

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



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

25 January 2018

Dear Councillor

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY, 31 JANUARY 2018**

Further to the agenda and papers for the above meeting, previously circulated, please find attached the following which the Chairman has agreed to take as an urgent item of business:-

**18. Minutes - 6 December 2017**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 6 December 2017 (copy attached).

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

Yours sincerely

Leslie Manning  
Committee Services Officer

email: [leslie.manning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:leslie.manning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)  
tel: 0300 300 5132

This page is intentionally left blank

**CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** held in Council Chamber, Priory House, Monks Walk, Shefford on Wednesday, 6 December 2017

**PRESENT**

Cllr K C Matthews (Chairman)  
Cllr R D Berry (Vice-Chairman)

Cllrs M C Blair  
Mrs S Clark  
I Dalgarno  
F Firth  
E Ghent

Cllrs C C Gomm  
K Janes  
T Nicols  
J N Young

Apologies for Absence: Cllrs K M Collins  
T Swain

Substitutes: Cllr D Bowater (In place of K M Collins)

Members in Attendance: Cllrs Mrs A Barker  
P Downing  
P A Duckett  
B J Spurr

Officers in Attendance: Ms P Bramwell Planning and Highways Solicitor,  
LGSS Law  
Mr J Ellis Planning Manager West  
Ms S Griffin Committee Services Officer  
Mr M Heron Principal Planning Officer  
Mr D Lamb Planning Manager East  
Mr L Manning Committee Services Officer  
Mr R Page Principal Highways Officer  
Mrs L Newlands Principal Planning Officer  
Mr M Plummer Principal Planning Officer  
Ms A Rowland Team Leader Sustainable Transport  
Team  
Mrs J Selley Head of Planning Delivery

**DM/17/95. Chairman's Announcements and Communications**

The Chairman advised the meeting that the order of business for the planning applications would be Items 6, 9, 7 and 8.

(Note: the above running order was subsequently amended to be Items 6, 9, 8 and 7).

DM/17/96. **Minutes**

**RESOLVED**

**that the minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 6 December 2017 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.**

DM/17/97. **Members' Interests**

(a) **Personal Interests:-  
Member**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>	<b>Present or Absent during discussion</b>
Cllr M Blair	6	Was involved in discussions with the applicant as a Member of Ampt Hill Town Council regarding the future of the car park. Has not commented or voted on the Item. Also knows the Ampt Hill Town Council speaker.	Present
Cllr R Berry	6	Has known the Ampt Hill Town Council speaker for a long time and is a personal friend.	Present
Cllr F Firth	9	Knows the Northill Parish Council speaker and the applicant.	Present
Cllr K Matthews	9	Knows the Northill Parish Council speaker.	Present

(b) **Personal and Prejudicial Interests:-**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>	<b>Present or Absent during discussion</b>
---------------	-------------	---------------------------	--

None.

(c) **Prior Local Council Consideration of Applications**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Parish/Town Council</b>	<b>Vote Cast</b>
Cllr M Blair	6	Amphill	No
Cllr F Firth	9	Northill	No

DM/17/98. **Planning Enforcement Cases Where Formal Action Has Been Taken**

The Chairman advised Members to raise any issues they might have with regard to planning enforcement cases with the Planning Enforcement and Appeals Team Leader.

DM/17/99. **Planning Application No. CB/17/03883/FULL (Amphill)**

The Committee considered a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/03883/FULL for the erection of 8 dwellings alongside the provision of 12 public car parking spaces and the demolition of an existing boundary wall at the existing public car park, St Andrew's Place, Church Street, Amphill.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional comments and an additional informative as set out in the Late Sheet.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received representations from Amphill Town Council, objectors to the application and the applicant under the public participation scheme.

A Member sought clarification from the Amphill Business Chamber representative, as an objector, as to whether the staff of local businesses had been mandated to use the car park. He then commented that signage was well signposted at the site itself but asked if the Chamber had put any parking signposting in the town itself. In response to the second question the representative stated that consideration could be given to providing such information on the large plan showing local businesses which the Chamber had placed in the town. She added that, as a Business Chamber, it would be

difficult to require employers to tell their staff to use the car park especially if the staff were required to pay. However, Waitrose, as a local employer, had indicated that it would require its staff to park there if parking was free. She also felt that many businesses were not aware that the car park existed.

The Member then sought clarification from the applicant with regard to the planning officer's report which appeared to suggest the company had not made a s106 contribution or affordable housing contribution as a part of its previous original application. In response the applicant explained the process undertaken and how, because the car park was assumed to generate income, a higher financial contribution had in fact been made to the Council's affordable housing fund. If the car park had not been provided it would have assumed no income would have been generated from the site and a lower contribution would have been made. He stressed that the company had made a contribution to the Council towards the latter's provision of affordable housing.

In response to other Members' queries the applicant stated that the site had now been assessed for business rates and a bill of £800 pm had recently been received. The car park had been in operation since late 2015 but usage data was only available from May 2016 when the necessary monitoring equipment had been installed following the realisation there was an issue with use. The applicant advised that he was unable to state how much money had been contributed to the affordable housing fund but he or the case officer could supply this information.

A Member sought clarification on the level of the financial loss for the car park. The meeting was advised that the total loss was approximately £1,250 pm. This sum included the monthly rates of £800. The meeting noted that should the car park operate as a free facility it would be at a cost of at least £800 pm. In reply to a query as to why the applicant had submitted the planning application the applicant stated that the purpose was to make the best use of the site as there was no benefit arising from an underused car park. The 12 spaces which would be retained would be sufficient to cover the established demand and there would be no other impact apart from the provision of the new dwellings and making the best use of a previously developed site. In response to a further query the applicant added that discussions had taken place with the Town Council on the low level of use of the car park and joint measures had been taken to encourage greater use. However, such co-operation had ceased after the Town Council failed to respond for a six month period to a query on assisting the applicant with the running of the car park. Given the unsustainable losses incurred by the car park's operator RCP it was decided to take forward a pre-application submission for the redevelopment of the site. The applicant pointed out that it had always been intended that the car park would be a commercial enterprise and the hourly charge for the car park was 80 pence which was lower than that charged by Central Bedfordshire Council. He did not believe this charge deterred the public from using the car park. He emphasised that it had not been the applicant which had withdrawn from discussions with the Town Council but that the latter had stopped communicating with the applicant. Given the losses incurred by the operator it was decided to proceed with a planning application.

The first ward Member set out his objection to the application. He referred to the Planning Inspector's opposition to building on the site because of the presence of an orchard but as it was widely recognised that a new local car park was needed the original application for housing had been approved subject to the provision of a car park. The car park use was to be free and this incorporated in a s106 Agreement but it was only conditioned instead. The ward Member stressed that ultimately the town would gain nothing if the current application for redeveloping the car park was approved. He referred to the use of phasing of a development as a means of avoiding the provision of affordable housing and that the application before the Committee should be considered on this basis. He referred to an appeal decision which he claimed was of relevance to the current development and which supported his claim that this was a single site. Further, all of the proposed eight dwellings should be provided as affordable homes, though this would not generate income for the applicant. He then referred to the Central Bedfordshire Council's own policy (Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy) under which a divided site would be considered as a single whole. He reminded the meeting that the Council also had a 5 year land supply. The ward Member then stated that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) had been completed and local side roads would eventually have double yellow lines applied which would increase usage of the car park, especially if it were available free of charge. He did not believe it was feasible to expect local people, for a variety of reasons, to pay for car park use. The Town Council had formally offered to run the existing car park and offered to pay rent to do so. The applicant could bequeath the land to the Town Council, the land reverting back to the applicant should this operation cease. He pointed out that there was no other land in the town centre which could be used as a public car park. He urged rejection of the application.

A second ward Member referred to the Maulden and Clophill residents who used Ampthill for shopping and who were frustrated by the parking difficulties they experienced. He stated that he was unaware that the car park in St Andrew's Place had opened. He acknowledged that the need to walk uphill to the town centre and then return back to the car park could be difficult for some people though if it was free to use this could influence people's opinion positively. The ward member added that because a piece of land was unprofitable it did not mean it should be built on. The ward Member saw the car park as an open space, a community asset used for a number of purposes outside its intended use and its removal would have a detrimental impact. He concluded by commenting that he was uncertain when a car park became profitable and that even large car park operators probably did not see a site become so for two-three years after opening. The new car parking strategy in Ampthill would see the future use of off street car parking increase and the application had raised local people's awareness of the car park's location. He did not believe the proposed dwellings were needed and urged rejection.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- The planning officer's comment that the s106 payment included a sum of £40k towards the provision of affordable housing and it had been collected. He stressed that the application site did not form part of a phased development as had been claimed but constituted an entirely separate scheme following the construction of the car park under the terms of the original application. The new application therefore represented a post-completion application. He explained how the appeal decision referred to by the first local Member was not relevant to the application before Members.
- The planning officer's comment that Council Policy CS7 did require a scheme to provide 35% affordable housing but Ministerial statements indicated that a contribution towards affordable housing should not be requested for smaller developments.
- The Chairman's comments and observations regarding many of the points raised by speakers including the validity of some of them as planning issues.
- The planning officer's comments that the building levels would be controlled by condition to ensure they were consistent with the adjacent built form and the Conservation area was 60 meters away. It was not considered therefore that there would be an adverse impact on the view of St Andrew's Church and that this was also the view of the conservation officer. He also stated that there would be no overbearing impact on the existing nearby bungalows.
- The new parking restrictions had not yet been implemented. The highways officer stated that he had only recently become aware of these. He explained the current parking restrictions near the application site and stated that he had not seen the details of those restrictions proposed though they appeared to be for Bedford Street (B530) leading north to Houghton Conquest and Bedford.
- A Member of the Committee, who was also a ward member, referred to the extensive background research he had conducted into the planning history of the application site. He explained how the requirement for the car park had arisen and how there had been widespread local support for it to be provided. He contrasted that with the opposition to the current application and how the commercial operation of the site had arisen.
- The ward Member stated that the Town Council had rightly not responded to the applicant's request to impose parking restrictions as a means to encourage use of the car park. He stressed that the proposed parking restrictions were to be introduced purely on the grounds of safety. The restrictions in Bedford Street had been imposed because parked vehicles created a dangerous pinch point.
- The ward Member referred to a series of meetings which had taken place with the applicant and the reasons why it had not been possible to immediately develop the Town Council's involvement in the operation of the car park. Once the business rate for the site had been announced the Town Council had been able to develop an operational budget and had contacted the applicant that it wished to take this matter further. However, no response had been received.



- On the matter of additional signage the ward Member stated that it was not the Town Council's responsibility to fund this for the benefit of a commercial body.
- The ward Member then detailed his opposition to the current application. He also drew the meeting's attention to the impact on the residents of Colston Rise which would cease to be a cul-de-sac and how there would no longer be a need for turning spaces because of this. In conclusion he stated that Members were misled as to the outcome of the 2013 revised application and that because it was an officer delegation Members were not enabled to object to the conditions and s106 Agreement. The application was seriously flawed. He then moved refusal and set out the reasons for doing so.

(Note: at this point in the proceedings the planning and highways solicitor interjected and raised concerns that the ward Member had fettered his discretion. She stated that it appeared from what he had said that the Member did not to have an open mind with regard to the application and had already taken a decision. The ward Member withdrew the motion and also withdrew from the seating allocated to Members of the Committee but remained within the Chamber. He took no further part in the debate or in the vote on this item).

- A Member referred to the desire for the Town Council to operate the car park, the costs involved and that an offer had been made by the Town Council to the applicant to do so. He also felt the application to be contrary to policy HA5 and this formed one of the reasons to refuse the application.
- A Member commented that the public would never pay to park at the St Andrew's Place car park when they could park at Waitrose which was both free and more convenient. She felt that there was no incentive to use the car park at St Andrew's Place and suggested a holistic review of all car parking in the town to gain the maximum efficiency of use. She strongly objected to the loss of 100 car parking spaces without first establishing whether demand would rise if the facility were free. She moved refusal on the grounds of loss of amenity. Another Member also suggested the application before Members was contrary to Policies HA5 and DM4 and would result in a reduction in sustainability.
- A Member referred to almost complete underuse of the St Andrew's Place car park and expressed the view that the public would not use a parking place unless it was directly in front of a shop. He also referred to the presence of the of the hill and how this would deter users from using the car park and walking to the town centre.. The Member stated that he had seen a similar refusal to use car park facilities that were only a short distance from shops in Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard. He was of the opinion that there might be about 12 vehicles using the car park in Ampthill and this was the number of places offered under the application. He added that it was in the Ampthill's interest both in general and for local businesses for better signage to be erected if business's were failing. Nonetheless, he believed that this would still not encourage greater use. In contrast housing was needed and the

application was a reasonable proposal for this and met Policy HA5. He did see how the application could therefore be refused and refusal would prove difficult to stand up to challenge. The Town Council did not refer to the loss of light and visual impact in its submission. He felt that these points should have been raised in written form and submitted before the meeting.

- In clarification the Chairman stated that the number of on-street car parking spaces lost as a result of the implementation of the proposed waiting restrictions in the town centre was unknown.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds of loss of amenity in form of 88 car parking spaces and contrary to Policies DM4 and HA5 of the Development Plan document, the reduction in the sustainability of Ampthill and the loss of amenity for the residents of Colston Rise on the basis it was no longer a cul-de-sac.

(Note: At the request of Councillor Nicols, and following the planning officer's comment that refusal would likely result in costs to the Council, and in compliance with paragraph 9.4 of Part 4E of the Constitution, a recorded vote was taken).

On being put to the vote 5 Members voted to refuse the application (Councillors Bowater, Mrs Clark, Dalgarno, Gomm and Young), 3 voted against refusal (Councillors Firth, Ghent and Nicols) and 3 abstained (Councillors Berry, Janes and Matthews).

### **RESOLVED**

**that Planning Application No. CB/177/03883/FULL relating to the existing public car park, St Andrew's Place, Church Street, Ampthill, Beds. MK45 2EW be refused as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.**

**AT THE CONCLUSION OF ITEM 6 ABOVE COUNCILLORS P DOWNING AND P DUCKETT LEFT THE MEETING**

**THE COMMITTEE ADJOURNED AT 12.02 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 12.20 P.M. ALL MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE WERE PRESENT WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILLOR MRS CLARK**

**DM/17/100. Planning Application No. CB/17/04334/FULL (Northill)**

The Committee considered a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/04334/FULL for proposed staff accommodation at Caldecote House Farm, 8 Caldecote Green, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BX.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to an additional consultation, an additional comment and an additional informative as set out in the Late Sheet.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received a representation from Northill Parish Council under the public participation scheme.

The ward Member expressed his objection to the application. He stated that the proposed accommodation was sited alongside an existing barn inside the farm entrance. The location was outside the settlement envelope and was contrary to Policy DM4. Its proximity to no. 7 Caldecote Green was contrary to the Council's Design Guidelines. In addition the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that local authorities should avoid new isolated houses in the countryside unless there was an essential need for a worker to live permanently at or near the site. The ward Member reiterated the point made by the Town Council representative that the work to be undertaken at the farm was seasonal in nature and so a temporary structure should be considered.

(Note: Councillor Firth withdrew from the seating allocated to Members of the Committee but remained within the Chamber. He took no further part in the debate or in the vote on this item).

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- The planning officer's comment that, from a planning perspective, the proposed accommodation was considered acceptable whether for temporary or permanent use and that the imposition of an agricultural tie was not considered viable as it would not meet the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). A second planning officer explained that an agricultural tie was imposed where development would not usually be allowed and an exception was being made because of agricultural need. In this case the proposed dwelling was considered acceptable in its own right irrespective of agricultural need so it would be neither necessary or reasonable to restrict occupancy to an agricultural worker.
- The provision of two bedrooms was not considered excessive as it provided the applicant's flexibility if there were more than one worker. The inclusion of a second bedroom made no material planning difference to the application.
- The possible use of existing farm buildings for accommodation purposes was not before the Committee for consideration. The Committee was required, however, to assess what was before it as being acceptable in planning terms.
- The planning officer acknowledged the requirements of the NPPF regarding isolated dwellings in the countryside and that the NPPF outweighed the old PPS7. However, the NPPF said little about agricultural workers' accommodation and many planners and Planning Inspectors relied upon the detailed tests set out within the old PPS7 when evaluating such issues. His view remained that the application

represented a sustainable form of development without the need for an agricultural tie.

- The planning officer acknowledged that the proposed dwelling was contrary to the Council's Design Guidelines in that it lay within 21 meters of another property. However, the former was of modest proportions so this proximity was not considered to be significantly harmful.

On being put to the vote 9 members voted for approval , 0 voted against and 1 abstained.

### **RESOLVED**

**that Planning Application No. CB/17/04334/FULL relating to Caldecote House Farm, 8 Caldecote Green, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BX be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.**

**COUNCILLOR MRS CLARK WAS ABSENT FROM THE CHAMBER FOR PART OF THE DEBATE ON ITEM 9 ABOVE AND SO TOOK NO PART IN THE DISCUSSION OR DECISION**

**DM/17/101. Planning Application No. CB/17/04022/OUT (Houghton Conquest and Haynes)**

The Committee considered a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/17/04022/OUT, an outline application for the erection of up to two dwellings at 12 North Lane, Haynes, Beds. MK45 3PW.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional comments as set out in the Late Sheet.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received representations from Haynes Parish Council and an objector to the application.

A Member sought clarification from the Parish Council representative with regard to the concerns which had been raised by that Council. In response the Parish Councillor explained that Parish Councillors' views on the application varied and he was, therefore, constrained in his response and could only refer to the form of words which he had read out. In view of this situation the Chairman referred the Central Bedfordshire Council Member to the objections received from some occupants of North Lane as set out in the planning officer's report.

The ward Member set out her objections to the application. She first referred to two errors by the officers relating to the application including a reference in the Late Sheet to a local bus service stopping in Bedford Road (A600) opposite the site. This was inaccurate as Bedford Road was some two miles away. She added that a choice had to be made on a proposed change of use and the replacement of an existing ancient orchard by the provision of two houses.

She emphasised that the plans supplied were purely indicative and there was no idea of the size of the properties or parking provision. The ward Member stressed the unique character of North Lane. She referred to the sewers being sometimes problematic and that no consultation had been carried out with either the British Horse Society or Ramblers Society as users of the Lane. Further, the application site was outside the settlement envelope, there was need to consider the impact on wildlife and the need to consider the views of the village. She supported the retention of the land as open space and reminded the meeting that Central Bedfordshire Council had its required five year land supply; refusing the application would not significantly impact on it. Allowing the application, however, would have a major impact and open the way to further development outside the settlement envelope.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- The planning officer's comment on the need to assess the application on its own merits, that the site lay between two existing dwellings and that the proposed development could therefore be classed as infill. He acknowledged that there had been no development in North Lane for 60 years but the Committee was required to determine the application before it. He added that it was unlikely that wildlife or the general use of North Lane would be adversely impacted to any great extent. North Lane was a fairly typical country lane and he would not expect footpaths to be present.
- The planning officer's view that the additional traffic generated was not considered to be significant given the number of dwellings. He acknowledged the error regarding the bus stop in Bedford Road (A600) but pointed out that there was a bus stop in nearby Silver End Road, stated that any problems with the sewer system was for the applicant/developer and Anglian Water to consider and that two suitably designed dwellings sited between two existing dwellings were unlikely to prove overbearing or damaging to the landscape
- The planning officer's statement that the loss of the existing orchard had been recognised but it was in a state of decline and the provision of a replacement suitable orchard close by would represent a gain for biodiversity. In conclusion he stated that he did not consider the new houses would have any impact on the quality of the John Bunyan trail and that consultation had been undertaken with the Council's highways team which, it was felt, was best placed to comment on any impact on users.
- The highway's officer's comment on the presence of grass verges and how these would probably prove more attractive to horses than a tarmac surface. The visibility splay from North Lane on to Silver End Road exceeded the highways requirement and a condition regarding visibility had been imposed for inclusion at the Reserved Matters stage. He added that there were no footpaths present along the Lane but this was to be expected in a rural area. There was therefore no objection on highways grounds.

- A Member's queries regarding the size and location of the land to be made available for a new orchard to compensate for the loss of the existing orchard and the protection offered for the existing trees. In response the planning officer advised that the land to be used for the new orchard was not part of the existing orchard but was in the ownership of the applicant. The intention was to retain as many of the existing orchard's fruit trees as possible though some would be lost as the site was developed. He explained that the existing trees were not currently protected and there was no specific proposal to do so though the proposed conditions could be amended to reflect this if Members wished. He emphasised, however, that this measure would not carry the same level of protection as with the imposition of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and that there were limitations in attempting to protect trees by condition. The planning officer commented that the applicant had been willing to undertake replacement planting and this approach suggested that it would be reasonable to seek the applicant's co-operation in retaining as many of the existing trees as possible.
- A Member's query as to why the replacement orchard was to be located out of site between the proposed properties as this represented a loss of visual amenity. Members were reminded that that the proposed site of the replacement orchard was owned by the applicant. The planning officer explained that the provision of the orchard was driven by ecological reasons and not visual.

On being put to the vote 9 Members voted for approval, 0 voted against and 3 abstained.

#### **RESOLVED**

**that Planning Application No. CB/16/04022/OUT relating to 12 North Lane, Haynes, Beds. MK45 3PW be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.**

#### **AT THE CONCLUSION OF ITEM 8 ABOVE COUNCILLOR MRS A BARKER LEFT THE MEETING**

#### **DM/17/102. Planning Application No. CB/16/02971/OUT (Houghton Conquest and Haynes)**

The Committee considered a report regarding Planning Application No. CB/16/02971/OUT, an outline application seeking detailed approval of vehicular and pedestrian access only, with all other matters reserved; for the creation of 16 self-build homes and all associated works including surface water attenuation, car parking and landscaping on land at Chapel End Road and London Lane, Houghton Conquest, Beds. MK45 3LN.

In advance of consideration of the application the Committee's attention was drawn to additional comments as set out in the Late Sheet.

No representations were made.

The Committee considered the application and in summary discussed the following:

- The payment of a commuted sum of £290,400, on a date to be agreed, by the applicant in lieu of the onsite provision of affordable housing. This followed the receipt of evidence that Registered Providers would not be able to/willing to deliver such housing. The commuted sum would be delivered by a s106 Agreement and the sum put towards future affordable housing within Central Bedfordshire.
- The means by which the level of the commuted sum had been reached. The planning officer reported this was the first self-build scheme with an affordable housing contribution it and had therefore been submitted for an independent viability assessment. A methodology had since been agreed which could be used for further such schemes in the future.

On being put to the vote 11 Members voted for approval, 0 voted against and 1 abstained.

#### **RESOLVED**

**that Planning Application No. CB/16/02971/OUT relating to land at Chapel End Road and London Lane, Houghton Conquest, Beds. MK45 3LN be approved as set out in the Schedule attached to these minutes.**

#### DM/17/103. **Late Sheet**

In advance of consideration of the planning applications attached to the agenda the Committee received a Late Sheet advising it of additional consultation/publicity responses, comments and proposed additional/amended conditions. A copy of the Late Sheet is attached as an appendix to these minutes.

#### DM/17/104. **Site Inspection Appointment(s)**

#### **NOTED**

**that the next meeting of the Development Management Committee will be held on 3 January 2018.**

#### **RESOLVED**

**that all Members and substitute Members along with the relevant ward representatives be invited to conduct site inspections on 2 January 2018.**

(Note: The meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m. and concluded at 1.06 p.m.)

Chairman .....

Dated .....



**Item No. 6**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	CB/17/03883/FULL
<b>LOCATION</b>	Existing public car park, St Andrews Place, Church Street, Ampthill
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of 8 dwellings alongside the provision of 12 public car parking spaces and demolition of existing boundary wall
<b>PARISH</b>	Ampthill
<b>WARD</b>	Ampthill
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	Cllrs Duckett, Blair & Downing
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Matthew Heron
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	26 July 2017
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	20 September 2017
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Dandara Ltd
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	Called-in by Cllr Duckett due to concerns regarding a loss of parking provision which is required to alleviate on-street parking pressures in the interest of highway safety.
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	Full Application – Recommend Approval

That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

The proposed development, by virtue of the loss of existing parking spaces, would harm the vitality of the town centre and would conflict with the plan-led approach for the allocation of this site for 38 dwellings and a public car park under Policy HA5 of the Site Allocations Supplementary Planning Document 2011. Furthermore, the proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of the occupants of adjacent dwellings as a result of vehicular movements associated with the development. As such, the proposal does not represent sustainable development, contrary to Policies DM3 and DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Item No. 9**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/17/04334/FULL</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>Caldecote House Farm, 8 Caldecote Green, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BX</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Proposed Staff Accommodation</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Northill</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Northill</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllr Mr Firth</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Martin Plummer</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>09 October 2017</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>04 December 2017</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Maudlin G J &amp; Sons</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	<b>Richard Beaty (Building Design) Limited</b>
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	<b>Applicant is related to Cllr C Maudlin</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Full Application - Approval</b>

**Recommendation:**

That Planning Permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following:

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS**

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 17.029.OSmap and 17.29.01A.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

**INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT**

**Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35**

Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. 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.

This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 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 No. 8**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/17/04022/OUT</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>12 North Lane, Haynes, Bedford, MK45 3PW</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Outline Application: erection of up to two dwellings</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Haynes</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Houghton Conquest &amp; Haynes</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllr Mrs Barker</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Dee Walker</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>29 September 2017</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>24 November 2017</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Mrs Roberts</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	<b>Mr R Murdock</b>
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	<b>Ward Cllr call in on grounds of site being outside the settlement envelope, change of use of an orchard, highway safety and visual impact</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Outline Application - Approval</b>

**Recommendation:**

That Planning Permission be APPROVED subject to the following:

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS / REASONS**

- 1 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.

- 2 **No development shall take place until approval of the details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development (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.**

- 3 Any subsequent reserved matters application shall include the following:
  - vehicle parking and garaging in accordance with the Councils standards at the time of submission;
  - cycle parking and storage in accordance with the Councils standards at

the time of submission;

- a refuse collection point located at the site frontage outside of the public highway and any visibility splays;
- a vehicular turning area within the curtilage of all premises taking access directly from the public highway;
- a plan showing the area for construction worker parking provision, deliveries, materials storage clear of the public highway.

Reason: To ensure the development of the site is completed to provide adequate and appropriate highway arrangements at all times. (Section 4 & 7, NPPF)

- 4 **No development shall take place until details of the junction of the access/junction arrangements, shown for indicative purposes on drawing no. 2, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling approved under any subsequent reserved matters application shall be occupied until such time as the agreed works, including the provision of 2.4m x 43.0m visibility splays, clear of all obstruction, have been implemented.**

Reason: This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure the access/junction is acceptable in order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and the premises. (Section 4, NPPF)

- 5 **No development shall take place until an Ecological Enhancement Strategy (EES) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The EES shall include the following:**

- Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed works;
- Review of site potential and constraints informed by an up to date tree survey;
- Detailed design showing retained trees and compensatory planting;
- Extent and location/area of proposed works on appropriate scale plans;
- Type and source of fruit tree species of local provenance;
- Timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development;
- Persons responsible for implementing the works;
- Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance.

The EES shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: This is a pre-commencement condition to ensure the development is designed at the detailed stage to deliver a net gain for biodiversity within this area of the Greensand Ridge Nature Improvement Area. (Section 11, NPPF)

- 6 **No development shall take place until details of the surface water drainage system have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including any land drainage system.**

Thereafter no part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until the approved drainage scheme has been implemented. Page 23

**Reason: This is a pre-commencement condition so that the drainage details can be finalised so that adequate surface water drainage is provided and that existing and future land drainage needs are protected. (Section 10, NPPF)**

- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 02, CBC/001, Supporting Letter.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

### 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. Please note that the unnumbered drawings submitted in connection with this application have been given unique numbers by the Local Planning Authority. The numbers can be sourced by examining the plans on the View a Planning Application pages of the Council's website [www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk](http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk).
3. 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.
4. The permission shall not extend to the indicative layout submitted in support of the application.
5. The applicant is advised that no works associated with the construction of the vehicular access should be carried out within the confines of the public highway without prior consent, in writing, of the Central Bedfordshire Council Highways Department. Upon receipt of this Notice of Planning Approval, the applicant is advised to seek approval from the Local Planning Authority for details of the proposed vehicular access junction in accordance with condition 4 Upon formal approval of details, the applicant is advised to follow this link on the Council website <http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/transport/request/dropped-kerb.aspx> or contact Central Bedfordshire Council's Highway Help Desk, Tel: 0300 300 8049 quoting the Planning Application number. This will enable the necessary consent and procedures under Section 184 of the Highways Act to be implemented. The applicant is also advised that if any of the works associated with the construction of the vehicular access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority

equipment etc.) then the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Page 24

To fully discharge condition 4 the applicant should provide evidence to the Local Planning Authority that the Highway Authority have undertaken the construction in accordance with the approved plan, before the development is brought into use.

6. The applicant is advised that the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 will apply to any works undertaken within the limits of the existing public highway. Further details can be obtained from the Highways Help Desk tel: 0300 300 8049
7. The applicant is advised that parking for contractor's vehicles and the storage of materials associated with this development should take place within the site and not extend into within the public highway without authorisation from the highway authority. If necessary the applicant is advised to contact Central Bedfordshire Council's Highway Help Desk on 0300 300 8049. Under the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 the developer may be liable for any damage caused to the public highway as a result of construction of the development hereby approved.
8. Best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the development site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway, in particular efficient means shall be installed prior to commencement of the development and thereafter maintained and employed at all times during construction of the development of cleaning the wheels of all vehicles leaving the site.
9. The applicant is advised that all cycle parking to be provided within the site shall be designed in accordance with the Central Bedfordshire Council's "Cycle Parking Annexes – July 2010".

**Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35**

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant 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.



**Item No. 7**

**APPLICATION NUMBER** CB/16/02971/OUT  
**LOCATION** Land at Chapel End Road and London Lane,  
Houghton Conquest  
**PROPOSAL** Outline application seeking detailed approval of  
vehicular and pedestrian access only, with all  
other matters reserved; for the creation of 16 self-  
build homes and all associated works including  
surface water attenuation, car parking and  
landscaping.  
**PARISH** Houghton Conquest  
**WARD** Houghton Conquest & Haynes  
**WARD COUNCILLORS** Cllr Mrs Barker  
**CASE OFFICER** Lisa Newlands  
**DATE REGISTERED** 07 July 2016  
**EXPIRY DATE** 06 October 2016  
**APPLICANT** Self-Build-Developments Ltd  
**AGENT** DLP Planning  
**REASON FOR  
COMMITTEE TO  
DETERMINE** Change in Policy position in terms of the 5 year  
housing supply from when it was original resolved  
to grant permission in November 2016.

**Major development recommended for approval with  
Parish Council objection and departure from the  
Development Plan.**

**Call in from Cllr Mrs Barker:**

**The site is outside the settlement envelope**

**The site is in open countryside**

**Concern over new access and parking**

**Self build scheme so only details for outline and  
reserved matters, also no contributions on Section  
106 to local school**

**RECOMMENDED  
DECISION**

**Outline Planning Application – Approve subject to  
a completed S106 Agreement.**

**Recommendation:**

That the outline planning application be APPROVED subject to the completion of a  
Section 106 Agreement

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS / REASONS**

- 1 Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local  
planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.

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.

- 2 Details of the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping, including boundary treatments (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To comply with Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (as amended).

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters 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.

- 4 **No development shall take place until an Environmental Construction Management Plan detailing access arrangements for construction vehicles, on-site parking, loading and unloading areas and materials storage areas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Environmental Construction Management Plan.**

**Reason: This condition relates to the construction period of the development and is necessary in the interest of highway safety, to ensure a satisfactory standard of construction and layout for the development and to comply with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009 and the principles of the NPPF.**

- 5 Any application for reserved matters shall include details of the existing and final ground, ridge and slab levels of the buildings. The details shall include sections through both the site and the adjoining properties and the proposal shall be developed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that an acceptable relationship results between the new development and adjacent buildings and public areas in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.

- 6 The landscaping details required to be submitted by condition 2 of this permission shall include details of hard and soft landscaping (including details of boundary treatments and any public amenity open space, Local Equipped Areas of Play and Local Areas of Play) together with a timetable for its implementation. The development shall be carried out as approved and in accordance with the approved timetable.

The soft landscaping scheme, with particular emphasis on the tree planting on the site boundaries, shall include planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes at the time of their planting, and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; and details of a scheme of management/maintenance of the soft landscaping areas. The soft landscaping areas shall be managed thereafter in accordance with the approved management/maintenance details.

The scheme shall also include an up to date survey of all existing trees and hedgerows on and adjacent to the land, with details of any to be retained (which shall include details of species and canopy spread); measures for their protection during the course of development should also be included. Such agreed measures shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable to be agreed as part of the landscaping scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development would be acceptable in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009 and the principles of the NPPF.

- 7 Unless an alternative routing is agreed at reserved matters approval the development shall not be brought into use until a 2.0m wide footway has been constructed from the junction of the proposed access along the east side of London Lane to Chapel End Road, to join with a 2.0m wide footway along the south side of Chapel End Road along the length of the frontage of the site to join the existing footway, in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Any Statutory Undertakers equipment or street furniture shall be resited to provide an unobstructed footway

Reason

In the interest of road safety and pedestrian movement in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and the principles of the NPPF.

- 8 Before the new access is brought into use the existing access to the north of the site fronting London Lane and not incorporated in the access hereby approved shall be closed.  
(see notes to applicant)

Reason

In the interest of road safety and to reduce the number of points at which traffic will enter and leave the public highway in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and the principles of the NPPF.

- 9 The details required by Condition 2 of this permission shall include full engineering details of the access arrangements shown for indicative

purposes on drawing no. 5074-PL02, including tracking diagrams for an 11.5m length refuse vehicle entering/exiting the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The internal layout of the site approved under any subsequent reserved matters application shall not be brought into use until such a time as the agreed works, including the provision of 2.4m x 43.0m visibility splays, clear of all obstruction, have been implemented.

#### Reason

To provide adequate access visibility between the existing highway and the proposed access, to make the access safe and convenient for the traffic which is likely to use it in the interest of highway safety. In accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and the principles of the NPPF.

10 Prior to approval of the details required by Condition 2 of this permission, a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the agreed Drainage Strategy Report (July 2016) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following:

- Run off shall be restricted to greenfield run off rate and fully attenuated for the (1 in 100 + 35% allowance for climate change).
- Detailed infiltration testing shall be undertaken in accordance with BRE365 to determine if infiltration systems can be used on any part of the site, including permeable paving on private driveways.
- Each plot's drainage requirements shall be in line with the requirements set out in the approved flood risk assessment, drainage strategy report and the design and access statement. The proposals shall not include impermeable areas of over 50% of a plot's total area, unless it is demonstrated that the increase in surface water can be managed appropriately on plot without increasing the agreed run off rate or volume. The need for culverting of surface water features including swales shall be avoided, where this is proposed the length involved should be restricted to a minimum, the hydraulic and environmental design assessed, and appropriate mitigating enhancements to the surrounding environment provided. Maintenance requirements shall also be considered.
- Management of exceedance in the event of system failure shall be demonstrated with the detailed design and finished floor levels shall be set a minimum of 150 mm above ground level, for plots shown to be at risk from any source of flooding floor levels should be set or 300 mm above the estimated flood level.
- Details of land drainage consent shall be provided with the full

detailed design, and an easement provided on the developable side of any existing watercourse to allow access for maintenance.

- Details of the arrangements for future management and maintenance of the design for the entire surface water drainage system.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance details.

Reason : To ensure the approved system will function to a satisfactory minimum standard of operation and maintenance and prevent the increased risk of flooding both on and off site, in accordance with para 103 NPPF.

- 11 **No development shall commence until a waste water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the approved works have been carried out in accordance with the approved waste water strategy.**

**Reason: The approved details may affect the resulting layout of the development and to prevent environmental and amenity problems in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.**

- 12 Prior to the submission of any reserved matters application a Development Parameters Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall set out the guiding principals to be applied in the design of any dwelling, associated structures, hard surfaces and landscaping to be constructed pursuant to this planning permission. The scheme shall include, but not be limited to: maximum building height, built form, materials, plot coverage, set back from plot boundaries, boundary treatment, access and parking facilities and, protection of existing trees and hedges. The design of each dwelling the subject of this permission shall be developed in accordance with the approved Development Parameters Scheme.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure a consistent design approach to the dwellings hereby permitted in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and the principles of the NPPF.

- 13 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 5074-PL02, TS16-212W1 and TS16-212W1.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

## INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. The applicant is advised that in order to comply with the highway related conditions of 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 access and associated road improvements. Further details can be obtained from the Highways Development Management, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ.
4. The applicant is advised that the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 will apply to any works undertaken within the limits of the existing public highway. Further details can be obtained from the Highways Help Desk tel: 0300 300 8049
5. The applicant is advised that if it is the intention to request Central Bedfordshire Council as Local Highway Authority, to adopt the proposed highways as maintainable at the public expense then details of the specification, layout and alignment, width and levels of the said highways together with all the necessary highway and drainage arrangements, including run off calculations shall be submitted to the Highways Agreements Officer, Highways Contract Team, Community Services, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ .
6. All roads to be constructed within the site shall be designed in accordance with Central Bedfordshire Council's publication "Design in Central Bedfordshire A Guide to Development" and the Department for Transport's "Manual for Streets", or any amendment thereto.
7. The applicant is advised that no private surface water drainage system designed as part of the new development will be allowed to enter any existing highway surface water drainage system.

8. The applicant is advised that all cycle parking to be provided within the site shall be designed in accordance with the Central Bedfordshire Council's "Cycle Parking Annexes – July 2010".

**Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35**

The Council acted pro-actively through engagement with the applicant during the application process which led to revisions and additional information in relation 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.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **LATE SHEET**

### **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – Date 06/12/2017**

#### ***Item 6 (Pages 13-34) – CB/17/3883/FULL – Existing Public Car Park, St Andrews Place, Church Street, Ampthill, Beds, MK45 2EW***

##### **Additional Consultations**

N/A

##### **Additional Comments**

Additional comments have been received from residents objecting to this proposal. Comments are summarised as:

- Further reduction to 12 public spaces is unacceptable.
- Improper to not secure the provision of a free car park legally.
- The Town Council are willing to operate a free car park.
- A free car park would alleviate pressures within other public car parks.
- Harm to the vitality of Ampthill Town Centre.
- Harm to the character of the area, including the Conservation Area.

One of the above mentioned objections also raises concern with regards to this application representing an additional 'phase' to the original, comprehensive, development. As such, it is suggested that affordable housing should be sought.

The comprehensive development has been completed and the associated car park has been operating since October 2015. As such, it is Officer opinion that this proposed development can not be regarded as an additional phase to the original development.

For reasons mentioned within the Officer report, it is therefore not reasonable to secure affordable housing at the site.

An additional response has also been received from the applicant addressing objections received. Comments are summarised as:

- The car park was attributed a positive value for the original, comprehensive scheme. As such, it did not result in reduced affordable housing provision.
- A Car Park Management Plan secured a maximum fee for use of the facility. It was not intended to be a free facility.
- The car park has been completed to high standards, but has been significantly underused.
- Initiatives to increase occupancy included; directional signage, reduction in charges, online advertisement, leafleting and discussions with the Council to query road layout alterations to increase use.
- The car park is not viable.

- 12 spaces would meet the maximum average daily occupancy.

### **Additional Informative**

10. 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 7 (Pages 35-56) – CB/16/02971/OUT – Land at Chapel End Road and London Lane, Houghton Conquest***

#### **Additional Consultations**

N/A

#### **Additional Comments**

The recommendation should say – outline planning application – approve subject to a completed S106 agreement.

### ***Item 8 (Pages 57-70) – CB/17/04022/OUT – 12 North Lane, Haynes***

#### **Additional Comments**

The following Reason for Recommendation was omitted from the agenda's officer's report:

#### Reason for Recommendation:

The application site is adjoining and closely related to the existing settlement envelope for Haynes and is considered to be a sustainable location for planning purposes. The proposal is contrary to Policy DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document but would not result in any harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety and archaeological impact and therefore accords with Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Document. The development would enable the delivery of a replacement orchard to enhance the local habitat thus considered to add weight in favour of the development and therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF

#### Report amendments:

1. Page 59 within the Site Location paragraph, the last paragraph should read:  
*The site is located abutting the defined settlement envelope for Haynes, lies within the Greensand Ridge Nature Improvement Area and contains a Habitat of Principal Importance as being an orchard.*
2. Page 63 paragraph 1.5:  
Social

*The provision of housing is a benefit of the scheme which should be given significant weight. Furthermore Haynes is regarded as a large village which has access to a number of services identified in the previous paragraph. The village is served by a bus service which stops on Bedford Road directly opposite the site. Therefore the village can be regarded as a sustainable location and it is considered that the settlement offers services and facilities that can help to accommodate the growth resultant from this scheme. Nearby services are considered to be accessible for new residents. Given that the scheme is for less than 10no dwellings, the Council is unable to secure contributions to local infrastructure in accordance with national policy.*

3. Remove paragraph 1.6.2

**Item 9 (Pages 71-78) – CB/17/04334/FULL – Caldecote House, 8 Caldecote Green, Upper Caldecote, Biggleswade, SG18 9BX**

**Additional Consultations**

Northill Parish Council object to the application because it proposes a permanent building when a temporary building would be more acceptable as it would only be used for part of the year.

**Additional Comments**

For the reasons outlined in the Officer Committee Report the proposed building is considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

**Additional Informative**

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.

This page is intentionally left blank