshire. At 3.3.1, it sets out the approach that will be taken to achieve these development requirements. Part of that approach is to control development within the open countryside.
- 1.4 Paragraph 3.6.1 explains that the physical boundaries of settlements in the district are defined to differentiate between the built-up part of settlements and open countryside. Settlement Envelopes are an established policy tool for determining planning applications. Settlement Envelopes are displayed on the Proposals Map which accompanies the Development Plan Document.
- 1.5 At 3.24.1 the Plan acknowledges that in many large and smaller villages in the district, the level of development which has come forward over the past 20 years has been locally significant, in order to help meet previous housing requirements. However, the scale of development in these lower order settlements is not sustainable in the longer term. The Core Strategy sets out an approach which balances the need for development to meet local needs with the overriding sustainability imperative to concentrate most development close to larger, more sustainable centres.
- 1.6 Paragraph 9.1.1 explains that the Development Management Policies are an essential part of the LDF and provide a more detailed policy framework as well as principles and standards against which planning applications will be assessed. The policies conform to Core Strategy policies and in some cases elaborate on them, to allow their practical application by the Council in its role as Local Planning Authority.
- 1.7 The supporting text to Policy DM4 (Development within and beyond settlement envelopes) sets out at 11.1.5 that outside settlement envelopes, where the countryside needs to be protected from inappropriate development, only particular types of new development will be permitted in accordance with national guidance. This includes residential development on Exception Schemes as set out by Policy CS7, or dwellings for the essential needs of those employed in agriculture or forestry, or that which reuses or replaces an existing dwelling. These criteria are reinforced by paragraph 55 of the NPPF. The main body of the policy text offers no support for development outside of the Settlement Envelopes.
- 1.8 The application site falls outside of any identified Settlement Envelope. The development would not constitute an exception scheme and would not meet any of the criteria set out in 11.1.5 of the supporting text to DM4 or paragraph 55 of the NPPF. In light of the Inspector's decision on the previous application and that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, this is a material consideration. Whilst the Council do not agree with the Inspectors conclusions in terms of the land supply, the premise of the

decision is that the proposal would not have a significant and demonstrably harmful impact.

- 1.9 The principle, of residential development in this location can therefore be considered acceptable in this instance. The proposal would amount to sustainable development in terms of the NPPF and the principle would therefore be acceptable.

## **2. Affect on the Character and Appearance of the Area**

- 2.1 The supporting text to Policy CS16 (Landscape and Woodland) sets out that the countryside outside settlements is a highly valued resource for agriculture, recreation, landscape and wildlife. The Council will protect the countryside for its own sake, safeguarding it from the increasing pressures of development. It will work with partners to enhance its recreational, landscape and wildlife value. Policy DM3 (High Quality Development) sets out that the development should be appropriate to its setting.
- 2.2 The site is within the open countryside, outside of the Settlement Envelope of Flitton. It has a rural, agricultural character. The site is a farmed open space within the village and open space is an important characteristic of the village.
- 2.3 The site has been reduced and the number of dwellings revised to up to 13. The illustrative plan shows a frontage development that would reduce further any encroachment into the countryside, it is therefore considered in light of the previous decision that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area.

## **3. Indicative Layout and scale parameters**

- 3.1 The submitted illustrative proposed site layout demonstrates how up to 13 units could be accommodated on the site. There is a mix of dwellings proposed. It is considered that this density is relatively high for an edge of settlement location, the adjacent properties are at a lower density. The proposal would provide additional dwellings and would also provide affordable housing. Given the previous appeal decision and the comments in relation to SUDs and layout, it is considered that this application would be acceptable.
- 3.3 With consideration to residential amenity, the design of the houses and a final layout would be submitted and assessed at reserved matters stage. It is clear that there would be the potential for sensitive relationships within the site that would need to be properly managed.
- 3.4 The principles of the Design Guide should inform the layout and detailed design of the dwellings particularly with regard to parking space requirements and internal and external space standards for residential properties.

## **4.0 Access and Transport**

- 4.1 Contrary to the previous application, this application is submitted with all matters reserved. The illustrative proposed site layout demonstrates some 4 accesses on to Greenfield Road. The Highways Officer has raised no objection to the proposal and it is considered that an appropriate design could be achieved at the reserved matters stage.
- 4.2 Internal road layouts, car parking, visitor car parking and cycle parking would be

assessed at reserved matters stage.

- 4.3 A servicing strategy for the site that would need to demonstrate that refuse collection and emergency vehicles could safely access and manoeuvre within the site could be secured by condition.
- 4.4 It has been raised by a number of concerned residents that traffic and congestion resulting from this development would be at an unacceptable level, however it is considered that the existing road network would be able to sustain the additional traffic.

## **5.0 Trees and Landscape**

- 5.1 This outline application has now been revised. The Illustrative Masterplan shows the retention of boundary hedgelines and trees of importance identified in the supplied tree survey and has ensured that the layout will not result in problems with trees and buildings into the future, primarily by keeping buildings some distance from them and incorporating them mainly into public open space. Additional hedge and tree planting is shown on the east boundary of the site.
- 5.2 The supplied Tree Survey has identified all trees on site and the Arboricultural Constraints Plan shows the extent of the root protection areas (RPA). A condition requiring a tree protection plan and an arboricultural impact assessment would be required should planning permission be forthcoming.

## **6.0 Ecology and Biodiversity**

- 6.1 The Councils Ecologist has not objected to this proposal but requested that a landscaping scheme be submitted, this would be covered by any reserved matters application and that given the presence of Common Lizard on the site, any vegetation clearance should follow guidelines and that there are opportunities to retain and create areas of suitable habitat for the Lizards in association with the areas of public open space on the north/ west site boundary.
- 6.2 The NPPF calls for development to deliver a net gain for biodiversity and therefore a condition is suggested that requires each dwelling to include one integral bird/ bat brick to be fitted according to BCT/RSPB guidelines - this would assist in providing a net gain on the site.

## **7.0 Other Considerations**

### **7.1 Infrastructure requirements and Planning Obligations**

- 7.2 Planning obligations are required to mitigate the impact of the development on existing local infrastructure. The requirements are also based on the site specific needs identified through the consultation undertaken for the application
- 7.3 Given the scale of the development proposed no contributions are sought towards local infrastructure, however, there would be a requirement for 35% affordable housing on the site and this would be secured by condition.
- 7.4 **SUDs**
- 7.5 Concerns have been raised regarding the future access and maintenance requirements of the proposed drainage scheme. In line with the appeal

decision it is considered appropriate to condition these aspects.

**7.6 Adjacent business - Smokehouse**

7.7 A number of representations have made reference to the adjacent smokehouse and potential for smoke/ odour to impact on the amenities of future occupiers. Consultation has taken place with Public Protection and whilst there are not aware of any complaints in relation to the business currently, it is something that should be considered. Public Protection have objected to the application and maintained there objection. However, given the conclusion drawn by the Inspector in relation to the previous application, it is considered that the smokehouse would not have a significant effect on the living conditions of future residents.

**7.8 S106 - Build Rate Timetable**

7.9 The issue of the build rate timetable has been discussed with the applicant. However, given that the larger scheme approved at appeal was not subject to a build rate timetable, it is not considered appropriate in this instance to insist on a build rate timetable for this proposal.

**7.10 Planning Balance**

7.10 It is considered that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, paragraph 14 and 49 of the NPPF therefore remain a material consideration. It is considered that the proposal would not have a significant and demonstrable harmful impact on the character of the area. It is considered that the proposal would be a sustainable form of development in terms of the NPPF and the impacts of the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the framework taken as a whole.

**7.11 Human Rights issues:** The development has been assessed in the context of human rights and would have no relevant implications.

**7.12 Equality Act 2010:** The development has been assessed in the context of the Equalities Act 2010 and would have no relevant implications.

**Recommendation:**

That Planning Permission be approved subject to the following conditions:

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS / REASONS**

- 1 **No development shall take place until approval of the details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development [and any other details required i.e. the landscaping adjoining it] within that area (herein called “the reserved matters”) has been obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

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

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

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

- 3 Any subsequent reserved matters application shall include the following;
- Vehicle accesses, vehicle parking and garaging, cycle parking and storage, refuse storage and collection day bin storage points in accordance with Design Guide requirements or in accordance with the councils standards applicable at the time of submission.
  - A 2.0m wide footway across the entire frontage of the site.

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

- 4 **No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:**
- i) the hours of construction work and deliveries;**
  - ii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;**
  - iii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;**
  - iv) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;**
  - v) wheel washing facilities;**
  - vi) construction traffic routes; and**
  - vii) details of the responsible person who can be contacted in the event of a complaint.**

**The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety.**

- 5 **No development shall commence until a tree protection plan showing the location of protective fencing in accordance with the specification within BS5837 2012: Trees In Relation To Design, Demolition And Construction Recommendations has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. Fencing in accordance with the approved details shall be erected prior to the commencement of development and shall be retained for the duration of the construction period.**

**Reason: In order to protect the existing trees on the site and ensure**

**adequate tree protection measures.**

- 6 No development shall commence until an arboricultural method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The method statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.**

**Reason: To identify all the constraints and how these will be addressed in terms of the trees on site.**

- 7 No development or any preparatory works shall commence on site until an Ecological Enhancement Scheme has been submitted to the local planning authority. The scheme should be based on the recommendations at section 15 of the Arbtech Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, submitted with the application. The development shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme and a programme of implementation**

**Reason: To ensure the site delivers a net gain for biodiversity.**

- 8 No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision of affordable housing as part of the development shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in Annex 2: Glossary of National Planning Policy Framework or any future guidance that replaces it. The scheme shall include:**

- i) the numbers, type, and location on the site of the affordable housing provision to be made which shall consist of not less than 35% of housing units;**
- ii) the tenure shall be split 63% affordable rented and 37% intermediate tenure;**
- iii) the timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing;**
- iv) the arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider or the management of the affordable housing if no Registered Housing Provider is involved;**
- v) the arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable**

**for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing; and**

- vi) the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of occupiers of the affordable housing and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.**

**Reason: In the interests of meeting the affordable housing needs of the area in accordance with policy CS7 of Central Bedfordshire Council's Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.**

- 9 A scheme shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme before the buildings are occupied and be thereafter retained.

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

- 10 The proposal shall be implemented in accordance with the principles set out in paragraph 5.4 of the Flitton Ecology Reptile Survey Report dated October 2015.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 11 No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water drainage works shall have been implemented in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Before any details are submitted to the local planning authority an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, having regard to BRE digest, and the results of the assessment have been provided to the local planning authority. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

i) include a timetable for its implementation; and,

ii) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To ensure the approved system will function to a satisfactory minimum standard of operation and maintenance, to prevent flooding.  
(Section 10, NPPF)

## **INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT**

1. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.
2. In accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the reason for any condition above relates to the Policies as referred to in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Core Strategy for North Central Bedfordshire.
3. The applicant is advised that in order to comply with 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 accesses and associated footway improvements. Further details can be obtained from the Development Control Group, Development Management Division, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ.
4. 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.
5. Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. Or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before the development can commence.



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

**DECISION**

.....  
.....  
  
.....  
.....