

Item No. 6

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/13/03448/FULL
LOCATION	Land Opposite Boundary Farm North Of, Baldock Road, Stotfold
PROPOSAL	Erection of building and associated works for the public display of The Saunders Collection of steam engines, fairground rides, mechanical organs and associated memorabilia and change of use from agricultural land to form an extension to the Stotfold Mill Nature Reserve.
PARISH	Stotfold
WARD	Stotfold & Langford
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Clarke, Saunders & Saunders
CASE OFFICER	Nikolas Smith
DATE REGISTERED	16 October 2013
EXPIRY DATE	15 January 2014
APPLICANT	Mr J Saunders
AGENT	DLP Planning Ltd
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	This development would represent a departure from the Development Plan, the applicant is an elected Member of Central Bedfordshire Council and the land is owned by the Council.
RECOMMENDED DECISION	That the application is referred to the Secretary of State. In the event that the application is not called-in, that it is approved subject to conditions. The application is referable to the Secretary of State because the development would comprise a leisure use outside of a town centre, the floor space would be in excess of 5000sqm and the development would represent a departure from the Development Plan.

Summary of recommendation:

Whilst the proposed development would conflict with policies contained within the Development Plan, material planning considerations outweigh harm that would be caused by it. In the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, it would be in accordance with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

Site Location:

The site has an area of around 11ha and is currently used for agricultural purposes. It is around 200m East of the urban edge of Stotfold and around 400m West of the A1(M). To the South is Baldock Road (A507), with the nearest neighbouring house, Boundary Farm, on the opposite side of the road. To the North and East of the site is agricultural land.

To the West is the River Ivel and Stotfold Mill and its nature reserve (which is

accessed from a link near to the mill).

The site falls outside of the Stotfold Settlement and any defined town centre. It is within the open countryside. It is classified as falling with Flood Zone 1 (the lowest risk category).

The Application:

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a building to house the Saunders' Collection of steam engines, fairground rides, mechanical organs and associated memorabilia. It would also be used as a leisure venue for tea dances, Christmas shows and band nights.

The proposed development comprises a building with an overall footprint of 7560m² measuring 144m by 42m. The building would be sited about 30m from the western boundary of the site with an eaves height of 9.8m, rising to 14m at the highest point of the curve. The curvature of the roof would fall away to the rear to a lowered eaves height of 7.2m. A carousel feature section would have a gateway entrance eaves height of 11.5m which would curve (inverted) to 9.1m.

The building would be orientated on an east-west axis such that its main façade, including the entrance and drop off, would be south facing. The site access and main area of car parking would be to the east of the building with coach parking to the north east of the building.

The principal aspects of the building would be to the south – with the public entrance and also a bay containing one of the carousel rides and to the west, which would provide an aspect over the River Ivel and the proposed extension of the Nature Reserve.

The eastern half of the building would contain provision for the Wurlitzer Organ in a self contained area which could be screened off from those parts of the building used more generally to display the Collection. The functional parts of the development – offices workshops, catering facilities and so forth would be on the north eastern flank.

Access to the site would be provided by a left in and left out arrangement from the eastbound side of the A507. The existing central reservation to the east of the site entrance would be extended to prevent right turns into and out of the site but without interrupting access to Boundary farm opposite.

To the front of the site, between a concourse at the entrance to the building designed to enable coach parties to disembark close to the building entrance and the site boundary, is proposed a water feature. This would serve multiple purposes in enabling steam watercraft to be demonstrated, providing a water resource that could be utilized for the boilers of the steam engines and moreover to provide storage for the run-off from the roof and car parking prior to controlled discharge into the River Ivel.

There would sufficient space around the building to the west and north west to enable activities such as the external steaming of traction engines and for the demonstration of ploughing.

Planning permission is also sought for the change of use of an area to the west of the site, between the site boundary and the river of 3.16 hectares to create an extension to the Stotfold Water Mill Nature Reserve. This land is also currently in the ownership of Central Bedfordshire Council. The change of use of this land would allow for a pedestrian and cycle access from Baldock Road, via the proposed development to Stotfold Mill.

Nature and Frequency of Uses

The following uses are proposed at the site:

Use	Approximate number of days per year
Open days	211
Tea dances	90
Big Band Nights	10
Christmas Shows	40

The building has been designed to accommodate a maximum of 650 guests to the Big Band Nights and Christmas Shows – the expected capacity for the tea dances is fewer – around 550 capacity.

Opening hours are proposed as follows:

Use	Hours	
	Normal hours	July-August and BH
Open days	1030-1700	1000-1900
Education/enthusiast visits	1030-1700	1000-1900
Tea Dances	1600-1930	1600-1930
Big Band Nights	2000-0000	2000-0000
	Afternoon	Evening
Christmas Shows	1430-1700	1930-2200

Staff

The applicant has set out that the following staff levels are expected when the building opened but may be likely to increase, dependent on the level of activities. Staff would include permanent jobs in administration and in connection with the operation of the building, and casual staff in respect of open days and events, the numbers of which are likely to be dependent on season and demand.

Staff	Numbers
Administrative staff	1 Full Time
Casual Staff During Open Days	1 Part Time
Entertainment Events	50 Part Time
Volunteer Staff	10

Relevant Policies:

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009)

CS3	Healthy and Sustainable Communities
CS4	Linking Communities – Accessibility and Transport
CS9	Providing Jobs
CS11	Rural Economy and Tourism
CS13	Climate Change
CS14	High Quality Development
CS16	Landscape and Woodland
CS17	Green Infrastructure
CS18	Biodiversity and Geological Consideration
DM1	Renewable Energy
DM2	Sustainable Construction of New Buildings
DM3	High Quality Development
DM4	Development Within and Beyond Settlement Envelopes
DM9	Providing a Range of Transport
DM14	Landscape and Woodland
DM15	Biodiversity
DM17	Accessible Green Spaces

Appendix F (Parking Strategy) of the Central Bedfordshire Local Transport Plan (2012)

Planning History:

There is no relevant planning history at this site but the planning history relating to similar development proposals at other sites in Stotfold is described elsewhere in this report.

Representations:

Town Council	No objection, in fact the Council supports the application on its local value to employment, education and training that it will provide to Stotfold and the whole Central Bedfordshire area. It will also be a very valuable addition to tourism within Central Bedfordshire and will put a collection of national and international importance on permanent display.
Neighbours	Press and site notices were displayed that advertised the planning application. 7 responses were received (6 in opposition and 1 in support to the proposals), which are summarised as follows:

Objection

- Not enough consultation was carried out
- People using the pedestrian and cycle route along Baldock Road could cause noise and disturbance late at night
- Visitors to the museum could park on Baldock

- Road rather than at the site
- Baldock Road should not be opened up for access to the museum
- The type of function provided at the site could be expanded to include weddings and concerts, etc.
- The description of development is not correct
- The scale and design of the building would be out of character with the site
- The land is good quality agricultural land
- There would noise and light pollution
- Traffic generated will result in congestion and the road layout would encourage U-turning
- The scale of the development would be excessive
- There would be a loss of privacy
- The scale of the building would dominate the area
- The development would be harmful to the nature reserve
- Some of the uses proposed would cause noise and disturbance problems
- The building would be as much for entertainment as a museum
- Other sites have been rejected for this development
- The business might not be able to succeed

Support

- The development would generate much needed tourism incomes and would compliment Henlow Bridge Lakes camping facilities
- There would no traffic problems

The Stotfold Mill Preservation Trust has written to the Council to say that it would be pleased to enter in to a lease with the Council for the proposed nature reserve extension land if it was offered. Discussions between the applicant, the Council and the Trust are ongoing in respect of the content of the nature reserve extension, in the event of approval.

Consultee responses:

Trees and Landscape Officer

The site consists at present of open farmland with the western edge being proposed as an extension to the nature reserve and the remaining approx. two thirds of the site developed for the Museum.

Area proposed for the addition to the nature reserve rises from water filled lowland onto slightly higher ground separated by a mature native hedge running approx. north/south along the existing field boundary. This hedge would be retained and along with the rising ground does

afford some screening viewed from the west.

There is an extensive amount of information supplied with this application including landscape detail, this includes a boundary proposal for the part of the site that is to be developed as Museum that consists of a 7 metre wide planting belt consisting of native shrub planting. In addition to this there is further landscaping of grass and standard tree planting which in the north-east corner is up to an additional 15 metres in width.

Viewed from the A507 the site at present has a mature native hedge that exists along the road boundary with the area close to the existing layby incorporating a low bund with planting. This existing hedge runs the full length of the access road and would be retained, there is additional low bunding proposed.

Planting along the access road consists of an avenue of one species and cultivar of tree. I would suggest that we should look for more variety here. The cultivar chosen is very fastigate in habit and I would suggest that in this setting tree species with a more spreading and natural habit would be suitable. In addition with more issues affecting trees as regards disease and pests it would be sensible to avoid the one species approach.

Obvious issues with this application are the scale of the building and its visibility from the A1 and to some extent from the A507. No amount of landscaping is going to effectively screen this.

From the A507 there will be some screening with existing hedge lines and the proposed lake area will set the building back from the road. The area to the south west of the lake is likely to be the dampest and existing vegetation within this area would indicate so. The use of more native wetland trees, Alder etc. would be preferable. I would suggest that *Prunus plena* should be changed to a more suitable species. There is some additional mounding proposed here.

From the A1 the site will be readily visible. To some extent this east and north boundary could benefit from some low scalloped bunding to increase the initial height of the planting and perhaps include more native trees that mature to a greater height, trying to include trees that will have an impact viewing the site from the A1 (eg good autumn colour etc)

With regards to planting, the emphasis should be on native planting around the periphery with no objections to

the use of more ornamental species within the confines of the site.

Between the lake and the building there is a proposal for planting of a single row of Sorbus aria Lutescens. Same would apply in that single species planting can be vulnerable to loss. This species can be vulnerable to fire blight and although a "safe" choice of ornamental tree is fairly unimaginative. This would be an area where the use of a couple of fastigate species would be a better choice as opposed to their use on the access road. There would also be the option to include two good specimen trees, one each side of the access to the jetty, may be Liquidambar or Sorbus torminalis, trees with good leaf shape and autumn colour.

The cycle path that enters the site from the south would not appear to end at a real destination, in that it ends at the jetty access with no cycle racks or anywhere to leave a bike. It may be preferable to rethink this area.

Ornamental shrub planting within the grounds would appear to be acceptable in species densities etc.

Wetland planting would be better commented on by Ecology.

The legend refers to 2.2 metre palisade fencing and gates. Looking at the plans I am uncertain where this is to be located. It appears to have a large area of the access road that is ungated or fenced and would be not visible from the A507 particularly at night (security of the site) Are the plans also indicating additional palisade fencing within the site itself? it appears to divide the parking area from the landscape to the east but if this is so I cannot see a reason for this.

There is no detail of what is proposed for the area of additional nature reserve. We need to have details of what is proposed.

Following comments made by both the Tree Officer and the Landscape Officer, the landscaping plans have been amended.

Landscape Officer

This site - the land between the River Ivel and the A1 - forms an attractive rural setting for Stotfold and is valuable in that it provides views of the attractive tree lined riverside which provides so much amenity and recreational value on the edge of the town.

My comments made at the pre-app stage still stand - I think permitting an industrial scale building in this location

will severely detract from landscape character and set a precedent for further development between the site and the A1.

The Landscape Character Assessment considers the Upper Ivel Valley to be a landscape in decline, largely as a result of urban impact and the loss of traditional features in the river valley. The Assessment highlights the need to avoid urbanising change in the river valley, which is highly sensitive to change.

I am concerned that introducing a large building, albeit for leisure and heritage purposes, will detract from an attractive part of the Ivel valley at what is the gateway to the "village" scale part of Stotfold. The current rural buffer between Stotfold and the A1 is important visually - it provides a break between the trunk road and the settlement and contrasts with the "shopping village" experience to the east of the Baldock turn roundabout. This latter development is set at the foot of a slope and is relatively well screened by the landform. In contrast, the Application would introduce large buildings into the highly visible setting of the valley floor. The arable land is very open with little woodland or hedgerows outside of the A507 road corridor. There is no context of building so that new development will appear incongruous and out of scale. I disagree with the findings of the landscape Study, which does not seem to take account of the height of the development. The Visual assessment provided is very limited in its extent and does not provide any visualisation of the development in the photographs.

The existing edge of Stotfold is very subtle, with residential properties nesting within the wooded setting of the Ivel Valley. There are only limited views of rooftops. The site is very exposed in views from the east and north and sits at the foot of the slope rising up to Topplars Hill. In the open panorama seen from this popular viewpoint there are no buildings of significance to be seen.

Although there are some gains to habitat to the west of the site, I do not feel that the landscape mitigation is adequate to screen or integrate the development from the north and east. As CBC is the landowner, the Authority should, if minded to permit the Development, investigate the scope to create a wooded setting in scale with the building. The landscape proposals for the north and east of the site are particularly limited in extent and will create a rigid outline to the development. There has been no attempt to use existing field boundaries as a more natural boundary for the screen planting. I accept that the built footprint has been kept to the lower ground.

I also have some detailed comment about the planting scheme :-

1 Entrance Avenue trees - The tree chosen is a form of maple with a very narrow columnar habit. 38 trees are proposed - which will create a very "busy " entrance. I would much prefer fewer trees, with wider spacing and preferably a native species more typical of the river valley. Lime would be an obvious choice.

2 Wildflower grassland - I welcome the use of these meadow areas but suggest the small triangle on the eastern boundary would be better planted as a native shrub mix, to save on an awkward area to manage but also to reinforce the boundary.

3 Use of ornamental varieties rather than the native form -

In general, this scheme will create a more formal setting for the building than seems appropriate for the river valley setting. We need to ensure that planting respects the locality particularly in the boundary screening and where there are views into the site eg with the avenue. This does not preclude planting that will convey the funfair!

Alder species - the lake is a natural habitat - but the alder chosen is the Italian - which has a strong form and larger cones -rather than the native Alder. I would be happy to keep the Italian alder if groups of native alder were also planted in the vicinity.

Field maple - again why plant a more narrow variety of field maple - *A. campestre* "Elsrijk" - rather than the native tree ; I realise it is to create a grouped effect , but again, I feel the planting around the lake should develop a rural quality and not be over formal.

Birch - the very white stemmed *Betula jacquemontii* seems to have been used throughout. This would be acceptable close to the building but the native birch should be used in the informal and native shrub and woodland planting. - if so there would need to be a far more extensive landscaping scheme to enable approval on landscape grounds.

4 Boundary screening :although the landscape strategy proposes 7m screening belts , which will go some way too mitigate the development, the square layout will still be very intrusive and lead to an unsympathetic edge. The choice of the columnar *Acer Elsrijk* is not acceptable - this is too formal a tree for the countryside edge.

5 Internal landscaping - The style of planting does not respond sufficiently to the riverside setting - although there have been some changes made, I still think there is too great an emphasis on ornamental trees eg the very suburban whitebeam *Sorbus aria* "Lutescens". Some of the shrub planting is again very urban - *Phormiums* for eg. I would prefer some revisions to increase wildlife value and create a more *locally* distinctive landscape.

6 Scope for expansion : A further issue which I think is still worth allowing for in the design is whether there will be a need to expand the facility - eg to facilitate visiting steam engines etc for rallies or to allow access to the adjacent agricultural land for ploughing contests etc ? If so - an off-road access should be planned.

I am concerned that the car-parking proposed would not be adequate for a major event .

To conclude -

Construction of a very large modern building of an industrial design is out of character but could be mitigated if more land is made available for planting in scale with the development .

Views of the building and coach parking will be difficult to screen- although I expect that a visitor attraction needs to have some visibility for the public. The elevations need to be high quality , with mitigation achieved through colour and materials so that glimpses of the development are of a high quality facility.

At present I object to this development on the grounds of both an inappropriate location as development of this scale is contrary to our Policy to protect landscape character. It would be more acceptable if substantial additional landscape mitigation is secured eg the planting of an native woodland to aid integration and protection of views from the north and east .

To accord with our Policy, it would also be necessary to revise aspects of the internal planting so that it responds to the Ivel Valley.

There is also the issue of whether this Application would increase the likelihood of further development east to the A1.

Subsequent discussions between the applicant and the Councils Landscape and Trees and Landscape Officers resulted in amendments to the landscaping scheme at the site and the following further comments from the Landscape Officer:

Following comments made by both the Tree Officer and

the Landscape Officer, the landscaping plans have been amended. Lime trees will be planted at the entrance to create a more traditional start to the feature avenue of trees. Elsewhere, additional areas of native shrubbery have been incorporated to enhance the rural edge. Native alder will be planted near the lake to benefit wildlife and Turkish hazel used as a feature tree on the west frontage to the building. The planting scheme retains a formal character but these changes will increase its acceptability in terms of landscape character.

Sustainable
Officer

Growth

I have reviewed the documents provided to me and have the following comments:

- The Sustainability Statement includes a BREEAM pre-assessment of the proposed development. I am pleased that energy and water elements of the assessment achieved minimum credits requirement for Excellent and Outstanding BREEAM rating. I am disappointed though that the overall score is not high enough to achieve excellent rating, encouraged by the Council's policy DM2. I note that the proposed development scored poorly on ecology elements of the assessment. Given that as part of this application an extension to the existing Stotfold Mill Nature Reserve is proposed, I would encourage the applicant to revise the ecological element of the assessment to whether there is a scope to increase biodiversity value of the site and achieve higher scores.
- The Council's policy DM1: Renewable energy requires the new development to meet 10% of its energy demand from zero or low carbon sources (e.g. renewable technologies). The Sustainability Statement suggest that the above development has a potential for installation of a large PV array (circa 450kWp), subject to load calculations. I would like to see a planning condition attached, if the planning permission to be granted for the scheme, to ensure that the policy requirement is met.
- Policy DM 2 also encourages implementation of features which will increase the scheme's environmental credentials, e.g. green roofs. The proposed development has an extensive roof space and I would encourage inclusion of green roof into the design alongside PV arrays.

Bedfordshire and River
Ivel Internal Drainage
Board

No objection subject to condition controlling storm water runoff.

Sustainable Transport Officer No objection. Travel Plan can be approved.

Archaeologist

The proposed development site contains a series of crop marks of a sub-rectangular enclosure (HER 16830); although this site is presently undated comparison with similar features in Central Bedfordshire suggest that it is likely to be a later prehistoric or Roman settlement. There is a further crop mark complex immediately to the south comprising an enclosure and rectilinear features (HER 13340). Small scale archaeological investigation in advance of road construction on the northern edge of this complex identified a number of archaeological features including ditches and post holes, finds indicate a date range from the prehistoric to early Saxon period. These are heritage assets with an archaeological interest as defined by the *National Planning Policy Framework*. These archaeological sites form part of a wider archaeological landscape in and around Stotfold which contains substantial evidence for extensive archaeological remains dating from the prehistoric to Roman periods. The site is known to contain archaeological remains and has the potential to contain further, as yet unidentified archaeological sites and features related to these sites or the wider archaeological landscape.

In their comments on a request for pre-application advice (CB/13/01694/PAPC) the Archaeology Team identified the presence of heritage assets with archaeological interest within the proposed development site and its archaeological potential. It was noted that on this basis any planning application would need to conform to Paragraph 128 of the *NPPF* and include description of the significance of the heritage assets and that in this instance an archaeological field evaluation would be required to provide sufficient information. This requirement was reiterated at the validation stage for this application.

The application does not include a description of the heritage assets with archaeological interest based on the results of an archaeological field evaluation. It is, however, accompanied by a letter (CgMs 16th October 2013) on the topic of "Heritage Issues". This document provides a brief summary of the archaeological context and potential of the proposed development site based solely on a desk-based search of the Central Bedfordshire Historic Environment Record. This is the minimum requirement specified in Paragraph 128 of the *NPPF*.

The letter on "Heritage Issues" confirms that the site contains "...archaeological evidence of interest..." though

it is suggested that these remains do not appear to be of national significance. It is difficult to draw this conclusion without evidence on the date, character and survival of the remains that would be obtained from an archaeological field evaluation. The letter goes on to suggest that, on the basis of the now out of date English Heritage Monuments Protection Programme monument class description the archaeological remains within the site are of low significance and that they would only have limited potential to address regional research objectives. While, without further information, it may be debatable whether or not any archaeological remains the site contains are of national importance, even if they are not of national importance it does not mean that they are of low significance. I disagree with the conclusion that the remains only have "...slight potential..." to address research objectives identified in the published regional archaeological research frameworks. The remains identified within the site are likely to be of later prehistoric and Roman settlement, the understanding of settlement of these periods within the wider landscape context has been identified as of regional importance (Bryant 2000; 14-17; Going and Plouviez 2000, 21; Oake 2007, 11 and Medlycott 2011, 29-31 and 47). On the evidence from the archaeological investigation on the line of the road on the southern boundary of the site, it also has the potential to contain Neolithic, Bronze Age and Saxon remains; understanding settlement in these periods has also been identified as being regionally significant (Brown and Murphy 2000, 9-13; Wade 2000, 23-26; Oake 2007, 9-10 and 12-14 and Medlycott 2011, 13-14, 20-21 and 57-58). The site's value in this respect is enhanced as it forms part of a wider contemporary landscape.

In terms of mitigating the impact of the proposed development on archaeological remains and the heritage assets with archaeological interest they represent, the "Heritage Issues" letter accepts the need for further assessment and evaluation of the archaeological resource in order to obtain sufficient information in order to devise an appropriate mitigation strategy. However, it suggests that this can be done as part of a post consent scheme of archaeological investigation rather than pre-determination in order to provide information to determine the application. It is also suggested that this programme of mitigation can be secured by a planning condition as part of any planning consent that may be granted for this development.

It is unfortunate that the applicant has not provided detailed information in the form of a field evaluation on the archaeology of the proposed development site. This

makes it difficult to define the character and significance of the archaeological resource and identify whether the impact on the archaeology that will result from the development and can be effectively mitigated. The lack of adequate information on archaeology represents grounds for refusing the planning application on the grounds that it is contrary to the requirements of Paragraph 128 of the *National Planning Policy Framework*.

The applicant acknowledges the site is archaeologically sensitive and the impact of the development on archaeology will require mitigation. If the proposed development gains planning consent a condition will be required in order to secure a mitigation strategy. Because there is insufficient information available to be able to define a specific mitigation strategy at this stage and the first part of any mitigation will be further assessment and evaluation it will be necessary to require a Scheme of Archaeological Resource Management (SARM) which allows the flexibility to adopt a staged approach to archaeological mitigation and the implementation of a range of strategies from investigation to protection and management of remains within the development. In order to secure this please attach the following condition to any planning permission granted in respect of this application:

“No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological resource management; that includes post excavation analysis and publication has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The said development shall only be implemented in full accordance with the approved scheme.”

Reason: To record and advance understanding of the heritage assets with archaeological interest which will be unavoidably affected as a consequence of the development and to secure the protection and management of archaeological remains which may be preserved *in situ* within the development site.

This request is in line with the requirements of Chapter 12 of the NPPF and policy 45 of the Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire (pre-submission version, January 2013).

Ecologist	Overall, approve of the application and have no overlying concerns.
Highways Agency	No objection
Environment Agency	No comment

Highways

As you are aware this proposal has been the subject of considerable and lengthy pre-application discussion and agreement in principle with both CBC highways and the Highways Agency.

This submission reflects those discussions and I am happy to confirm that there is no highway objection to the grant of planning permission.

The vehicle access arrangement is acceptable in terms of location and layout. The off-site works to the A507 to reduce the risk of indiscriminate U turning traffic are appropriate despite the solid central barrier not extending right up to the Norton Road roundabout. These works will be subject to a Highways Act Section 278 agreement which will identify in detail all necessary signs and lines and be subject to formal safety audit processes.

I am aware that the applicant's agent has been in contact with my Sustainable Transport colleagues with regard to Travel Plan issues and the foot/cycle linkages to Stotfold. I note that they have been consulted directly and assume that you will receive a response regarding the acceptability or otherwise of the Travel Plan that has been submitted as part of the application. In the event that no comments have been received I recommend inclusion of a Grampian condition to secure the submission of Travel Plan details before works on site commence.

In the event you are minded to recommend that the application be granted planning permission I recommend inclusion of the following conditions and advice notes.

Determining Issues:

The considerations in the determination of this application are:

1. The principle of the development
2. The appearance of the development and its impact on the landscape
3. The impact of the development on biodiversity
4. Traffic, parking and sustainable transport
5. The impact of the development on neighbours
6. Other material considerations
7. Matters of procedure
8. Conclusions

Considerations:

1. The principle of the development

Development in the open countryside

Policy DM4 (Development Within and Beyond Settlement Envelopes) sets out that outside of settlements, where the countryside needs to be protected from inappropriate development, only particular types of new development will be permitted – none of which would accommodate the proposed scheme.

Policy CS16 (Landscape and Woodland) confirms this position where it states that the countryside outside settlements is a highly valued resource for agriculture, recreation, landscape and wildlife. The Council will protect the countryside for its own sake.

It is clear from this policy position that the presumption in this case should be that a development in this location, outside of a settlement and within the open countryside, would not be acceptable. This is because it conflicts with policies set out in the Development Plan. Tourism facilities are supported by Policy CS11 within the Core Strategy. The provisions of that policy and how much weight should be afforded to it are described elsewhere in this report.

However, Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the NPPF (2012) set out that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

If it could be demonstrated that other material considerations outweigh the conflict with policies DM4 (Development Within and Beyond Settlement Envelopes) and CS16 (Landscape and Woodland), it could be concluded that on balance, planning permission should be granted for the development.

The collection and its value

The applicant has assembled a diverse and unique collection of steam driven road locomotives and showmans' engines, fairground organs, fairground gallopers and yachts. In 2004 he acquired the Turner's Collection of fairground equipment and musical organs which, over the preceding 40 years, had become well known in the Northampton area. Purchase by the applicant saved the Turner's Collection as a single entity and prevented much of it from being exported. However, since that time the majority of the Turners Collection has remained in storage unseen by the public who once were able to appreciate it, for the want of the opportunity to create a suitable venue for its display.

The applicant contends that many of the items in the Collection today are unique and irreplaceable. They represent the culmination of the engineering expertise of the leading manufacturers of their era – Burrell, Fowler and the steam lorry manufacturer Foden amongst others. In several cases they comprise the last surviving working examples of their type. One example is a steam powered

fairground yacht ride. This, an irreplaceable piece of English industrial archaeology, which has since been restored to full working order.

All of the items in the Collection are in full working order and they are exhibited at fairs and shows, not only locally but across Britain and Europe.

The safe and appropriate storage of the Collection is a major issue. The majority of items are kept at several locations in and around Stotfold, principally at 97 Arlesey Road, where accommodation is shared with the operational space used by the Saunders vehicle recovery business, and at the applicant's private residence. Other items are distributed amongst family members and in various other locations, for example at Wrayfields Farm.

At Arlesey Road, due to the lack of covered space a number of the items including the valuable steam yachts are stored externally, sheeted under tarpaulins to provide some protection against the weather. Other items are kept in redundant articulated lorry trailers. Presently its dispersal and security considerations preclude any opportunity for public access to the Collection other than at formal shows and steam fairs.

The Council acknowledges, and has acknowledged when previous planning applications for similar buildings have been considered, that the collection does have a significant value and that in itself, its retention and display is a positive thing. It is clear that there is significant benefit in displaying the collection together and that its association with Stotfold is an important one.

Where applications had been made in the past, it had not been felt that the identified benefits inherent to the storage and display of the collection outweighed material planning considerations regarding the suitability of the sites for the use proposed.

Previous planning decisions

Whilst there is no relevant planning history related to this site, planning permission has been sought for a similar development at different sites in Stotfold.

In 2004 planning permission was sought on land at Wrayfields (04/00416). The application was called in by the Secretary of State, who agreed with a planning inspector that the site was outside of the settlement envelope, and therefore would not meet the broad policy thrust of PPS7 to restrain new development in the countryside, and as such 'would result in the establishment of sporadic commercial development...which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the rural area'. It was felt that the development would not promote more sustainable patterns of development and would fail to focus development in or next to towns or villages. It was found that there was no need for the collection to necessarily be stored and displayed in Stotfold, as the collection was accepted to be of national importance.

In 2011, planning permission was refused for a similar development at Skylarks on Great North Road (11/00087). Planning permission was refused because of the unsustainable location of the site and the impact that the development would

have on the appearance of the open countryside. Concern was raised over the lack of information relating to noise and fumes.

It is clear that the central issues in both cases was the impact that a development like this might have on the appearance of the countryside and the potential of a site to provide sustainable methods of transport to and from it. Proper attention also needs to be paid to noise and disturbance issues.

Since those decision were made, there has been a significant shift in the policy context with the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework with its focus on the rural economy, tourism and job creation, which are described below.

Additionally, whilst this site is, like the two previous proposals, outside of the Settlement Envelope, it does have a better relationship with the built up area of Stotfold.

Opportunities to improve the overall context of the development and its relationship with existing tourist facilities presented by the proximity of the site to Stotfold Mill and the nature reserve, together with proposed sustainable travel measures are described later in this report.

Rural tourism

The NPPF (2012) sets out that planning policy should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. To promote a strong rural economy, local plans should support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside.

Policy CS11 (Rural Economy and Tourism) of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) sets out that the Council will seek to support the rural economy and promote tourism by supporting proposals for tourist or leisure developments in the countryside which provides opportunities for rural diversification and are well located to support local services, business and other tourist attractions.

This development would represent a significant tourism attraction. The value of the collection in itself has been described above. The building would contribute towards the rural economy in Central Bedfordshire and would attract visitors from around the country.

Crucially, the proximity of the site to the Mill and nature reserve presents an opportunity for this development to support that tourist attraction and that could not be said that have been the case in the other locations that consent had been sought for a building like this. A footpath running between the site and the nature reserve extension would allow easy access between the two attractions and it seems very likely that this development would have a significant impact on the numbers of people visiting the mill. This connection would represent a material planning consideration that should be afforded notable weight.

Employment

The NPPF (2012) sets out that the Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity.

Policy CS9 (Providing Jobs) of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) sets out the Council's plan to deliver a minimum of 17,000 additional jobs in the plan period.

The applicant has set out that the development would result in the equivalent of around 35 full time jobs. This would likely be variable depending on season and demand but would be a valuable source of employment in what is a rural location. Previously, where applications had been considered for this type of building at other sites in Stofold, it was not felt that similar levels of employment would mitigate the planning harm caused by those developments. Since those decisions we made, the NPPF has been introduced, with its clear focus on creating jobs. It could now be the case that at least cumulatively, when taken together with other material factors, the employment created by the development would outweigh planning harm caused.

Town centre uses outside of a centre

The NPPF (2012) sets out that local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with the Development Plan. Whilst one function of the proposed building is to house the Saunders collection in a museum, it would also be used as a leisure attraction. A leisure use would constitute a main town centre use as referred to in the NPPF.

Policy DM7 (Development in Town Centres) of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) supports a sequential approach to town centre uses outside of centres.

The applicant has demonstrated that they have considered a number of sites against the following criteria, which given the nature of the development, are considered reasonable:

- A location close to Stofold arising from the highly specialised retained and volunteer skills base which is inherently required to undertake the on-going maintenance of the Collection, the restoration of newly acquired items, to reflect the local association of the Collection with the town and to deliver the specific tourism objectives for the area.
- A site with a nexus to other established attractions such as the Ivel Valley and Stofold Mill was considered highly desirable.
- An accessible location, adjoining a principal route was sought in order to facilitate public accessibility; to enable easy access for local people likely to be employed and to provide easy access for the large low loader vehicles which are a pre-requisite for moving the heavy, bulky and sometimes relatively delicate exhibits, to and from steam rallies and fairs outside the immediate area.
- The levels of traffic likely to be generated, particularly the heavy goods vehicle movements, must have minimal impact upon any residential

- amenity, notwithstanding the fact that they are likely to be low in number.
- The site must be of a sufficient size to accommodate a building large enough to house the Collection and provide an appropriate landscape setting that would enable external displays to be operated with minimal prospect of disturbance to any residential properties.
 - There should be scope to deliver associated environmental improvements or at least to facilitate others to provide such benefits and the scheme should be respectful of existing planning policies and Council objectives.

The test concludes that the proposed site is the most appropriate of those considered. Within the context of the criteria described above, it is felt that the sequential approach undertaken is robust enough. Certainly, the proximity of this site to the Mill and nature reserve acts very positively in the favour of this site having been selected.

The NPPF goes on to require an impact assessment of leisure development outside of town centres on existing, committed and planned investment in centres within the catchment of the proposal and on the vitality and viability of nearby town centres. In this case, given the very specialist type of leisure activity that would be carried out at the site, it could not reasonably be concluded that the development would result in a significant adverse impact in either case and there would not likely be any harmful impact.

Summary

- The development of a building in this location would conflict with the objectives of some policies in the Development Plan. The development would cause harm in planning terms.
- Planning permission can still be granted for the development if it is considered that other material planning considerations outweigh that harm.
- The Council acknowledges, as it has done in the past, that the preservation and display of the Collection would be a significant benefit and is desirable.
- Planning permission for similar developments at other sites has been refused in the past. Key issues were the sustainability of the proposed sites and the harm caused by those buildings to the character of the open countryside. If those issues could be overcome, planning permission could be granted for this development.
- The introduction of the NPPF, with its emphasis on promoting the rural economy and providing jobs is a notable material planning consideration that adds weight to the approval of this application. The relationship between this site and the Mill is an important benefit.
- It has been satisfactorily demonstrated that a robust enough sequential test to site selection has been carried out and that this development would not result in significant harm to existing centres.
- The principle of this development would be acceptable if it could be demonstrated that any harm caused to the character of the countryside was outweighed or mitigated and that the development was satisfactorily sustainable. These matters are described elsewhere in this report.

2. The appearance of the development and its impact on the landscape

The impact of the building on the landscape

Policy DM14 (Landscape and Woodland) of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) sets out that planning applications will be assessed against the impact of the proposed development on the landscape, whether positive or negative.

A building of this size, in this prominent location would, without question, have a significant impact on the appearance of the landscape, particularly given the necessary access and parking areas that would be associated with it. Whilst the provision of some landscape buffering would, to a modest extent, mitigate that impact, the development would irreversibly alter the character of the site. The Council's Landscape Architect has described why it is felt that the impact would be harmful and it must be concluded that it would be.

That impact weighs against the approval of the planning application. This report describes whether other material considerations outweigh that harm.

The design of the building

The building would be large, and quite industrial in design. Decorative elements to the South, like the canopy and carousel housing features, would soften its design from that direction. Ultimately, the building would appear quite grand, perhaps befitting the status of the Collection that it would contain. Much of the building would be given over to other, related uses, like the dance arena and café, which it has been demonstrated are necessary for the long-term survival of the museum. It is not felt that the landscape impact would necessarily be much reduced if a much smaller building were proposed. Materials would be controlled by condition.

Landscaping at the site

Hard and soft landscaping within the site would be extensive and proposals have been revised to respond to the specific issues raised by the Council's Tree and Landscape Officers. The impact of the proposed landscaping scheme on the overall quality of the development would be positive, notwithstanding the level of car and coach parking that would be provided.

The quality of the environment in general

It has been described how this site has a benefit that previous proposed sites did not in that it is near to the eastern edge of the built up area of Stotfold and the Mill complex and its nature reserve, in particular. It is proposed that use of the western position of the site (over 3ha in area) is changed to an extension of the nature reserve. A link running along the boundary of this extension and the building would allow access between the two attractions for visitors.

Connecting the site to the nature reserve, and so the eastern edge of Stotfold would significantly improve the quality of the area overall and would have a significant positive impact on the relationship between the site and the town. The

two would become linked by the extended nature reserve.

This benefit would act as a material planning consideration in favour of the development. Given the harmful impact that the building would have on the landscape, and criticisms of previous proposed sites because of their remoteness, planning permission could not be granted without works being carried out so as to extend the existing reserve.

Mill Meadows has been developed adjacent to Stotfold Mill by the Stotfold Mill Preservation Trust. The Trust lease the land from Central Bedfordshire Council. The Reserve was formally opened in 2011 and have been worked on by a partnership of the Trust, The Astwick and Stotfold Environmental Link (Teasel) and the BRCC. The Trust has written to the Council setting out that they would be willing to take on the management of the extension land. A planning condition is recommended that would require the approval of a scheme of works for the extension to the reserve and its implementation. Draft schemes are currently being discussed by the relevant parties.

3. The impact of the development on biodiversity

Like the NPPF, Policy DM15 (Biodiversity) of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) encourages developments to result in a net gain in biodiversity at a site. The applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that, subject to a planning condition, no significant harm would be caused to local ecology at the site.

Significantly, the change of use of the adjacent agricultural land to an extension to the existing reserve and its planting in accordance with a scheme that would be secured by condition, would result in a significant net gain in biodiversity that would act as a material planning consideration that would weigh in favour of the development.

4. Sustainable transport, traffic and parking

Sustainable transport

Previous proposals to locate a building like this at other sites in Stotfold were criticised and found to be unacceptable because of their poor relationship with the town and their unsustainable locations. Both of the other sites proposed could not be accessed using public transport, which is an important consideration given the likely number of visitors. This site would be different because whilst outside of the settlement, it is within a reasonable walking and cycling distance of the built up area of Stotfold which is served by bus services. Arlesey rail station would help to serve the site but only operates a North/South rather than an East/West service.

It is the case that given the type of facility being proposed, a large number of visitors travelling to the site would do so by road. However, the applicant has submitted a Framework Travel Plan that would aspire to increase sustainable travel to the site as far as possible. The following measures are proposed:

- A pedestrian/cycleway connecting with Baldock Road.

- Resurfacing and landscaping improvements to the section of Baldock Road between the A507 and Littlebury Close including the removal of a gate and the installation of bollards.
- The introduction of signage to promote the use of these links.
- The provision of cycle parking at the site.
- A shower room for the use of staff who cycle to work.
- The provision of a pre-booked mini-bus service from Arlesey station to this site.
- Incentives for lower entry fees where public transport has been used.
- Promotion of car-sharing.

It is felt that these measures, when taken together with the relative proximity to the town, would result in a development that would be as sustainable as could be reasonably expected of a building of its type and in this location. It would certainly be a significantly more sustainable site than those for which planning permission had been refused in the past. Car travel would still likely dominate, though.

Traffic and access

The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment that concludes that the development would not result in levels of traffic that could not be accommodated by the existing road network. The Council's Highways Officer is satisfied that the access to the site would be safe and its details would be secured by planning condition. The Highways Agency have raised no objections to the development.

Parking

Car and coach parking would be provided at levels that would meet the expected demand.

5. The impact of the development on existing neighbours

The nearest neighbour to this site is Boundary Farm, on the opposite side of Baldock Road. Neighbours to the West would also be reasonably near to the development. It is clear that the types of activity proposed at the site could result in noise, most notably when those activities were carried out outdoors. There is background noise created by nearby roads, which would reduce in to the evening.

The Council's Public Protection Officer is satisfied that subject to planning conditions controlling outside activity and hours of operation, the impact of the development on living conditions at neighbouring properties would be acceptable. Those conditions are recommended.

6. Other material considerations

Flooding and drainage

The Environment Agency and the Internal Drainage Board are satisfied that

subject to a planning condition, there would be no risk of flooding and drainage would be properly dealt with.

Archaeology

The Council's Archaeologist is satisfied that subject a condition, there would be no unacceptable risk to local heritage assets.

Sustainable construction and renewable energy

Planning conditions would ensure that the appropriate sustainable construction methods were utilised and that reliance on low or zero-carbon energy sources was maximised.

7. Matters of procedure

Referral to the Secretary of State

This proposal would constitute development within the open countryside, which would be in conflict with Policy DM4 (Development Within and Outside of Settlement Envelopes) of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009). As such, the application has been advertised as a departure from the Development Plan in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009. In addition, the development would comprise a leisure use outside of a town centre and would have a floor area larger than 5000sqm. As a result, any decision other than the refusal of planning permission would require this planning application to be referred to the Secretary of State prior to its determination.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

This planning application has been considered in the context of the EIA Regulations (2011). It is not considered that the proposal would have significant impacts of wider than local importance, the site is not considered to be in a particularly sensitive or vulnerable location and it is not anticipated that there would be any unusually complex or potentially hazardous environmental effects which have not been described in this report and mitigated. As such, this development would not require the submission of an EIA.

8. Conclusions

- This development would conflict with policies within the Development Plan that seek to control building outside of Settlement Envelopes, within the open countryside.
- Planning permission can still be granted for the development if it considered that other material planning considerations outweigh that harm.
- This proposal is different from those which have been refused in the past for a building to house the Collection because of the introduction of the NPPF and the benefits associated with this site and its closer proximity to Stotfold.

- This development would benefit the rural economy and would benefit existing tourist attractions (the Mill and nature reserve). This, together with the generated employment constitute a significant benefit in support of approving the planning application.
- The impact of the development on the landscape would be harmful. Securing a scheme to extend the existing nature reserve would represent a significant benefit that would mitigate that harm.
- The site would be relatively sustainably located and measures to increase sustainable travel to the site would be secured.
- Other matters would be acceptable and where appropriate and necessary, would be controlled by planning condition.
- The benefits of the development would outweigh the harm caused by it and in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

That the application is referred to the Secretary of State. In the event that the application is not called-in, that it is approved subject to conditions.

- 1 The development 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 **No development shall commence at the site before details of materials to be used in the external surfaces of the building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved.**

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development would be acceptable.

- 3 Hard and soft landscaping at the site shall be carried out in accordance with plans PLPP400/2-020A, DLPP400/2-021A, DLPP400/2-022A, DLPP400/2-023A, DLPP400/2-024A and the Guide to Management of External Areas prepared by Elwood Landscape Design dated September 2013. The landscaping shall be completed in advance of the building opening to the public and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the site would be acceptable.

- 4 **No development shall commence at the site before a scheme demonstrating how the development would achieve at least 10% of its energy demands through the use of low and zero-carbon technology has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme.**

Reason: To ensure that the development would be sustainable.

- 5 **No development shall commence at the site before a scheme has been submitted to the Council for works to the nature reserve extension land (shown hatched in green on plan number D02B) together with a timetable for its implementation and a scheme for its long-term management. The scheme shall be carried out as approved in accordance with the approved timetable and management scheme.**

Reason: To balance the harm that the development would cause to the appearance of the open countryside and to improve the biodiversity value of the development.

- 6 **No development shall commence at the site before details of existing and proposed site levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved.**

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the site would be acceptable.

- 7 **Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted in principle plan, no development shall commence at the site before full engineering details of the junction between the proposed access road and the associated off-site highway works within the confines of the public highway, including lighting and signage, have been submitted to approved by the Local Planning Authority and no building shall be occupied until works have been constructed in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To secure a satisfactory access appropriate to the development, in the interest of public safety and convenience.

- 8 **Notwithstanding the details shown on plan number D028, no development shall commence at the site before full engineering details of the proposed foot and cycle link between the proposed development and Baldock Road have been submitted to approved by the Local Planning Authority and no building shall be occupied until works have been constructed in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the provision of appropriate sustainable transport linkages with Stotfold in the interest of public safety and convenience.

- 9 **Notwithstanding the submitted details the development shall be brought into use until the approved Travel Plan requirements have been implemented in accordance with a timetable to be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To promote and encourage sustainable modes of travel and to reduce the potential traffic impact of the development on the local highway network.

- 10 **All on-site vehicle areas shall be surfaced in tarmacadam or similar durable,**

porous but bound material and arrangements shall be made for surface water from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.

Reason: To avoid the carriage of extraneous material or surface water from the site into the highway so as to safeguard the interest of highway safety.

- 11 Before the new access is first brought into use, any existing access within the frontage of the land to be developed, not incorporated in the access hereby approved shall be permanently stopped up to vehicular traffic and the highway reinstated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority before the development is brought into use.

Reason: In the interest of road safety and to reduce the number of points at which traffic will enter and leave the public highway.

- 12 The scheme for parking and manoeuvring indicated on the submitted plans shall be laid out prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway.

- 13 **No development shall commence at the site before a scheme detailing access provision to and from the site for construction traffic, which details shall show what arrangements will be made for restricting such vehicles to approved points of access and egress has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be operated throughout the period of construction work.**

Reason: To ensure the safe operation of the surrounding road network in the interests of road safety.

- 14 **No development shall commence at the site before a scheme detailing provision for on site parking for construction workers and deliveries for the duration of the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented throughout the construction period.**

Reason: To ensure adequate off street parking during construction in the interests of road safety.

- 15 **No development shall commence at the site before a scheme of for the drainage of storm water has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved.**

Reason: To ensure adequate drainage at the site.

- 16 **No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological resource management; that includes post excavation analysis and publication has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The said development shall only be implemented in full accordance with the approved scheme.**

Reason: To record and advance understanding of the heritage assets with archaeological interest which will be unavoidably affected as a consequence of the development and to secure the protection and management of archaeological remains which may be preserved *in situ* within the development site.

- 17 The building shall only be used as a museum, for tea dances, big band nights and Christmas shows. There shall be no retail use at the site beyond the sale of souvenirs associated with the use of the site as a museum.

Reason: To ensure that the uses operating at the site are appropriate.

- 18 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers [Design and Access Statement prepared by DLP dated September 2013, D02B, D03A, PL033, PL037, PL036A, PLPP400/2-020A, DLPP400/2-021A, DLPP400/2-022A, DLPP400/2-023A, DLPP400/2-024A, PL030, PL031, PL034, Planning and Operational Statement prepared by DLP dated September 2013, Sustainability Statement prepared by Lumenco, Baseline Ecological Evaluation prepared by Greenwood Environmental dated June 2013, The Saunders Collection - Contents, letter from CgMs dated October 2013, Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Wormwald Burrows Partnership Limited dated September 2013, Transport Assessment prepared by Matrix dated September 2013, Framework Travel Plan prepared by Matrix dated September 2013 and Guide to Management of External Areas prepared by Elwood Landscape Design dated September 2013].

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Notes to Applicant

1. The applicant is advised that in order to comply with 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 Development Control Group, Development Management Division, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ.
2. 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 Traffic Management Group Highways and Transport Division, Central Bedfordshire

Council, Technology House, 239 Ampthill Road, Bedford MK42 9BD.

3. The applicant is advised that no highway surface water drainage system designed as part of a new development, will be allowed to enter any existing highway surface water drainage system without the applicant providing evidence that the existing system has sufficient capacity to account for any highway run off generated by that development. Existing highway surface water drainage systems may be improved at the developer's expense to account for extra surface water generated. Any improvements must be approved by the Development Control Group, Development Management Division, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford SG17 5TQ.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012 - Article 31

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and 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) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012.

DECISION

.....
.....