# **LATE SHEET**

# **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 17 OCTOBER 2012**

Item 6 (Page 11-20) – CB/12/01412/VOC – Portland Industrial Estate, Hitchin Road, Arlesey.

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses** 

None.

#### **Additional Comments**

E-mail received from the applicant's agent on 16/10/12:

I am writing in connection with the application which is being presented to the Development Control Committee of the 17th October 2012. I have reviewed the report produced by Mark Spragg and I feel that there are a number of issues which need to be clarified, albeit these issues have already been raised by Chris Daniels, Daniel Bros. (Shefford) Ltd in his recent letter to the Councillors sitting on the Committee. Firstly, it would be more appropriate to describe the application as a variation of Condition 15 of planning approval CB/10/02584/REN. As detailed in Chris's letter it is still our intention to provide a footway through the Portland Industrial Estate although the footway will only be 0.8-0.9m wide close to the junction of the access road with Hitchin Road. The use of the alley way will provide an alternative and safer route directly to Hitchin Road. Therefore, it is incorrect to state that the alleyway is the sole route. The report also fails to mention the location of bus stops which are much closer to the alleyway, with buses providing a sustainable form of transport to both Arlesey and more importantly Hitchin.

The comments made regarding "The principle of development in this development in this location would not have been acceptable by the Inspector in allowing the original consent and it is not considered that anything has changed by the detail provided in the application" is statement is deliberately misleading and as you are aware the main reasons connected with the outline application were the loss of industrial land, residential amenity and noise. Therefore, I would be grateful if this issue could be confirmed to the Committee. Whilst, the issue of pedestrian access was considered this does not lead to the assumptions made that the appeal would have been dismissed. Furthermore, as previously advised the layout and orientation of the approved scheme is vastly different to that which was the subject of the original appeal.

I would be grateful if you could ensure that the contents of this email are presented as an update to the Committee thereby ensuring that a more balanced report is presented to Committee.

#### Additional/Amended Reasons

None.

# Item 7 (Page 21-42) – CB/12/02740/FULL – Leighton Linslade (Greenleas) Lower School, Kestrel Way, Leighton Buzzard.

## **Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

## Highways (04/10/2012)

I refer to my memorandum to you of 7 September 2012, where I commented on the above application.

Within those comments I recommended that a parent drop off point be provide and I offered condition 8 in my memorandum which read as follows:

Development shall not begin until details for car parking arrangement for parents to drop off and pick up pupils at the beginning and end of the day for 10 cars within the confines of the site and 10 cars within the confines of the highway network has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall also include management details and no building shall be occupied until those parking spaces have been provided in accordance with the approved details.

Having discussed this matter further with my colleagues I confirm that a parent drop off point should not be provided. As a result i recommend that the above condition be deleted from any decision notice if permission were to be granted.

## Sustainable Transport (11/10/2012)

Note: The Local Planning Authority has received a revised School Travel Plan on 08/10/2012 which was submitted in response to Sustainable Transport's previous comments. Sustainable Transport's comments in respect of the revised School Travel Plan are as follows:

I have received a copy of the travel plan for the new Greenleas site and over all am happy with it and can advise you that it meets the approval criteria.

I would still advise that we continue to include a condition for the travel plan that ensures that the travel plan and the issues that it addresses are monitored and reviewed. This will ensure that the school makes the most of the opportunity to set a culture of sustainable travel and continues to encourage this. Also that there is a formal mechanism for dealing with any particular travel and transport issues that may arise.

# Environment Agency (10/10/2012)

We have reviewed the information received from Willmott Dixon Construction Limited regarding the above mentioned site, which was received on 2 October 2012 and wish to make the following comments. We are able to remove our objection. It is recommended that a condition be imposed to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

## Bedfordshire Police - Architectural Liaison Officer (11/10/2012 & 15/10/2012)

Concerns are raised that the application does not adequately address community safety. The Local Planning Authority has received a revised Design and Access Statement on 15/10/2012 which was submitted in response to the Architectural Liaison Officer's comments. The revised Design and Access Statement addresses a number of community safety matters which were considered by the school and architects at the design stage and sets out the general approach to community safety and the proposed security/safety measures which include the zoning of the site, fencing, lighting and access arrangements. The Architectural Liaison Officer has confirmed he is satisfied with the proposals subject to satisfactory details relating to fencing and lighting. These can be secured by condition as recommended by Development Management Officers.

### **Additional Comments**

Since the completion of the Committee report for this item, the emerging parking strategy, which will form part of the Central Bedfordshire Local Transport Plan, has been endorsed by CBC Executive for Development Management purposes. The maximum Parking Standards for Non-residential uses set out within the emerging strategy indicate a maximum of 34 parking spaces would be required for the development. A total of 39 parking spaces are proposed as part of this application. With regard to Educational Establishments the strategy provides the following guidance:

Standards for parking at schools have been set to limit the amount of space within the school grounds dedicated to parking provision. The parking allocation covers staff, visitors and parents. The allocation does not include the potential for parking by pupils. Only in exceptional circumstances where road safety is the prime consideration, should drop off and pick up points for pupils (including school buses) be within school premises (a full justification must be submitted to the Council along with a Travel Plan and arrangements for managing the on-site parking).

All new or expanded educational establishments that are likely to generate more traffic movement or parking requirements will be required to implement a Travel Plan. The school Travel Plan will make provision for the appropriate management of overspill parking and the enforcement of any provisions relating thereto.

Bus / coach loading and waiting areas, either on the premises or on the highway, will be required for most new schools and tertiary education facilities. Sufficient space should be reserved to allow buses to enter and leave the site safely and secure cycle parking at all schools and higher education establishments must be provided. (Pages 45-46)

The proposal is considered to be consistent with this advice.

#### **Additional Conditions**

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) dated September 2012, reference SSFRA-P5854/WW-01 revision 0, compiled by JPP Consulting Ltd, and the following mitigation measures

detailed within the FRA:

- 1. Limiting the surface water run-off generated by the 1:100 year critical storm plus allowance for climate change, so that it will not exceed the rate of 95.8 litres per second, and shall therefore not increase the risk of flooding off-site.
- 2. Demonstration within the FRA that the impermeable area of the finished development shall not exceed 0.544 hectares in total;

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Should the designs be altered in such a way that proposes an increase in impermeable surfacing or such that leads to an increase in surface water discharge rates, appropriate measures to mitigate the impacts of this to ensure flood risk does not increase must be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site and to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.

Prior to the creation of any pedestrian/cycle route into the rear of the school site, full details of the rear access arrangements including any associated enclosures to the school site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The pedestrian/cycle access arrangements shall then be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To protect, as far as possible the character of the locality. (Policy BE8 S.B.L.P.R).

Item 8 (Page 43-50) – CB/12/02693/FULL – 1 Ashton Square, Dunstable.

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses** 

None.

**Additional Comments** 

None.

**Additional/Amended Conditions** 

None.

Item 9 (Page 51-60) – CB/12/02561/FULL – Land at 28 The Avenue, Sandy.

<b>Additional Consultation/Publici</b>	ity Responses
--	---------------

None.

**Additional Comments** 

None.

**Additional/Amended Conditions** 

None.