

Central  
Bedfordshire  
Council  
Priory House  
Monks Walk  
Chicksands,  
Shefford SG17 5TQ



**TO EACH MEMBER OF THE  
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

08 October 2013

Dear Councillor

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - Wednesday 9 October 2013**

Further to the Agenda and papers for the above meeting, previously circulated, please find attached the Late Sheet:-

(i) Late Sheet

**3 - 10**

Should you have any queries regarding the above please contact Democratic Services on Tel: 0300 300 4040.

Yours sincerely

Helen Bell,  
Committee Services Officer  
email: [helen.bell@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:helen.bell@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

## LATE SHEET

### DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 9<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2013

#### ***Item 5 (Page 5-52) – CB/13/02733/FULL – Bell Farm, 15 Dunstable Road, Studham, Dunstable.***

#### **Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

##### Objection

##### 3 Dunstable Road:

- Development would spoil the historic village.
- Much of the site is Green Belt and not brownfield.
- Increase in traffic would result in accidents.

##### General Comment

##### 23 Bell Cottages:

Due to traffic increase, consider erecting a mini roundabout at the site entrance. This would also slow traffic on Dunstable Road.

##### Petition against (6)

Cherry Trees, High Beeches, Adelaide Cottage, 2 Church Close, 1 Holywell Road and Tuesday Cottage:

- Proposal contrary to the Council policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) regarding development in the Green Belt.
- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) demonstrates a sufficient number of deliverable sites for housing development.
- Loss of a local shop.
- Development would not be sustainable as it would generate about 290 vehicle trips per day.
- Appeal dismissed by a Planning Inspector for development at the Bell Public House.
- Financial reasons for relocation should not be given weight.

##### Top Acre (Land to the rear of Bell Farm)

Further representations received regarding access rights which run along the northern boundary of the site.

#### **Consultee Comments**

1. Housing Development Officer – Due to viability issues, the housing mix will need to be 7 units of affordable housing at a mix of 3 affordable rent units and 4 shared ownership units for the scheme to be viable. This is a tenure mix of 43% Affordable rent and 57% Shared Ownership but ensures we get the full 30% affordable housing requirement.

2. Conservation Officer –

- Plot 13 to have a door frontage to the street. The drawings have been amended accordingly.
- Key frontage hedges should be set behind the highway verge – Drawings have been amended accordingly.
- Impact of the raised table junction, road surfacing and markings and speed restriction signage on the Conservation Area –Details of the road improvement will be dealt with under section 278 works.

**Additional Comments**

Applicant's response to the Parish Council's comments

Timing of the application

This was governed by contracts and was not an attempt to disguise the application during the holiday period. A public exhibition was later held and the consultation period extended by the officers.

Construction Traffic

A condition for the submission of a construction traffic management plan would be acceptable. The development would be timed over a 12 month period to minimise disruption.

The Oaks

This bungalow is of no architectural merit and hence it made sense to include it within the application site.

Traffic Issues

Under a section 278 Agreement, improvements would be carried out to the junction and the wider area including speed restrictions. This would improve safety on entry and exit from the site.

Local Housing Need

About 40% of the units will be 3 bedroom dwellings. Affordable housing provision including tenure and size have been agreed with the Housing Department. These units could be ring fenced for local people.

Design

Following officers's advice, several amendments were made to the scheme to ensure that the development would not detract from the character of the Conservation Area. The Conservation Officer has confirmed that the design is now acceptable.

## Section 106 Agreement

Heads of terms were put forward and final figures will be agreed prior to the committee Meeting.

### **Additional/Amended Conditions**

#### Conditions

- **Conditions 2 & 4 consolidated into one to read, 'Before development begins and notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, details of the materials to be used, which should include a written schedule of external materials for walls, roofs and final finishes for the proposed buildings and any hard landscaping and surfacing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.'**

**Reason: To control the appearance of the buildings.  
(Policies BE8, S.B.L.P.R and 43 & 45 DSCB).'**

- **Condition 8: Remove reference to the car park so as to read, 'Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, the applicant shall submit in writing for the approval of the Local Planning Authority, a suitable external lighting design scheme and impact assessment, devised to eliminate any detrimental effect caused by obtrusive light and/or glare on neighbouring land uses. The scheme shall be prepared by a suitably qualified lighting engineer in accordance with relevant publications and standards, and the approved scheme shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwellings, unless an alternative period is approved in writing by the Authority.'**

**Reason: To control the development in the interests of the amenities of the area.  
(Policy BE8, S.B.L.P.R. and 43 D.S.C.B).'**

- **Condition 18: To read, 'Prior to the first use of the accesses ----'**
- **Condition 36: The following amended plans have been received : 2119/P/14B & 12119/P/24B and 5114/LM02 Rev. D, 5114/PP 03 Rev. D, 5114/PP 04 Rev. D, 5114/PP 05 Rev. D, 12156/4, SK05 Rev. E and SK06.**

## Section 106 Agreement

Terms revised as follows:

- Waste Management : **£2,208**
- Footpath improvement : **£17,000**
- Education contribution : **£93,200**
- Community and sports facilities : **£39,953**
- Emergency and health facilities : **£23,548**
- Affordable housing : **7 units**
- Relocation of existing uses to appropriate sites within CBC

- Access and highway improvement works under a section 278 Agreement
- Waiver against damage to the road surface by waste collection vehicles

***Item 6 (Page 53-62) – CB/13/02682/VOC – 3 Olivers Lane, Stotfold, Hitchin.***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

None.

**Additional Comments**

None.

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

None.

***Item 7 (Page 63-72) – CB/13/03036/FULL – 38 Barford Road, Blunham, Bedford.***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

An objection has been received from Blunham parish Council that raises the following concerns:

- It would be inappropriate development which has no precedent in the area. It could set a precedent.
- It would not conform to a building line and bringing vehicles up along side the house could be dangerous.
- It would harm views from the neighbouring property and would have a visual impact on the nearby playing fields.
- The bungalow would not be compatible with the use of the playing fields because of noise and light problems.

Blunham Parish Council also sent correspondence from the Blunham Playing Fields Association, which raised the following objections:

- A fire engine might not be able to reach the playing fields.
- Balls might go in to the rear garden of the new house.
- The use of the sports fields could result in late night noise.
- Traffic travelling past the house might lead to disputes.
- Existing flood lighting could be problematic for future occupiers.

Two letters of objection from No 36 Barford Road have been received, that raise the following concerns:

- The building would be too tall.
- There would be a loss of privacy and the view of playing fields would be blocked.
- The location of the bungalow could undermine the ability of the playing fields to properly function.
- Traffic and emergency vehicles could be problematic.
- The development would not be in keeping and could set a precedent.
- There would be harm to the character of the area.

### **Additional Comments**

References to planning application reference CB/13/01604/FULL being withdrawn on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2013 are incorrect. In fact, the application was refused on the same date for the following reasons:

- 1) The development would, by virtue its scale, height and mass when taken together with its proximity to the boundaries of the site, result in a cramped and visually dominating building that would cause harm to the appearance of the area. It would conflict with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policy DM3 (High Quality Design) of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and Design Supplement 1 (New Residential Development) of Design in Central Bedfordshire (a guide for development) (2010).
- 2) The development would, by virtue of its scale, height, mass and the location of dormer windows in the roof, cause significant harm to living conditions at neighbouring properties to the East and West by way of overlooking of rear gardens and by creating an oppressive relationship. It would be contrary to Policy DM3 (High Quality Development) of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and Design in Central Bedfordshire (a guide to development) (2010).
- 3) The development would, by virtue of the cramped nature of the site, result in an unsatisfactory parking and servicing arrangement that could result in vehicles needing to reverse the length of the proposed driveway on to Barford Road which could prejudice the safe and free flow of traffic. It would be contrary to Policy DM3 (High Quality Development) of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009), Design Supplement 7 (Movement, Streets and Places) of Design in Central Bedfordshire (a guide for development) (2010) and Appendix F (Parking Strategy) of the Central Bedfordshire Local Transport Plan (2012).
- 4) In the absence of a completed Unilateral Undertaking, the development would result in an unmitigated impact on existing local infrastructure in the local area that would be contrary to the Central Bedfordshire Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (North) (2009).

The Committee report explains why it is felt that amendments to the scheme would now result in an acceptable development.

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

None.

***Item 8 (Page 73-84) – CB/13/03029/VOC – Eagle House, 135 Potton Road, Biggleswade.***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

None.

**Additional Comments**

None.

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

None.

***Item 9 (Page 85-94) – CB/13/02801/FULL – 84 Miles Avenue, Leighton Buzzard.***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

A revised layout has been provided by the applicant to respond to the Highways officer's concerns regarding adequate access and sufficient parking provision.

The Highways officer has agreed to remove one of his suggested conditions and amend the remaining condition.

**Additional Comments**

The applicant's plan number 1/6 should be replaced with number 1/6 Revision 1

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

Condition 2 has been amended to:

**No development shall commence until the widened access and parking areas shown in drawing no. 1/6 Revision 1 have been laid out, drained and surfaced.**

**Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway in accordance with Policy T10 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan**



**Review and Policy 27 of the emerging Central Bedfordshire Council Development Strategy (January 2013).**

Condition 4 has been amended to:

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 1/6 Revision 1, 2/6, 3/6, 4/6, 5/6 and 6/6.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

***Item 10 (Page 95-102) – CB/13/02731/FULL – Crooked Oak, Bridle Way, Toddington.***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

Response from Toddington Parish Council – No objection to application.

**Additional Comments**

None.

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

None.

***Item 11 (Page 103-108) – CB/13/02862/FULL – 3 Kestrel Road, Flitwick, Bedford.***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

Response from Flitwick Town Council – Supports application.

**Additional Comments**

None.

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

None.

This page is intentionally left blank