

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



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

31 January 2017

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - Wednesday 1 February 2017

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

14. Late Sheet

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

A
B

- (i)
- (ii)

This page is intentionally left blank

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 1st February 2017

Item 6 (Pages 15-34) – CB/16/02069/OUT – Land off Greenfield Road, Flitton.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 7 (Pages 35-82) – CB/16/03249/FULL – Land East of Bedford Road, adjacent to Woodcote, Northill.

Additional Consultation/ Public Responses

Neighbours:

Further Neighbour representations objecting to the development have been received from the following:

- The Old Orchard House, 5 Bedford Road, Northill
- Woodcote Corner, Bedford Road, Northill
- 7 Bedford Road, Northill

Raising the following objections and concerns (in summary):

- Request for the determination of the application to be deferred to a later committee, for the following reasons:
 - No. 5 Bedford Road, has not received notification of the committee;
 - The application is being rushed through;
 - The report within the agenda lacks clarity, analysis, arguments for and against, leading to an objective and rational conclusion. Can the committee make sound decisions based on poor information?
 - The planning meeting should be held in the evening enabling more of the working public to attend;

- The agenda report contains information not published before, which requires public consultation;
- The agenda for 1st February is far too long.
- The application is speculative with the main driver for the application being that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing supply;
- To grant planning permission before the Northill Parish Plans are published will result in poor timing of the decision that should be made in the context of other more suitable sites being made available;
- Highway Comments lack credibility and transparency:
 - Where are the facts and figures, the definitive measurements of the visibility splays, the figures quoted by the Agent are wrong;
 - Where is any assessment of the additional dangers for traffic turning into and out of the estate;
 - Where is the list of additional risks posed by two pedestrian crossings along the narrow footpath;
 - Where are the mitigating factors against the identified risks;
- The residents of Bedford Road live with the traffic dangers 24/7 and see and experience the many traffic incidents that occur daily, these views are not properly recorded in the comments and objections section;
- Why were the residents of Northill not made aware of the Highway comments until days before the CBC Planning meeting;
- The highways section lacks transparency to back their comments, there is a need to have an independent professional and objective assessment of Bedford Road safety based on road surveys;
- Harm to the Conservation Area;
- Not a sustainable location in relation to access to public transport, services, facilities, health care, schools and employment;
- No gain in having a picnic area;
- The agents documentation has numerous errors, omissions and inconsistencies in the submission;
- The lack of five year housing supply is only a temporary situation until the Northill Parish Council publish their plans. Hence refusal is the only sound decision that can be taken;
- Traffic surveys show the 30mph limited is exceeded by 46% of traffic in areas where the access road and pedestrian crossings would be located;
- Speeding occurs in Bedford Road which is mentioned in the Local Transport Plan;
- Car parking concerns;
- Concerns in relation to visibility;
- Lack of nearby overflow car parking;
- Highway safety concerns relating to pedestrian footpath and crossings;
- Concern in relation to the loss of hedgerow at the frontage of the site in the context of the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- Design of buildings not inkeeping with existing buildings;
- The development does not make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness nor significantly enhance its immediate setting;
- The development is out of character;
- No provision made for storage tanks, or sheds;

- Countryside outside of the settlement envelope is recognised as a highly valued resource and should be protected for its own sake, safeguarding it from the increased pressures of development;
- Concern in relation to the impact of the development including the proposed footpath and loss of hedgerow upon the rural character and appearance of the area, the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings;
- The proposed loss of hedgerow and footpath on important green spaces (grass verges) as identified by the conservation area appraisal is contrary to the guidance within the conservation area appraisal, which states “where necessary seek to retain... important hedgerows” and “ensure that development proposals are resisted on sites identified as important green spaces”;
- The picnic area is not wanted and there are existing and better car parking and picnic facilities available including the crown public house and by the village pond;
- The Local Consultations relating to the Northhill Neighbourhood plan concluded that the site is not suitable for residential development and the site would not be included in the Northhill Neighbourhood Plan;
- The consultation showed that more than sufficient sites were available to meet the local housing needs within Northhill Parish;
- Discussions for the Neighbourhood Plan indicate a desire for new housing to be in keeping with the character of the settlement and for new infill developments, the site is not infill;
- Concern in relation to the capacity of the overloaded sewage and drainage systems to cope with additional housing in Bedford Road;
- The proposed picnic and car parking area would take trade away from the Crown Public House;
- Local people use and are happy with walking on the grass verges;
- The site is beyond the settlement envelope and a part of it is within the Northhill Conservation Area;
- This proposal, if approved, would be the start of a change to the character of the area. Whilst we as residents, may own our properties, we do not ‘own’ the history and the heritage of this wonderful village. It is ours on trust for future generations and we have an obligation to do everything in our power to preserve it, and pass it forward in the best possible condition that we can;
- Previous planning history of the site includes an application in 1984 that was refused on the following grounds: The proposal is contrary to Policies of the County Structure Plan which indicates that the Local Planning Authority will not normally grant permission for residential development in rural areas with the exception of infilling within villages on sites which are physically contained by existing development. The proposal, if permitted, would extend the existing development area of the village into the open countryside and would constitute an unwanted intrusion detrimental to the character and appearance of the area;
- Even in 1984 it was recognised that the proposed development by nature of its siting and relationship with adjacent land does not constitute infilling;
- The development is contrary to Policy DM4;
- The development would detract from the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area, contrary to Policies CS15 and DM13 of the Development Plan;

- Historic applications on neighbouring land including MB/80/525 was refused planning permission due to the detrimental effect on the rural character and appearance, the likelihood of creating a precedent for future development, would constitute ribbon development outside the main built up area of the village and would cause a danger to traffic;
- Reference is made to MB/06/607 an application on neighbouring land as being relevant;
- Northill Parish Council records between 2010 and 2012 show that this site was discounted as part of a review of sites for the Housing Needs Survey for social and affordable housing and a call for sites exercise which included this site. The site was rejected on road safety issues and damage to the conservation area;
- The greensand ridge car park is only sufficient to park cars from the development when calculating car parking from the suggested levels within the CBC Design Guide (2014) and as such the benefits of the car park is obsolete.

Item 8 (Pages 83-104) – CB/16/04926/FULL – 21 Sandy Road, Everton, Sandy, SG19 2JU.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Everton Parish Council (14/01/17) – Original Comments iterated and further comments received and verbatim below on 30/01/17:

Small Village status as defined in CBC document DMP 2009:

- Everton is defined as a small village in CBC policy CS1. Spatial Strategy section states that development in such areas should support local needs and services. Neither CBC or the developer appear to have made a case to support “village needs”. The “shoe-horned in” appearance of the development, in particular the narrow south-west access road, is not in keeping with the spatial layout of the rest of the village and as such threatens the character of the village.

Neighbouring amenity: Significant loss of garden amenity and /or privacy for residents in adjacent properties seems to discount local opinion.

Planning issues with the south-west access appear contrary to CBC Highways requirements:

- The road width for two-way traffic and the 2m service strip requirements each side of the access road appear to have been completely disregarded by the developer;
- The tracking drawing clearly show that HGV’s entering/exiting the site will be dangerously close to No.27.

Services, Infrastructure and Sustainability concerns:

- Other than a school and a pub, Everton has no public amenity and little employment. Residents are totally reliant upon private cars. The village is served by an inadequate bus service, which a venerable minority depend upon and which is expected to be cut by 50% in April. Is it sustainable to build more houses?

- There is concern about the capacity of the village school, in particular the risk in of having to bus children of primary school age out of the village. A more likely scenario is that parents drive their children to school. Is this sustainable?
- Water pressure is already a problem, particularly in the summer, has this been taken into account.

Pedestrian safety concerns: There appears to be no provision of street lighting, creating personal security and road safety concerns.

Ecological concerns: Despite the ecology statement made by the developer, the site is known to be used by bats. Strong anecdotal evidence from residents strongly suggests that there are bat colonies present in the existing barns. Will any attempt be made to ensure that the developer ecology report is sound and that bats will not be displaced?

Road safety concerns:

- The south-west (SW) access to the site is on the tip of a blind bend, vehicles leaving the site also have very poor visibility of approaching traffic from both directions;
- Warden Hill, almost opposite the new SW access, adds to the complexity and safety of the new junction;
- Traffic transiting the village in both direction has very poor visibility of the SW access road because of the bend;
- The proposed SW access visibility splays are totally inadequate given the speed of traffic in the village;
- Recent CBC ATC data taken in Potton Rd. recorded that 62% of traffic towards Potton & 47% towards Sandy exceeded 30MPH. There is a serious speeding issue in Everton, CBC Highway (RMF) have recognised this;
- The assumption in the Highways considerations that “Vehicles should be at a slower speed because of the bend” is in the view of EPC flawed and should be confirmed by a CBC ATC survey before any decision is reached;
- Whilst welcoming the suggestion from Highways that mitigation by means of vehicle activated signage, there appears to be no demand for this to be a planning approval condition;
- It is also unclear if the suggested mitigation will require one or more VAS's. Given that poor visibility is an issue from both directions it is assumed that at least two signs will be required. Clarification would be welcome;
- There is also some confusion! The advise from CBC highways in the context of RMF funding has been that VOS's are not proven to be effective and as such are not included in the list of available measures. Instead unaffordable raised tables have been proposed. Are VOS's effective or not? If so then we would ask that they are added to RMF options, retrospectively if possible, as an affordable option;
- There appears to be no provision of additional street lighting in Sandy Road to illuminate the somewhat concealed development access;
- An apparent lack of bin collection point for tenants of adjacent properties within the SW access visibility splays is of major concern. If bins are placed by residents or left by waste operatives on the Sandy Rd. footpath, the poor visibility problem will be significantly exacerbated;
- Everton Parish Council ask that our road safety concerns are taken into account by the Planning Committee when deciding the outcome of the application. We respectfully request that a CBC ATC survey be conducted and that if and when

approval is granted, that it be conditional upon the developer providing CBC Highways approved traffic calming measures.

Summary - We ask that the committee consider the following points:

- Small Village status as defined in CBC document DMP 2009.
- Is there a proven “Local” need for the proposed development in a small village?
- Is the design, in particular the access, in keeping with the rest of the village?
- Neighbouring amenity: Has the amenity and privacy interests of the adjacent neighbours and the wishes of the local community been considered carefully enough?. Will it pass the localism test?. Does it pass the high bar set by CBC planner?
- Planning issues that appear contrary to CBC Highways requirements.
- Is the access road wide enough and does it comply with CBC guidance regarding service strips etc.?
- Services, Infrastructure and Sustainability concerns: Is the development sustainable in terms of limited access to public transport, Schools and health-care, with no pedestrian access to local amenities in Potton or Sandy? Is forcing more people to do more car journeys sustainable?
- Are water and sewage services able to cope with the development without compromising current consumers?
- Pedestrian safety: Is the south-west access road and parking area safe for pedestrians at night?.
- Ecological concerns: Anecdotal evidence from residents strongly suggests that there are bat colonies present in the existing barns. Will any attempt be made to ensure that the developer ecology report is sound and that bats will not be displaced?
- Road safety concerns: Is the south-west access road safe?. Is the visibility sufficient?. Have CBC ATC figures been used to determine road speeding levels and safety?. Is there adequate street lighting?. Where will adjacent properties place their bins for collection?

Everton Parish Council ask that our road safety concerns are taken into account by the Planning Committee when deciding the outcome of the application. We respectfully request that a CBC ATC survey be conducted and that if and when approval is granted, that it be conditional upon the developer providing CBC Highways approved traffic calming measures

18 Sandy Road x 2 (16/01/17)- Objection retained due to the following reasons in summary:

- Unsustainable, lack of village facilities and services;
- Construction noise and occupation noise;
- Highway safety and traffic concerns;
- Overdevelopment;
- Impact on the rural character and setting of the village.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Section 1 Principle, paragraph 1.4 should be substituted for the following due to error in wording of last sentence:

- 1.4 However regard should be had to fact that DM4 states that "limited extensions to gardens will be permitted provided they do not harm the character of the area. In this instance, the extended area would allow for a 3 metre wide landscape buffer to be provided along the (south-east) rear boundary of the site to sufficiently demarcate the development for the prevailing countryside and in addition would allow for greater flexibility within the site for appropriate turning provision and external amenity space for future occupiers. Whilst it is considered that the proposal would have some visual implications as a result of the further extension into the open countryside, this is outweighed by the benefits to the layout of the development as indicated.

Item 9 (Pages 105-112) – CB/16/05293/FULL – Top Farm, Rectory Road, Campton, Shefford, SG17 5PF.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

Amendment to Relevant Planning History:

MB/97/00270/TDM was determined on 20/03/1997 and not 20/03/2007

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 10 (Pages 113-126) – CB/16/05597/FULL – Whitestyles, 3 High Street, Gravenhurst, Bedford, MK45 4HY.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Additional document received from Cllr John Furniss. The document seeks to clarify comments raised within the objection from the Parish Council, which includes the possible encroachment of the site onto the land of the Village Hall. The document, which has been made available to the members of the Development Management Committee, offer suggestions from the Parish Council, towards schemes which may be more acceptable.

The applicant has submitted a revised site edged red accurately showing the site boundary at 1:1250 and 1:500 scale. The applicant has also submitted a revised

Design and Access Statement making reference to this current application and has confirmed the dimensions of the house as built on site.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Condition 1 amended to refer to drawing number 1768.3A (external materials).

Item 11 (Pages 127-138) – CB/16/05450/FULL – Whitestyles, 3 High Street, Gravenhurst, Bedford, MK45 4HY.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 12 (Pages 139-152) – CB/16/05025/VOC – 11 Brook Lane, Flitton, Bedford, MK45 5EJ.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Prior to the site being used as an independent dwelling house or holiday let a plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing a defined curtilage for the application site.

Reason: To define the residential curtilage of the property, and to protect the character of the area in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.