

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



**TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

19 July 2016

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY, 20 JULY 2016

Further to the agenda and papers for the above meeting, previously circulated, please find attached the following:-

13. Late Sheet

Should you have any queries regarding the above please contact me.

Yours sincerely

Leslie Manning
Committee Services Officer

email: leslie.manning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
telephone: 0300 300 5132

This page is intentionally left blank

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 20th July 2016

Item 06 (Pages 15 - 44) – CB/15/04664/Full – Land At Timber Lane, Woburn.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None

Additional Comments

Additional representations sent to the Chairman/ Vice Chairman of Development Management Committee.

4 Timber Lane: Forwarded a copy of the letter dated 31st May 2016 and photos. Objected to the proposal on a number of fronts; validity of the scheme in relation to the Green Belt, impact on the environment and the significant increase in the existing hazardous road layout contributing to health and safety issues. As residents of 4 Timber Lane particularly affected by all three of these issues. Not only is it a challenge to exit our driveway with cars parked, it makes the bend of Timber Lane increasingly more hazardous.

3 Timber Lane: Revised proposal has failed to address any of my previous concerns and the core principles remain for my opposition as follows:

- Designated green belt
- County Wildlife Site
- Public Right of Way through the site – impacted on by the development
- Not identified alternative sites which are brownfield – applicant have identified a further five sites in Woburn suitable for development
- Highway Safety – Timber Lane is a lane and as such cannot withstand one point of residential vehicle egress from this proposed development on to it within less than 75m of Leighton Street
- Existing parking/ passing problems already in place
- The Transport report is heavily biased in its calculations
- The revised proposal has allowed for 10 parking spaces including garages and assumes that residents will use their garages for parking – reality is they will use them for storage. Therefore, lack of parking provision within the scheme.
- Extreme driving conditions during winter on entry to Timber Lane from Leighton Street and vice versa.
- Residential roof tops will blot out the scenic view of Woburn village from the meadow.
- Please look at application CB/15/04299 where the proposal to build 2 dormer bungalows in West Orchard, Fairfield Park was refused – the issues mirror this situation. It was refused as it failed to support the management and protection of the County Wildlife Site; the proposal would result in an overly domestic

character to an existing open landscape area which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the neighbouring residents; the proposal has failed to consider the local aspirations of the local community and proposes development of an area intended to be classified as open space.

- CBC should clearly prioritise the use of brownfield over greenfield land in local planning policy so these applications cannot continue to be re-submitted.

3 Timber Lane: Reinforcing existing objection to the application.

- The consultation is out of date and the views of the public have not been sought from the developer on this current proposal;
- Local development should be for the benefit of the community and not just the financial benefit of the developer;
- Supporter of affordable housing, the revised proposal fails to address many of previous objections
- Green belt land, County Wildlife Site, historic bridleway a much used local amenity area;
- Sajid Javid (Business Secretary) The Green Belt can rightly be protected. There is plenty of land which is not Green Belt that we can build on and which is suitable for housing, and we need to get on with it. (July 2015)
- Timber Lane is extremely narrow and no wider than a small country lane. It has an acute curvature which makes exiting adjacent properties a hazardous manoeuvre, sight lines are challenging and it is difficult to see oncoming vehicles entering from Leighton Street.
- The development of 6000 new homes at nearby Wavendon and Kingston as well as new housing development along the M1 corridor from Luton will see traffic volumes increase significantly in Woburn over the coming years. Leighton Street is already congested and any additional traffic volumes from Timber Lane will further exacerbate the problem.
- Woburn offers limited employment opportunities and everyday Timber Lane witnesses an exodus of commuter traffic leaving for the conurbations of Milton Keynes, Leighton Buzzard and Bedford.
- Insufficient parking provision for ten houses.
- The views from Timber Lane should not be discounted and form part of the historical and spatial context of Woburn itself.
- The housing needs survey is out of date and the proposal does not meet the required need. No additional survey since 2011.

46 Timber Lane:

- The site is Green Belt
- The site is a Historic Landscape and County Wildlife Site
- In my opinion, there is already more than an adequate supply of rental housing stock in Woburn. For example, one local landlord, the Woburn Estate, has had an average of 2.15 properties available for let, in Woburn (sample period December 2013 to June 2014) - why does Woburn need ANY additional housing if the current supply of rental housing stock consistently exceeds demand?
- The Housing Needs Survey showed that Woburn has an average of 25% private rental properties against a County average of 6.9%. This further illustrates that there is already way more than an adequate supply of rental housing stock in Woburn without any additional development.

- Although the Housing Needs Survey on which this application is founded is 3-years out of date, in that survey just 2.7% of the population of Woburn suggested that any additional housing would be desirable in our village

Secondly, in addition to the above points, I also object to this specific planning application for the following reasons;

- Based on the points above, the applicant has failed to objectively demonstrate that any need for this development exists
- The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for 6-one-bed units. Notwithstanding what is written above, this planning application does not meet that need
- The applicant has not considered any alternative, brown-field sites in the village. No SWOT analysis of alternative locations has been conducted nor any weighted scoring of alternative sites undertaken. As such, the need to demonstrate that any special circumstances exist to justify greenbelt development in the Woburn Conservation Area is not met
- My understanding is that any planning application submitted under the Rural Exception guidelines should be solely for affordable housing. That is not the case with this application
- The application raises significant road safety & traffic concerns on Timber Lane
- Local children have used this field for recreation for years and years and their need for local "play areas" is overlooked.
- Finally, the development sits outside the Woburn Settlement Boundary

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 07 (Pages 45-68) – CB/15/03850/Full – Eversholt Beeches, Watling Street, Caddington, Dunstable, LU6 3QP

Application withdrawn from committee

Item 08 (Pages 62-92) – CB/16/00181/Full – Land to the Rear of 33 to 57 Shortmead Street, Biggleswade, SG18 0AT

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Three further letters of objection and a further report prepared by MTC Engineering on behalf of a number of residents have been submitted since the Committee Report was finalised. They make the following comments:

- The positive amendments to the scheme are welcomed but there are still concerns.

- The highways situation would still be unsatisfactory. The Council could be held accountable in the future.
- The density would still be high.
- There would still be overlooking and a loss of sunlight.
- The loss of the existing wall would be unacceptable.
- New residents could use the existing lay-by parking on Wharf Mews.
- The existing grassed area would be lost and new amenity space should be adopted for public use.
- There would be various conflicts with the Council's Design Guide.
- The deeds for new properties should include various covenants.
- Construction traffic should be carefully managed.
- There would be noise and dust during the day.
- Wharf Mews cannot accommodate more than 50 dwellings.
- Further works to the road are required.
- There should be a resident's parking scheme.
- The Council should not approve plans without certainty that the developer can deliver the development.
- The junction would be unsafe and there is no evidence of there being sufficient capacity on the road network.
- Parking in the turning head would be lost.

Additional Comments

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Item 09 (Pages 93-114) – CB/16/0374/RM – Land East of Station Road, Langford

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

A further representation has been received from a resident at No 49 Station Road that reads:

Whilst my concern is not a major objection, I would like some reassurance that it is being considered as I have to live with the outcome on a daily and permanent basis. I did spell out clearly that my main area of concern was the close proximity of plot No 8 to my boundary as my living aspect is all facing this direction. Whilst I do not expect this proposed building to be significantly moved, I would expect some level of screening to be provided to offer a level of privacy to both my property and the proposed building. Based on how many house's are being developed on this site, I feel my request is both reasonable and fair.

In response, officers highlight that a condition would secure a detailed landscaping scheme which could include additional landscape screening on that boundary.

Additional Comments

The applicant has requested that the Committee is aware of the following points:

Highways:

Information pertaining to conditions 9, 10 and 12 were submitted and validated on 10th May 2016

The submitted information deals with the railway noise, the Langford Mitigation Strategy (April 2016) updates the noise mitigation strategy in line with the current bund and wall proposal

Landscape Officer:

Three landscape drawings were submitted with the reserved matters application GL0558 01B, GL0558 02B and GL0558 03B these have detailed planting information on them

DWH have no intention of removing the hedgerow/trees to the north of the site (along Jubilee Lane). The only instance where this is likely to happen is where we connect our drainage into the ditch

Housing:

The proposed housing split (63% rented 37% intermediate) is as per the outline planning appeal decision condition No. 8

The housing will be tenure blind

Rights of Way:

A sum of £13,800 was allocated in the S106 specifically bridleway No. 8

We are leaving the current field access open through to bridleway No.8, this will remain open after completion of the site

Two access points are not viable due to the ditch running along the length of Jubilee Lane

Network Rail:

S106 contribution is noted

Waste Services:

A number of the units noted already have bin collection points on the layout, those that have been missed will be amended.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Condition 2 should be amended to read:

Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development shall commence at the site before a revised landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing what trees would be retained and planting

on the northern boundary of the site, the retention of a field gate access from Jubilee Lane and landscape screening between Plot 8 and No 49 Station Road. The development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance and layout of the site would be acceptable in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

Item 10 (Pages 115-156) – CB/15/01657/Out – Samuel Whitbread Community College, Shefford Road, Clifton, SG17 5QS

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Sport England

I had a few comments on the committee report that I would be grateful if you could consider and report to members of the committee at the meeting as follows:

1. Paragraph 5.4 – S.106 agreement Sport & Leisure requirements (page 147 of report): While I appreciate that the wording of the section 106 requirements may not need to be definitive for the purposes of the committee report, can I make the following points:
 - As advised in my response, the commuted sum for drainage works at Shefford Sports Club would be £78,657 plus professional fees and VAT as the club will need to bear the costs of the fees and VAT as well as the capital costs of the works.
 - As advised in my response, at Robert Bloomfield Academy, as well as submission/approval of the construction specification for the playing field works, there will need to be provision in the obligations for the delivery of the works, the delivery of an annual long term maintenance programme and a new or revised community use agreement. The s.106 requirements in the report only refer to the construction specification.
 - As advised in my response, the same provisions need to be made at Etonbury Academy as at Robert Bloomfield Academy. While the committee report acknowledges the off-site provision at Etonbury Academy as part of the mitigation package in paragraph 1.7 (page 142), there is no reference to Etonbury Academy in the s.106 requirements summary in paragraph 5.4
 - As advised in my response, as well obligations to include facility management of the proposed facilities, there will need to be obligations covering playing field maintenance.

It is considered important that the committee are made aware of the full range of obligations that are expected in relation to sport and leisure before the application is determined plus to avoid any confusion or misinterpretation at a later date about the content of the obligations when the s.106 is drawn up between the applicant and the Council.

2. Proposed Condition 18 – Sports Facility Design (page 152 of report): This condition has amalgamated 5 separate conditions that I requested in my consultation response. I do not have a problem in principle with this approach for the tennis courts, cricket facilities, athletics facilities and sports pavilion as proposed condition 18 would have the same effect as 4 separate conditions for the 4 different facilities. However, in relation to the Artificial Grass Pitch, a bespoke condition was requested requiring the design and layout to be prepared in accordance with the content of Appendix 4 of the submitted Sport England Response to Comments (attached). The content of Appendix 4 had been worked up and agreed between the applicant, Sport England, the FA and the RFU and was intended to be more specific about the design requirements for the facility (than a more general submission/approval in consultation with Sport England approach) in order to provide some specific parameters for the design to be assessed against and to ensure that the commitments made by the applicant to date in relation to its design were followed through in practice and that a potential scenario where a design which did not follow the specific requirements set out in Appendix 4 was subsequently approved by CBC against Sport England's advice. As the AGP is seen as the main element of the playing field mitigation by the FA and the RFU, it is imperative that its detailed design will be acceptable in practice. A further consideration, is that not all of the specific requirements in Appendix 4 can be assessed at pre-application stage which was another reason why a bespoke design condition for this facility was requested. The requirement in Appendix 4 for the AGP to be designed to meet the FIFA 1* Performance standard can only be assessed following completion of the construction as the pitch has to be tested against the FIFA standard and then added to the FA' Register of Football Turf Pitches before it would meet this requirement. Condition 18 as proposed would presumably require the details submitted to be approved and the condition discharged before commencement of development and may not therefore provide the opportunity for an assessment to be made of whether it met the FIFA standard at the post construction stage. To address these concerns, it is requested that for the Artificial Grass Pitch, a separate design condition is imposed on any planning permission along the lines recommended in my formal response. At the very least, as an alternative (in addition to proposed condition 18 as currently worded), to address the point above about assessing whether the artificial grass pitch has met the required performance standards before it is first used, a further planning condition as follows is recommended to address this matter:

“Use of the artificial grass pitch shall not commence until certification that the Artificial Grass Pitch hereby permitted has met FIFA Quality Concept for Football Turf - One Star accreditation (or equivalent International Artificial Turf Standard (IATS)) and the World Rugby Regulation 22 (2016) requirements, including confirmation that the facility has been registered on the Football Association's Register of Football Turf Pitches, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The artificial grass pitch will be maintained in accordance with the approved details for as long as the facility is operational.

Additional Comments

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Amended condition 18

No development shall take place until details of the design and layout of the Tennis/Netball Court, Cricket Facilities, Athletic Facilities and Sports Pavilion have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England. The development hereby approved shall not be constructed other than substantially in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development is fit for purpose and sustainable and to accord with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

Replacement condition 23

No development shall take place until a scheme to ensure the continuity of the existing sports use on the playing fields and facilities shown edged within the red line area on Drawing No. 14-01 during construction works is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England. The scheme shall ensure that the sports facilities remain at least as accessible and at least equivalent in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness and quality to the existing playing fields and facilities and shall include a timetable for implementation. The approved scheme shall be implemented and complied with in full throughout the carrying out of the development.

Reason: To protect the playing fields from damage, loss or availability of use and to accord with Policy E4 of Sport England's Playing Field Policy.

New condition

No development shall take place until details of the design and layout of the Artificial Grass Pitch, as proposed in accordance with Appendix 4 of the document Sport England Response to comments (January 2016 revision) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with Sport England. The development hereby approved shall not be constructed other than substantially in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development is fit for purpose and sustainable and to accord with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

Item 11 (Pages 157-196) – CB/15/04456/Full – Land at Long Lake Meadow, High Road, Seddington, Sandy, SG19 1NU

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Highways England

Additional Comments

Regarding Internal Drainage Board objection:

The application site falls outside of the flood zone. The objections relate to the possible loss of flood compensation area required by condition for an existing consent for stabling adjacent to this application site.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Additional condition as a replacement for conditions 5, 7 and 8.

The residential caravans hereby approved shall not be brought on to site until details of a development scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the approved development scheme shall implemented in full prior to occupation of any caravan, and thereafter retained in the agreed form.

- (i) The proposed means of foul and surface water drainage of all parts of the site;
- (ii) Walls, fencing, gates or other means of enclosure on the boundary of and within all parts of the site, together with any additional such walls, fencing, or other enclosures on all parts of the site. The means of enclosure shall include a proposed boundary on the eastern boundary of the site and acoustic fencing on the western boundary (as required by condition 5 of this decision); and
- (iii) The waste storage facilities to serve the various parts of the site; and
- (iv) The treatment of the hard-surfaced areas of the site.

Reason: To provide a satisfactory appearance in recognition of the location of the site in an open countryside location.

(Policy DM3 CSDMP and Sections 7, 9 & 11 NPPF)

Additional condition

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or brought into use until the details of any external lighting to be installed on the site, including the design of the lighting unit, any supporting structure and the extent of the area to be illuminated, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the visual amenity of the site and the open countryside of the A.O.N.B & AGLV and its surrounding area.

(Sections 7 & 11, NPPF)

This page is intentionally left blank