

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



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

26 February 2014

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - Friday 28 February 2014

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

Late Sheet

3 - 14

Should you have any queries regarding the above please contact Democratic Services on Tel: 0300 300 4032.

Yours sincerely

Martha Clampitt,
Committee Services Officer
email: martha.clampitt@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 28 FEBRUARY 2014

Item 4 (Page 5-116) – CB/11/02827/OUT – Clipstone Park, Land South of Vandyke Road & North of Stanbridge Road, Leighton Linlade.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Campaign to Protect Rural England

Representations made by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) were received in relation to this application on 21st September 2011 but were omitted from the report, the comments are attached.

The Fraser Family, Model Farm, Leighton Buzzard

A letter was received on 20th February 2014 from Bletsoes, stating that the Fraser family are aware of the planning application and have entered into an arrangement with applicants. A copy of the letter is attached.

Chilworth International Corporation

The owners of an area of land to the north of Vandyke Road which is included in the Framework Plan for East of Leighton Linlade but excluded from any planning application before the Council have been in touch through their legal advisors, Hogan Lovells.

The letter raises a number of concerns which are summarised below along with the Council's position which was set out in a reply to the letter.

1. The basis on which the Council considers that the employment provision to be delivered by the applications is adequate and conforms with the Council's Framework Plan, joint Core Strategy and emerging Development Strategy.

The provision of employment opportunities is a key component of the Clipstone Brook scheme. The Committee Report sets out that the Applicant's have demonstrated how they consider that the proposal will deliver a sufficient number of new jobs to accommodate all of the economically active persons likely to be generated from the whole allocation.

2. Confirmation that the Council will treat the development of this area in a holistic and cohesive manner to ensure the vision of the Framework Plan and emerging Development Strategy can be realised and delivered.

The Council will treat the development of the allocated site in an holistic and comprehensive manner.

3. That the draft s106 for the Clipstone Park application is not available.

There are no draft Section 106 agreements in the Council's possession.

4. Confirmation that the s106 agreements will provide legally enforceable mechanisms for the delivery of infrastructure to support the whole of the allocation including the provision of the full quota of employment land.

This cannot be confirmed until the draft and final agreements are in place.

5. That the officer's report is not available.

A link was provided to the Officer's committee report.

6. The applications were submitted 3 years ago and the base data on which the Environmental Statement supporting the application is based is now significantly out of date.

The Applicant has not been requested to provide further environmental information.

18 Mercury Way, Leighton Buzzard

The occupier of 18 Mercury Way wished to attend the Committee meeting to speak however she is unable to do so and therefore requested that her comments be presented to the Committee. Her comments are reproduced below:

"Myself and many others are very disappointed to discover that the meeting is to be held such a long way from the above site, surely if you wish to engage the local people it needs to take place in an area that everyone can reasonably get to. Also a time when most people are not out working.

Are we, the citizens of Leighton Buzzard, to have our own debate and make our own decision as agreed by Mr Cameron, the Prime Minister. I thought that local opinions are to be taken into consideration when deciding on planning proposals. We have already shown a NO vote.

This particular application has already been given the thumbs down by the residents as we have grown too big, too fast and need a period for infrastructure growth to catch up.

Our current road system will not cope with the volume of traffic, and the said link road WILL NOT relieve congestion as the new population will need to cross town to get to the rail links.

We have seen far more traffic around the town centre at certain times of the day and this will only get increase.

The residents of Leighton Buzzard currently need to travel away from their homes (90% of the work force) for work and this will not change just by building houses and leaving hard spaces for companies to come to the town. What incentives are there to attract new employers.

Bedfordshire Police have concerns about the layout as it will be easier for criminals to go about their business. Now that we do not have a manned police station criminal activity will increase.

Anglian water also stated that it will propose " an unacceptable risk" of flooding.

The developers have stated it is offering affordable houses but as the percentage is so small, will it really make a difference to the people living in Leighton Buzzard or will the houses be given to people outside the area as we are being told.

We must all accept change but it has got to be of a benefit to the community and this is not."

Additional Comments

Construction Traffic Management

Control over the routing of construction traffic is currently included within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) requirements contained in condition 9. It is considered that traffic routing is best controlled through a clause in the s106 agreement. The detail of the wording will need to control construction traffic movements in order to ensure that construction vehicles do not use unsatisfactory routes particularly in relation to Heath and Reach.

East of Leighton Linslade Framework Plan

The East of Leighton Linslade Framework Plan was endorsed for the purposes of Development Management in May 2013. A link to this document on the Council website has been sent to all Members and hard copies will be available at the meeting.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Amended condition 9 - delete reference to construction traffic routes at d).

No development shall commence in any area, as defined by the areas plan required by condition 4, of the development (including any works of demolition) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan ('CEMP') has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall accord with the Framework Construction Environment Management Plan submitted as part of this planning application and shall include details of:

- a) Environment Management Responsibilities;
- b) Construction Activities and Timing;
- c) Plant and Equipment, including loading and unloading;
- d) Points of access/egress to be used by construction vehicles;
- e) Details of site compounds, offices and areas to be used for the storage of materials;
- f) Utilities and Services;
- g) Emergency planning & Incidents;
- h) Contact details for site managers and details of management lines of reporting to be updated as different phases come forward;
- i) On site control procedures:
 - i. Traffic mitigation measures including traffic management and parking
 - ii. Temporary haulage routes
 - iii. Air and Dust quality
 - iv. Noise and vibration

- v. Waste and Resource Management
 - vi. Agricultural Soils and Materials
 - vii. Temporary surface water drainage during construction
 - viii. Protection of Controlled Waters
 - ix. Trees, Hedgerows and Scrub
 - x. Ecology
 - xi. Archaeological and Cultural Heritage
 - xii. Visual and Lighting
 - xiii. Utilities and Services
 - xiv. Protection of water resources
 - xv. Protection of species and habitats
- j) Detailed phasing plan to show any different phasing, different developers and/or constructors to be updated on an annual basis;
- k) Details for the monitoring and review of the construction process including traffic mitigation (to include a review process of the Construction Environmental Management Plan during development).

Any development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved CEMP.

Reason: To ensure that the development is constructed using methods to mitigate nuisance or potential damage associated with the construction period and in accordance with Policy 44 of the emerging Development Strategy Central Bedfordshire for Pre-Submission.

26 SEP 2011



Campaign to Protect
Rural England

BEDFORDSHIRE

Trevor Saunders,
Asst. Director of Planning,
Central Bedfordshire Council,
Priory House, Monks Walk,
Chicksands,
SHEFFORD, SG17 5TQ

21st September 2011

Dear Sir,

Application CB/11/01937/OUT - Chamberlains Barn Quarry, Leighton Buzzard, up to 950 Dwellings etc.

Application CB/11/01940/FULL - Chamberlains Barn Quarry, Leighton Buzzard, Link Road, Heath Road/Vandyke Road etc.

Application CB/11/02827/OUT - Clipstone Park Leighton Buzzard, up to 1280 Dwellings etc., with Link Road, Vandyke Road/Stanbridge Road

We have studied the submissions made in respect of the above, and write to register our objection to all 3 of these applications.

Our grounds for objection are as follows:-

1. Planning Context

1.1 The applications are associated with an emerging Core Strategy which the Secretary of State has now confirmed should be withdrawn. The proposed developments all lie in the South Bedfordshire Green Belt, but would have been facilitated by the Green Belt boundary change which that Core Strategy was proposing. However, with the withdrawal of the Core Strategy, it would seem to us that there is currently no mechanism in place by which the intended Green Belt boundary change can be formally progressed towards adoption.

1.2 We submit, therefore, that until some other planning framework and mechanism emerges whereby any change to the Green Belt boundaries East of Leighton Buzzard can be formalised, these applications have to be viewed as inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and therefore subject to the 'very special circumstances' test in PPG2.

1.3 In our view, no sufficient case of 'very special circumstances' currently exists. In this regard, we draw attention to the fact that at the present time there are very substantial tracts of allocated and consented land within the Leighton Buzzard Southern Urban Extension Area (Grovebury Farm and Brickyard

CPRE Bedfordshire
First Floor
5 Grove Place
Bedford MK40 3JJ

Tel: 01234 353381 & 343564
Fax: 01234 353381
e-mail: info@cpredbeds.org.uk
website: www.cpredbeds.org.uk

CPRE, the Campaign to Protect Rural England, is a charity which promotes the beauty, tranquility and biodiversity of rural England. We welcome positive responses to the applications from all the countryside. Founded in 1971, we have 40,000 members and a branch in every county.
Patron: Her Majesty The Queen
President: Sir Bryan

Registered charity number: 1023466
Printed on 100% recycled paper

-2-

Quarry) which have still to be developed. You are also aware that the Council's refusal of 900 homes on land West of Linslade is currently awaiting the outcome of an Appeal Inquiry. Were the Secretary of State to allow this Appeal, this would quite clearly have major impact on the case for any housing expansion to the East of the town.

2. Sustainability

We note that the applicants point to recent initiatives and announcements by the Government designed to drive up the rate of housebuilding, and that they refer in particular to the draft National Planning Policy Framework, currently the subject of consultations, which the Government propose should contain a 'presumption' in favour of sustainable development.

However, the Government has made it quite clear that this presumption is not intended to operate in such a way as to weaken the existing level of protection given to land of Green Belt status.

In any event, the key word underlying the presumption is 'sustainable', and we consider the applicants' proposals fail significantly to meet that criterion.

To be specific:-

2.1 Traffic

The applications involve a total of 2230 dwellings and we consider that - especially after taking into account the effects of a fully built out Leighton Southern Urban Extension - proposals of this magnitude must inevitably impose significant unsustainable traffic impacts on the town. Access to the town centre, and cross-urban movement between Leighton Buzzard and Linslade, is already subject to congestion, and the latter flow will be particularly affected by additional traffic seeking access to and from the railway station. The proposed Heath Road - Vandyke Road Link, together with the proposed Eastern Link Road, alterations to road junctions and enhancements to the local bus network, will in our view offer only limited mitigation of these impacts.

Indeed, the effectiveness of the proposed new bus services will depend not just on their frequency but also on their reliability, and this - along with the reliability of the rest of bus network throughout the town - will undoubtedly be severely compromised by the raised levels of traffic and congestion which are bound to be experienced within Leighton Buzzard's urban core.

It is by no means unrealistic to envisage that the applicants' combined proposals could entail some 2500 - 3000 additional cars domiciled within the town's boundaries, and that a high proportion of these will be seeking access to the road network within similar timeframes of the day. Against this background, we submit that the conclusions of the applicants' Transport Assessments that

-3-

'there are no highway reasons why this proposal should not be permitted' (Chamberlains Barn) and that there will be a *'nil detriment impact on Leighton Buzzard'* (Clipstone Park) can command no credibility.

2.2 Employment & Economy

2.2.1 There have to be serious grounds for concern over the sustainability of the employment prospects associated with the applicants' schemes. Out of the 2230 households proposed, it is not unreasonable to envisage that in well over 1500 of them there will at least one person requiring access to employment. However, the actual number of additional local jobs that could potentially be created within the proposed new employment zones, or be available elsewhere within the town, is clearly not going to meet such a level of requirement. It is certainly well within the bounds of probability that over two-thirds of those requiring access to work will need to out-commute to other locations, placing strain both on road and rail networks and, in the case of the latter, on access to and from the town's rail station.

It is already an unsustainable feature of Leighton Buzzard and its economy that such a high proportion of its residents have to commute elsewhere to work. The scale of the applicants' proposals, relative to their employment creation potential, can only make the existing situation even more unsustainable than it is already is.

2.2.2 The town's most important visitor attraction is the Leighton Buzzard Narrow Gauge Railway, which takes people out to what is currently a pleasant area of open countryside. The applicants' proposals will largely urbanise the whole length of its countryside section bar the last 300 yards, and thus have highly damaging impacts on the attraction of the railway.

In exchange for open green countryside, we get what is described as a 'green corridor' -- albeit one which features close-up views of a new road link and residential development on its north side, and on its south side more views of residential development together with a 'Neighbourhood Centre' incorporating a supermarket and a public house. Moreover, prior to completion of the applicants' developments, the railway would face years of despoiled surroundings while the applicants' extensive schemes were under construction -- construction work which includes the diversion of the railway at one point from its historic route in order to accommodate the junction of Vandyke Road with the proposed Heath Road/Vandyke Road Link.

Not just in the long-term, but particularly through the construction phase, the applicants' proposals show scant regard for the railway's importance to local people, to visitors, and to the local economy. The impacts on the railway are highly adverse, are incapable of effective mitigation, and are therefore by definition unsustainable.

2.3 Environment

We wish to draw attention to the Sustainability Appraisal Report (November 2010) prepared in conjunction with the Core Strategy Pre-Submission document. This S.A. report comments at P.74 on the 'First Sieve' output from the S.A. methodology in relation to Sites C and D, i.e. the site areas to which the applicants' proposals relate. It then lists the mitigation measures seen as required should these sites be taken forward for development.

2.3.1 For Site C, the mitigation measures listed include the statement *'Development beyond the urban area up to the Shenley Hill Road is not considered appropriate'*. To a significant extent, the applicant's proposals ignore this important S.A. recommendation. Whilst he appears to seek partially to meet it by proposing the rising area of the land up to Shenley Hill Road be developed as a 'Country Park', the lower area flanking Vandyke Road is shown as almost entirely given over to residential development. Particularly in this respect, we submit that the application involves a major non-compliance with the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal.

2.3.2 For Site D, the mitigation measures recommended in the Core Strategy S.A. include the statements *'Development should avoid the sensitive slope and ridge leading up to Charity Farm'*, and *'The setting of Eggington should be safeguarded'*. The applicant's proposals appear to comply with neither of these recommendations. The alignment of the proposed Eastern Link Road appears to cut well into the base of that sensitive slope, and the general setting of Eggington village is undoubtedly adversely affected not only by the encroachment of residential development but by the proposal to site two employment zones alongside the Link Road at its southern end. One of these is even proposed to be on the east side of the Link Road, thus breaching the 'barrier' to development it otherwise affords.

These proposals would bring residential and industrial development within half a mile of the outskirts of Eggington village. We submit that, far from safeguarding the setting and environment of Eggington, the applicant's proposals involve impacts on it that are profoundly adverse, which are incapable of effective mitigation, and which are therefore unsustainable.

3. Localism

3.1 The Government's Localism Bill is expected to be on the Statute Book this November. The Bill promotes, inter alia, a planning process in which local communities will have a much greater say in the forward strategy for their areas, based on their own vision of local needs.

The 2,500 homes envisaged for the East Leighton-Linslade SSSA in the Submission Core Strategy has never been a figure based on an estimation of the town's own requirements. It is a figure which originated from the Milton Keynes

-5-

& South Midlands SRS stipulation that a total of some 25,300 additional homes should be delivered within the Luton & South Bedfordshire Growth Area over the period 2001-2021, with provision for a further 15,400 over the years to 2031, figures towards which Leighton-Linslade should make an 'appropriate contribution'. This 'appropriate contribution' became quantified at 2,500 in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document of April 2009.

3.2 Following the Government decision in May 2010 that top-down Regional targets should be abolished, and replaced by targets that reflected local need, the Core Strategy was re-worked and re-based to provide for 23,150 new homes over the period 2011-2026, with contingency provision for some 4,050 homes beyond that date. Notwithstanding the substantial reduction that this represents against the original targets, the 'contribution' to be made by the East Leighton-Linslade SSSA by 2026 has remained unaltered in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy from that originally set in the context of the old MK & SM SRS targets for 2031. This contrasts noticeably with the situation at the other two SSSAs, both of which have seen significant reductions. The reason for this appears, once again, to have little to do with Leighton-Linslade's local needs, but is because the East Leighton SSA is seen as offering the opportunity for a faster start towards delivery of the Core Strategy targets than either of the other two.

3.3 The Pre-Submission C.S. itself states at Policy CS1 that *Leighton Buzzard will be a secondary location for development that will provide development opportunities to meet the needs of the town and make a contribution to meeting the housing needs of the wider area*. Taking that statement at its face value, if the housing needs of the wider area have been marked down it clearly follows that the 'contribution' required from Leighton Buzzard should also be marked down. This has not happened, and in our submission it should have done.

3.4 In any case, the 'contribution to the wider area' approach should now be seen as at fundamental odds with that set out in the Localism Bill, which clearly points to local need as the basis on which local development should take place. Local people have spoken out strongly against development at Leighton-Linslade on the scale proposed. We submit that the principles of the Localism Bill alone – quite apart from the other arguments we have presented – now require that the concept and scale of any development to the east of the town be completely re-evaluated.

4. Conclusion

We urge your Council to give all due consideration to the representations we have made in this letter, and accordingly to refuse the present applications.

Yours sincerely,


J.H. Adburgham

Area Representative, South Beds & Luton



Your Ref:
Our Ref: AYB/VAB/15002

Email: alistair.brodie@bletsoes.co.uk

20th February 2014

By email only: victoria.davies@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Ms Vicki Davies
Principal Planning Officer
Development Management
Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House, Monks Walk
Chicksands, Shefford,
Bedfordshire, SG17 5TQ

Dear Ms Davies

Clipstone Park – The Fraser Family

I confirm that we act on behalf of the Fraser family of Model Farm, Hockliffe Road, Leighton Buzzard, in connection with property matters.

I write to confirm that the Fraser family are aware of the report which is to be considered by Committee shortly, recommending the grant of planning consent for a primarily residential development at the Clipstone Park scheme. I wish to confirm that the Fraser family are aware of the possible grant of planning consent and are fully supportive of the development proposals. Indeed, they have entered into an arrangement with the promoters Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd, designed to steer this proposal through the planning process and, hopefully, secure a formal grant of planning consent, in due course.

My clients are aware that the Committee will be undertaking a site inspection early next week and we understand that Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd will be erecting sighting flags, in order to assist members to understand the position of principal features and facilities and the alignment of roadways, etc.

My clients are aware that, if planning consent is granted and the development comes forward, one of their modern farm buildings sits within the route of the proposed eastern distributor road. My clients are aware of the need to remove this building, if planning consent is granted. Contingency plans are in place to deal with taking down this building and re-locating it onto an alternative site.

My clients hope that the site inspection will go well and look forward to a positive decision being reached by Committee, in terms of passing a resolution to grant planning consent, when the application is considered at the end of next week.

Yours sincerely

A Y Brodie

c.c. david.hale@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
c.c. Simon Willis

This page is intentionally left blank