

## **LATE SHEET**

### **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 29 February 2012**

#### **SCHEDULE B**

***Item 9 (Pages 75-100) CB/11/03370/FULL – Retention of use of land as a residential caravan site for 6 Gypsy families, including hardstanding, utility blocks and landscaping, land to the rear of 197 Hitchin Road, Arlesey***

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

No additional responses received

#### **Amended Conditions**

No amended conditions

#### **Additional Informatives**

None required

***Item 10 (Page 101-118) – CB/11/04549/FULL – The Bell, High Street, Westoning***

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

##### **Petitions:**

Two petitions have been received in Support of the development; a 241 signature petition was received on the 14<sup>th</sup> February, and a 138 signature petition received on the 27<sup>th</sup> February.

##### **Additional Individual letters:**

#### **17 letters of Support received:**

The letters are mainly from patrons of the Bell Public House, 8 are from Westoning residents, and 9 are from outside the Westoning area.

Letters indicate support for the development on grounds that the Public House needs to be upgraded, and that the additional houses would help facilitate the improvements. The letters indicated that they did not wish to see the Public House close.

**1 further letter of Objection received:**

18 Bell Close, Westoning detailed the reasons they chose to live in Bell Close

- 1 Character of Bell Close
- 2 The nice scenic quality of Westoning and Bell Close
- 3 The Bell PH being centre of the village
- 4 The Bell PH being land mark for village
- 5 A street and village where there is no over development or cramped build
- 6 The present design of the street and houses in Bell Close

It was noted that should the development go ahead the above would be ruined. It also noted the Localism Bill and the wishes of the residents.

**1 letter received from Richard Roberts, Licensee of the Bell Public House:**

- 1 States that the renovation of the pub is required in competitive market.
- 2 Noted that the design of the houses was subject to pre-application discussion with the planning department.
- 3 Showed support within the village, indicating the petition submitted.
- 4 Stated that they did not think that the Bell Public House would remain open unless the renovation was undertaken.

**Additional Comments**

None

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

No additional or amended conditions.

***Item 11 (Page 119-128) – CB/11/0450/LB – The Bell, High Street, Westoning***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

Additional Individual letters:

**9 letters of Support received:**

The letters are mainly from patrons of the Bell Public House, 1 is from a Westoning resident, and 8 are from outside the Westoning area.

Letters indicate support for the development on grounds that the Public House needs to be upgraded, and that the additional houses would help facilitate the improvements. The letters indicated that they did not wish to see the Public House close.

It is noted that the Listed Building application only relates to works to the Listed Building, and therefore comments relating to the 3 dwellings can not be considered as part of this application.

**1 letter received from Richard Roberts, Licensee of the Bell Public House:**

- States that the renovation of the pub is required in competitive market.
- Noted that the design of the houses was subject to pre-application discussion with the planning department.
- Showed support within the village, indicating the petition submitted.
- Stated that they did not think that the Bell Public House would remain open unless the renovation was undertaken.

**Additional Comments**

None

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

No additional or amended conditions.

**Item 12 (Page 129-138) – CB/11/04175/FULL – The Winston Churchill, Church St, Dunstable**

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

1 letter received:

3 Priory Heights:

Strongly opposes the construction of the conservatory on the roof, but unable to attend the committee, states that their flat is directly parallel to the proposal. Stated that this development would cause loss of light and overshadowing to their property. Suggested that members should view the application site from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of Priory Heights.

*It is noted that although this is additional representation, the resident of 3 Priory Heights did object when the application was originally submitted, and therefore the earlier representation is considered within the main report. Photographs have been taken from the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> floor of Priory Heights to show to members.*

**Additional Comments**

None

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

No additional or amended conditions.

**Item 13 (Page 139-158) – CB/11/03412/FULL– Barford Road Blunham**

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

None

**Additional Comments**

An email was sent to all members from the Chair of Governors for John Donne Lower school in Blunham, regarding the education contribution and how this is sought.

A response has been received from the Head of School Organisation & Capital Planning in relation to this matter and states:

*The Chair of Governors is correct that education contributions are secured, where they can be justified, in accordance with the adopted Planning Obligations SPD. The impact of the development on the overall permanent capacity of a school vs. numbers currently on roll, and the need therefore for additional permanent build is indeed the main criteria.*

*Organisational issues i.e. temporary 'bulges' working through the school, can be managed with our support, and through the use of temporary accommodation where necessary where pressures arise as a result of demographic changes not just from housing development.*

*With regard to this specific planning proposal we evaluated the potential impact at Lower School level and determined that planning obligations could not be supported.*

*At the point of evaluation John Donne Lower School had 72 pupils on roll, against a capacity of 90. The additional pupil product forecast from the proposed development would have added a further 7 pupils, taking up some of the surplus places but not requiring additional permanent provision.*

*Area health authority data also indicates that an average of 8 pre school children per age group currently exist within the school's catchment. Set against a PAN of 18 we can see that the school's current capacity is sufficient to provide for the local area, even with the additional impact of the proposed development.*

*The latest school data indicates a total of 77 pupils on roll with year groups of 14, 17, 15, 14 and 17. Even if the total pupil product from the proposed development were to cause pressures in any one year group this would be temporary.*

*I was sorry to read that Chair of Governors feels let down by Education Officers as we have in the past two years supported the school, with the Diocese, in the allocation of approximately £220k of Voluntary Aided Capital for a new Nursery to be built, and in the forthcoming year's programme for a further allocation of £90k for heating, fire alarms and classrooms. These were deemed to be the school's priorities at the time.*

Given the current capacity at the school, and the advice of the Education Officer, it is considered that there is no justification for seeking an educational contribution for the John Donne Lower School in this instance.

#### **Additional/Amended Reasons**

None

***Item 14 (Page 159-174) – CB/11/04175/FULL – Land at former Fairholme, Fairfield Road, Biggleswade***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

None

**Additional Comments**

Still awaiting Legal Agreement from developer concerning affordable units in perpetuity.

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

***Item 15 (Page 175-184) – CB/11/04334/FULL – 54 High Street, Sandy***

**Additional Comments**

In response to local concerns, should permission be granted, it is advised that two further informatives be added:

- 1) Parents are to be advised not to park on the pavement or illegally when dropping off or collecting children from the premises.
- 2) Measures shall be put in place on the site to prevent children from gaining access to the highway.
- 3) The Committee are advised that the site plan in the agenda is incorrect and that the correct site plan is attached to the late sheet

**Additional/Amended Conditions**

None.

## **SCHEDULE C**

### ***Item 16 (Page 185-198) – CB/11/03682/FULL – Land adjacent to Marshalls Avenue, Shillington***

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

Further comments have been received from Shillington Parish Council:

"I write to advise you that in the light of new information received relating to this application the Parish Council wishes to withdraw its support.

Having read your report to the Central Bedfordshire Council's Development Management Committee meeting to be held on 29 February 2012 it is noted that yet again, as part of the application, a viability assessment has been produced which states that the scheme would not be viable if the calculated Section 106 financial contribution is made and therefore, taking into account of the Council's strategic aim to secure more affordable housing, it is concluded that this again overrides the justification for financial contributions in this particular case. This will be the second time in a four week period that we will have missed out on substantial financial support to improve the infrastructure of our parish on the back of enforced development.

Shillington Parish Council is quite appalled that yet again CBC has decided to waive a considerable amount of s106 money, a proportion of which could have been allocated for use to improve our village facilities. Indeed our previous correspondence in connection with planning application CB/11/03036/FULL submitted by Grand Union Housing Group in respect of Scyttels Court, Vicarage Close, made it very clear that we deplore the council's practice of waiving Section 106 contributions, which in this new case would amount to approximately £96,000".

#### **Additional Comments**

None

#### **Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**

None