

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 23 MAY 2018

Item 6 – CB/17/01158/OUT – Land at Chase Farm, east of High Street, Arlesey.

Amendments to the Agenda

The site location plan attached to the agenda, includes Chase Farm Care Home. Please note this is an error in the plotting of this site and for clarification, this site does not include Chase Farm Care Home.

Additional Comments

The Site Proposal as referenced in the Officers Report, should include the fact that a 3 form entry lower school was negotiated during the life of the application, instead of a 2 form lower entry.

Additional Representations

The agent has also supplied additional comments in support of the application since the officers report was collated, and they have requested that this been included on the late sheet. These comments has been summarised below:

The application site is allocated for mixed use development, along with land to the west of High Street, under Policy MA8 of the Site Allocations DPD 2011. The principle of it being developed is therefore well established in planning policy.

The proposal accords with all of the requirements of Policy MA8 and the approved illustrative masterplan with the exception of the specific employment land designation however, the proposal complies with the underlying intentions of Policy MA8 to create substantial new job opportunities as set out in the Officer's Committee Report

The proposed development would bring about numerous benefits, which have been set out in the officers report, and these benefits are material considerations that carry significant weight in favour of the proposal.

There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be refused. The Officer's Committee Report demonstrates there are in fact very few technical objections to the proposal with the vast majority of CBC Officers supporting the proposal. The development should therefore be considered acceptable and planning permission granted.

Points of clarification are considered to be required in respect of the officers report, namely that there is some overlap in paragraphs 2.3 & 2.4 which appears to refer to the West side of the allocation, however to iterate, the site will provide substantial new areas of green infrastructure and open space, as well as, walking and cycling opportunities.

Furthermore, whilst paragraph 2.8 of the officers reports refer to the number of jobs envisaged by the development, it is important to clarify that the masterplan nor the policy species the number of jobs anticipated to be created only the hectares of land for employment. The proposal will still create a significant number of jobs over a varied range of employment uses.

In response to the Town Councils objections in respect of the loss of the employment land, impact on road infrastructure and impact on drainage infrastructure.

Firstly, in the masterplan illustrates only the potential of 10ha of employment land to the east of the site. This application proposes 4.68ha of employment land predominantly located in the local centre to the west of the site, closer to the centre of Arlesey.

In addition, it has been suggested that there would be a reduction in long term jobs from 1,124 to 729, however again Policy MA8 does not make specific reference to the job numbers proposed to be created by the 10ha of employment land, and nor does the approved illustrative Masterplan.

It is important to note that the intention of the Masterplan was not to absolutely fix the disposition of land uses. This is confirmed in paragraph 4.6, which states *'this high level framework for development will be subject to more detailed design testing at the point of preparing design codes and any future planning applications for the site. Planning applications will need to be in general conformity with the concept plan unless satisfactory justification can be provided for an alternative approach'*

Whilst a further objection has been raised in respect of traffic generation, as set out in the Officer's Committee Report following extensive negotiations there are no objections from the Council's Highway Officers or Highways England, subject to the recommended conditions requiring specific highway works.

Lastly in respect to objections raised in respect of drainage infrastructure, the current proposals indicate sewage is to be pumped to the north and into the existing sewers in Stotfold Road, an arrangement that has been approved by Anglian Water. As set out in the Officer's Committee Report there are no objections to the development from the Environment Agency, the Internal Drainage Board and Anglian Water. Furthermore, no objections were raised by the Councils own SuDS Engineer.

Item 7 – CB/17/04833/FULL – Land between 8A and 28 and rear of 28 to 38 New Road, Clifton.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Informative

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.

Item 8 – CB/17/04447/FULL – 4 Cotswold Farm Business Park, Millfield Lane, Caddington, Luton, LU1 4AJ.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Further response of Caddington Parish Council (4 May 2018):

"(This application was originally discussed at Committee in November 2017.
To be discussed in light of further information)

It was noted that committee in November had made clear comments based on the application paperwork, and with reference to, the then draft Neighbourhood Plan, which includes this site, Cotswold Business Park, as a provider of commercial business space, and refers to support through the consultation process for further B-class business development.

The Neighbourhood Plan had since been passed by the Examiner and is due to go to referendum. As of 1st May 2018 the Caddington and Slip End Neighbourhood Plan (Section 7 "Commercial and Retail") still has this site listed as commercial business space; http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/Images/neighbourhood-plan-caddington-slip-end_tcm3-25211.pdf

Committee are concerned that with the Business Park still referenced in the Neighbourhood Plan as a business site, if we were to support this application would this mean the Neighbourhood Plan would be compromised or even become defunct?

It should be noted that, as is the case with any planning application, the parish council always supplies comments based on the study and discussion of the paperwork before them, but ultimately it is Central Bedfordshire Planning Department /Councillors who make the final decision whether to approve or not. Committee appreciated that Planning had information regarding the viability of the site as on-going commercial business, and we appreciate that the applicant wants to change the use of the land. But, as we understand things it is currently an active business premises, and although not in full capacity, as far as we are aware it is not one that is defunct.

Committee are concerned that we are being asked to change our comments, which would effectively then be in contravention of our own Neighbourhood Plan. With consideration to the documentary evidence the Planning Committee do not feel they can change their previous comments at this stage without compromising the

Neighbourhood Plan in that it might encourage the removal of business and employment opportunities within the village.

If the application was not to be determined by an officer but to go to Central Beds. Council DMC, the Caddington Parish Council Planning Committee are happy to nominate Chairman Cllr A. Palmer to attend CBC DMC regarding this application."

Additional Comments

On 17 April 2018, a report on the Caddington and Slip End Neighbourhood Plan by an Independent Examiner was submitted to Central Bedfordshire Council. Subject to minor changes, the Plan passed this examination and can therefore proceed to a referendum. The Plan therefore currently carries considerable weight.

It is acknowledged that the Cotswold Farm Business Park is included in the Neighbourhood Plan as commercial business space, and considerable weight is attributed to this. However, this needs to be balanced against the factors outlined in the Principle of Development section in the Committee Report. Firstly one of the two office buildings in the Business Park would be retained. The businesses in the second building are either remaining on site or leaving by their own choice. Despite being marketed, tenants have not been found for two units (6 and 8) which have been unoccupied for over a year. Furthermore, there is no objection in South Bedfordshire Local Plan policy terms to the loss of the office building, and there is no objection from Central Bedfordshire Council's Business Investment section.

Taking all these factors into account, in principle the loss of the office building is considered acceptable.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 9 – CB/17/05311/FULL – Unit 5, The Ridgeway Business Park, The Ridgeway, Moggerhanger, Bedford, MK44 3PH.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

The applicant has indicated that a security fence 2 metres in height is likely to be erected around the circumference of the extended car park and suggests that a planning condition be attached with any grant of planning permission relating to this.

Additional Comments

The plans submitted indicate no such security fence but, at a height of 2 metres, would be a permitted development. It is important to ensure that the fence is appropriately designed and sited so that the proposed landscaping surrounding the car park has its full positive effect in helping to screen and soften the impact of the car park in the countryside location. A planning condition relating to this matter is therefore considered to be necessary and reasonable in this case.

Additional/Amended Conditions

1. Prior to the commencement of any above ground building work in relation to the extended car park hereby approved, details of any boundary walls, fencing, gates or other means of enclosure around the circumference of the extended car park shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such boundary wall, fencing, gate or other means of enclosure shall be designed and sited to the extent that any approved landscaping around the car park will be allowed to mature and have the effect of screening/softening the impact of the extended car park in views from the west and south of the site. The Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the provision of appropriate and adequate boundary provision in the interests of the character, appearance and views of the development site from public vantage points in the open countryside.

Informative

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.

Item 10 – CB/17/05567/FULL – Manor Farm, High Street, Eyeworth, Sandy, SG19 2HJ.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

4 further representations were received. One letter of Objection, and 3 further letters of support, which are summarised as follows:

Objection –

- Inaccuracy in the application form regarding contamination on the site. Asbestos etc.
- Lack of infrastructure to support increase in the village size.
- Strain on electricity mains
- No enough parking which would result in parking on the high street
- 5-year housing supply is met so is there a need for these houses?
- Expansion of settlement envelope instead of infilling
- Good farming land so loss of employment
- Archaeological remains believed to be on site
- Loss of privacy from landing window in plot 3
- Loss of privacy to kitchen and utility room
- Light Pollution from landing window
- Bats in the development
- Glass link results in overlooking

Support –

- Lack of housing for families
- Design would enhance the character and appearance of the area.

Additional Comments

Corrections to the report which would reflect the access. The proposed conversion would include a new access and would not be taken from the existing access. This would not alter the Highways Officers comments or proposed conditions as they have referred to the new access in their comments, and not the existing.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Amendment to condition 12 to specify which buildings are to be demolished.

All existing onsite buildings and other structures associated with the agricultural unit within the red line boundary which are not proposed for conversion as part of this application shall be demolished and all resultant detritus completely removed from the site prior to the commencement of any building works.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.
(Section 7, NPPF)

Item 11 – CB/17/05355/OUT – Land off The Sidings, Henlow.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Additional consultation response received from 16 The Sidings, as follows:

This is a life changing decision for me personally so I would appreciate it if all our comments are taken seriously.

I have 2 main concerns;

- 1) The proposed new build is being constructed so close to the back fences of houses 14/16 The Sidings, there will inevitably be a shadow cast over the back gardens particularly early in the morning when the sun rises directly behind these 2 plots.
- 2) Highway and Safety Issues. These have already been raised by most of the residents. The report attempted to address these concerns with several recommendations such as not allowing HGV vehicles into the Close and not allowing contractors to park their cars here. But these are just words and with no policing in place they will simply be ignored. To this end, I think it is imperative for the safety of the children in the Close that the footpath is continued all the way along the new access road on both sides and at the moment I can't see that there is enough space to do this while keeping the road the same width. As you can see from the attached photo, number 18 The Sidings only really has one parking space in front of their garage. Therefore, they park the other car on the pavement. This would not be acceptable from a safety point of view should the pavement be extended as required.

The other point to make is that on the original plans the new access road is planned to go between the other side of the new build and the perimeter of the RAF base. This is obviously being done with a view to the builders obtaining access to the rest of the land they own behind the estate. Let us not be naïve to think they won't apply for further planning permission once they start this development. Therefore, instead of construction traffic being on site for maybe 12-18 months, it could be ongoing for several more years. And instead of an extra half a dozen resident's cars using the new access road it could eventually be 20 or 30 !!

Henlow Parish Council has made the following comments and forwarded the following photos:



The owner of the adjoining garage only has the one parking space in front of his garage, if building work begins then they will park the second vehicle on the pavement..!! The same will apply to the vehicles to the left of the photograph, then there will be the construction crew vehicles it will be an intolerable position for a period of at least 18 months.

Additional Comments

Clarification of information in Committee Report – Section 4 (Highways Considerations): 19 Signal Close should read **19 The Sidings**

The issues raised above are considered in detail in the Committee Report. The issues raised above are considered in detail in the Committee Report. It is noted that 18 The Sidings has 2 no. allocated spaces (one garage and one space) and this meets the guidance in the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide for a 3-bedroomed house.

Item 12 – CB/18/01210/FULL – The Quarry House, San Remo Road, Aspley Guise, Milton Keynes, MK17 8JY.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

The Old Chapel, Mount Pleasant, Aspley Guise – Support (Summary) – through design nestled into the ground, low lying and respectful to surroundings.

Additional representation received from the Architect / Application which has been sent directly to a number of councillors of the development management committee which reads as follows:

“Please accept my apologies for the unannounced nature of this email.

If you prefer to not be contacted by applicants of applications to be heard by the Development Management Committee then please discard this email.

I write as applicant, on behalf of my wife and I, and architect for the above application which has been called-in for determination by the Development Management Committee on 23rd May by our Ward Councillor, Cllr Budge Wells.

Cllr Wells is in support of our application which is for a single family dwelling inside the designated Green Belt infill boundary in Aspley Guise.

In advance of the committee meeting, I would like to provide you with a very brief overview of our application such that, alongside the Planning Officers' Report, you are in receipt the information we believe is necessary to make a fully informed determination of our application.

We believe the principal grounds for our application to be supported can be summarised by the following key points:

1. *There have been no third party objections. There have been two third party registrations of support plus Aspley Guise Parish Council have confirmed no objection and stated that the proposal is a good design.*
2. *The site is inside the identified infill boundary where the principle of development is considered acceptable.*
3. *The proposal conforms with the councils definition of an infill development (as stated within the preamble to Policy DM6) - small scale, vacant plot of land, complements the surrounding pattern of development.*
4. *The proposal is complementary to the character of its surrounding context as demonstrated by the enclosed Pattern of development analysis.*
5. *The design is site specific and utilises sloping topography by nestling the proposed dwelling into the landscape. There are extremely limited views into the site and the proposal has no adverse impacts on its surroundings.*
6. *There is a larger and taller outbuilding already consented on the same footprint of the proposed dwelling. The proposed dwelling would replace this already approved outbuilding.*

In concert, I enclose the following documentation, all as previously submitted with our application, to provide a high level overview of our case.

- *Copy of letter sent to Councillor Wells which explains the background to our case.*
- *Cover letter prepared by DLP Planning Consultancy which explains, in Policy context, why we believe our application should be supported.*
- *Photomontage studies which provide an instant overview of our proposal and its context.*
- *Pattern of development analysis which shows how our proposed new family dwelling complements the surrounding pattern of development.*

I appreciate that you are undoubtedly extremely busy however we would be tremendously grateful if you are able to find the time to consider the above and attached in advance of the Committee meeting.

If you have any questions or queries or would like to discuss further then please do not hesitate to contact me.

I look forward to seeing you at the committee meeting next Wednesday.”.

Additional Comments

In response to the additional representation made by the application / architect the following comments are made:

1. It is correct that there have been no neighbour objections to the proposal and that the parish council has also raised no objection.
2. The infill boundaries as outlined in the North Core Strategy do not on their own determine that the principle of “infill” is acceptable, rather they highlight locations where infill development could be considered.
3. The proposal is not considered to comply with the council’s definition of infill development as stated within the preamble to Policy DM6 as, for reasons outlined extensively in the officer’s report, the proposal is not considered to complement the existing surrounding pattern of development.

4. This point is addressed above, whilst the study provided is useful it is clear to see on site that the proposed location of the dwelling is not reflective of the existing pattern of surrounding development. As such it is not considered to be “complementary to the context” of the site.
5. Whilst this may be the case, as the proposal does not meet with any of the exceptions of paragraph 89 of the NPPF nor does it establish very special circumstances. As such the proposal is considered to result in inappropriate development, which as outlined in the NPPF, is harmful to the openness of the Green Belt by definition. (by the very fact it would be there).
6. Whilst a larger outbuilding could be erected under permitted development (as has already been established through a lawful development certificate, and not through a formal planning application) this is not considered to amount to a very special circumstance that would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt due to the inappropriateness of the proposal.

Additional/Amended Reasons

None.

Item 13 – CB/18/00083/FULL – 53 Northwood End Road, Haynes, Bedford, MK45 3QB.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Development shall not begin until a scheme detailing the parking arrangement, surfacing, boundary treatment and refuse storage has been approved by the Local Planning Authority and the said scheme shall be delivered within 12 months of the approval of those details.

Reason: To safeguard the interest of the general public and the highway authority and to manage works on the public highway in accordance with the Highway Act.

Item 14 – CB/18/00615/REG3 – Franklin House, Brewers Hill Road, Dunstable, LU6 1UU.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Response from 70 Brewers Hill Road, Dunstable:

- 1) Paragraph 2.1 states there have been no external alterations to the property but the report goes on to recommend secure fencing be installed, request any fencing is not palisade as it would give industrial / prison like appearance.
- 2) With regards to paragraph 2.2, could the officer please expand on how the change of use is a positive aspect that could lead to a more inclusive and missed community. Clearly the recommendation to install fences suggests proposed residents could be a concern to the immediate community.
- 3) Report refers to the incident of 3rd April as a medical emergency. Although I have no medical training the presence of 6 police vehicles suggests something more sinister. More details should be made public before approving this application.
- 4) Can I draw attentions to the number of parking spaces, 21 and the accommodation comprises 42 bedrooms. Number of spaces seems insufficient, has staff parking been considered? Parking on Brewers Hill Road is already an issue with people parking on verges damaging grass and blocking pavements.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.