

## **LATE SHEET**

### **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – Date 5<sup>th</sup> March 2014**

***Item 6 – (Pages 13 – 29) CB/13/04201/FULL- Land At Lodge Road and High Street, Cranfield.***

#### **Additional Consultation/Publicity Response**

**Cranfield Parish Council:  
Additional Comments**

#### **Revised Plan:**

A revised plan 16965-1001H has been received, in conjunction with revised detailed of the proposed garage on plot 8. It is proposed to relocate the garage of plot 8 to the rear of the site, and increase the pitch of the roof, to screen views of the private amenity space, from the approved (not constructed) dwelling within Home Farm on the rear boundary of this plot. It is considered this is an appropriate solution to ensure the privacy of both residential properties.

#### **Ecology:**

Happy with the findings and conclusions of the further ecological documentation, concern raised regarding the hedge line running to the rear of plots 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 15. Requested further landscape information.

A condition requiring further landscape detail, and maintenance is already on the recommended condition list.

#### **Archaeology:**

Archaeology, condition recommended.

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

Archaeology Condition:

**No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation; that adopts a staged approach and 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 archaeological 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.**

Alteration to plan number condition (Condition 14):

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 16965/1000, 6965/101B, 6965/111C, 6965/104A, 6965/106C, 6965/108C, 6965/110C, 6965/114C, 6965/122C, 6965/121B, 6965/113B, 6965/109B, 6965/107C, 6965/105C, 6965/103B, 6965/100A, 6965/102C, 6965/115A, 6965/123C, 6965/116B, 6965/118D, 6965/119E, 6965/124D, 16965/1001H.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

***Item 7 (Pages 31-44) – CB/13/04425/FULL – Land adjacent 82 and 84 Station Road, Ridgmont***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

None

**Additional Comments**

The single car recovery vehicle is still stored on site, therefore an additional condition will be recommended consistent with the Variation of Condition application CB/11/03381/VOC.

A CD has been received from an objector containing video images of the site. It was requested that this be shown to the committee, however, we do not have the facilities to do this of which the objector has been informed.

**Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**

Condition 3 amended to:

Activity on the site shall only take place between the hours of 9am to 5pm Mondays to Fridays. Activity on Saturdays between 9am and 5pm shall be restricted to site maintenance only involving hedge cutting, drain clearing and grass mowing, and no activity at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities which the occupiers of neighbouring properties might reasonably expect to enjoy.

Additional condition:

No vehicles other than private motor cars and one single car recovery vehicle shall be stored on the site.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

***Item 8 (Pages 47 – 54) – CB/14/00389/REG3 – Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands***

## **Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

### Internal Drainage Board

The downstream receiving watercourse system for the proposed surface water discharge of this development is under the statutory control of the Board. Hence, this discharge will be subject to obtaining the board's statutory consent.

The Board therefore suggest that planning permission should not be granted without conditions requiring that the applicant's storm water design and construction proposals are adequate before any development commences.

### Environment Agency

No objection. No conditions required.

### Public protection (Contaminated Land)

Soil investigations have already identified isolated areas of slightly elevated contaminants to the natural soils and this material should be dealt with appropriately, with re-use off site if possible as it is understood there will be significant arisings which cannot stay on-site.

### Trees and Landscape

No objection.

### Highways

In a highway context there is no technical capacity or safety reason to oppose the development. The additional car parking is remote from the public highway and the roundabout junction onto the A507 leading to the overall site is appropriate for the level of traffic already associated with the current level of development and significant neighbouring developments. The proposed layout and construction details are satisfactory and given the remoteness of the site from the public highway there is no need to impose conditions relating to construction traffic routing, parking or wheel wash .

I note that the existing Travel Plan is to be updated and I leave my Travel Plan colleagues to advise accordingly.

### Ecology

Having looked at the documents submitted in support of the application information on the future landscaping and impact on existing landscape does not appear to have been adequately addressed. Priory House lies within 200m of 2 County Wildlife Sites recognised for their wetland habitats. It is noted from drawing 2 that the existing swale is retained and the design and access statement refers to 'the majority of the landscaping and the effects of the new work are being designed to improve the existing landscaping and biodiversity within the site.' However such details of improvements do not seem apparent. The existing swale has established itself with

a variety of wetland plants and it is likely that a number of animal species are present here.

The D & A notes that natural habitat and small trees are present on the site and yet no allowance for mitigating the loss of this habitat has been provided with the application. The trees are not yet fully established and hence could potentially be moved and incorporated within the expansion. The NPPF calls for a net gain to biodiversity through development and given that the applicant is CBC this is an ideal opportunity to offer an exemplary scheme.

Whilst there is no dispute over the need for the proposal, methods to create the additional parking and associated habitat enhancement require clarification to ensure no detrimental impact on the ecology of the site.

### Landscape Officer

The frontage, approach to Priory House / Central Beds Council should be of the highest quality design; an exemplar of civic / urban design, presenting a strong sense of place, down to detail design, use of materials and landscaping, and setting the standard expected of other developments within the CBC authority. Unfortunately such design ambitions are not evident in the current proposals.

I realise the need for additional car parking but having studied the supporting documents and site it is disappointing that there is no over all concept plan particularly describing the proposals in relation to site as a whole and incorporating SUDs, landscape and planting features linked to landscape / ecological enhancement and habitat creation.

At present the views from Chicksands residential areas to Priory House are quite exposed in places, with limited or no planting to screen views, eg. JF Kennedy Drive, Orchard Drive, Eisenhower Place. The opportunity to screen views on to car parking via landscape and planting needs to be considered further along with enhancement of existing planting screens to the general site boundary.

A number of existing trees will be removed to accommodate the additional / new car parking areas - this loss needs to be offset on site; trees which provide shade to assist in urban heat island effects, trees which contribute to the management of rain water/ surface water run off, enhance biodiversity, screening and aesthetics. Meadow / wetland grasses would contribute to water attenuation, site character and biodiversity.

The D&A describes the use of block paving with grit between gaps on a stone base within the new car park areas; further information on materials, construction techniques and drainage performance are required including access crossing the existing swale.

It is of note the plans indicate additional lighting columns in the car park extension at 6ms high; details on lighting levels, control of light direction and timing controls are required especially regarding potential impact on adjoining residents and biodiversity.

The amenity value of space in and around the site could also be reconsidered especially regarding the provision of outdoor communal areas with seating for staff.

The extension of the car parking area could be an exciting opportunity to include more subtle areas for water attenuation, eg wetland habitat areas, linked to bioswales, gravity fed. Whilst realising that budgets are highly restricted the depths and profiles of some or all of the existing swales could be reviewed and linked more effectively with additional SUDs features and wider wetland areas on site. Robert Bray Associates Ltd. (Sustainable Drainage Consultants and Landscape Architects) carried out a SUDs Audit at Priory House in September 2013 with the Audit Report recommending a number of measures to improve performance of existing on site SUDs along with social, biodiversity and landscape benefits but these recommendations do not appear to have been fed into the proposed car park design.

### Neighbours

Two responses have been received from neighbours to the site, which read as follows:

I have no objection overall to the development going ahead, but would like you to consider the adverse impacts it will have on adjacent residential neighbours if certain controls are not put in place.

Vehicle access should be restricted to this area and the whole site. There are ongoing problems with boy racers congregating right through the night driving dangerously fast around the site with loud music and shouting. My bedroom backs onto the proposed development and I am often kept awake at night especially through the summer months.

The car park should be used as an overflow by the Council to minimise disruption and noise when residents may be trying to sleep - especially those working night shifts.

There is antisocial behaviour, vandalism and arson taking place on site with marauding youngsters congregating. I travel to work early and have personally seen and heard groups at 0500 in the morning during the school holidays. Restricting vehicle access, especially at close proximity, to the residents would help to reduce the problem.

Vandalism etc usually takes place at night. The CCTV should be upgraded to night vision to capture images, deter individuals and to assist with prosecutions of perpetrators.

The current bio diversity of the site should not be disrupted. The low lying wet areas are habitat to some interesting species, flora and fauna beneficial to the environment. An environmental impact assessment should be undertaken by a suitably qualified person with careful consideration and control measures put in place to eliminate risks.

I sincerely hope my views will be upheld and the appropriate actions taken to minimise environmental impact.

I would appreciate if you could keep me informed of progress and any opportunities for further consultation.

And

Being a resident that would back onto these new 146 car parking spaces, I feel I need to comment on the following ~

### **Restricted Access**

We have a BIG issue with "boy racers" at the week end and I am for ever calling out the police, it is just a matter of time before there is a serious accident

I feel frightened of the fact that, these new spaces would be close to my back garden and would like to propose that they are used for "overflow" in such a way that they may be "blocked" off when not in use ( **eg a barrier** ). This would make access to the new spaces impossible for the boy racers.

### **CCTV**

This is a great thing if it is WORKING ~ we have a problem with cars at night parking up beside the recycle bins, one evening resulted in the bins & fences being set alight. When police asked for the CCTV footage, they were told the camera was not working ? I personally have had a push bike stolen & was told the same thing. ( A neighbour had a car vandalised same story )

Please can you make sure they are working & NOT pointed near the windows of the houses as all the MOD house have their bedrooms at the back

### **Traffic**

Volume of traffic is a serious worry, as a resident we only have one entry in & out and share this entry with the MOD & Priory House staff & visitors, along with school busses. How can we assure this access is not blocked up with many MORE visitors to the council building? This is always a BIG issue when you have meetings on, especially the one regarding the new travellers sight where the photographs ended up at the local newspaper. Could you do a "park & ride" from Shefford seeing as car share does not work ? ( the facilities manager is fed up with the residents and nothing seems to be done to cars that park dangerously & illegally )

These are my main concerns regarding the proposed new 146 car parking spaces.

### **Additional Comments**

The comments of both the Ecology Officer and the Landscape Officer are noted, but it is not felt that, on balance, concerns should constitute a reason for refusing this application or the imposition of planning conditions. An informative would seek to ensure that the applicant was conscious of existing ecology at the site.

Concerns from the two residents are noted. It would not be practical to ensure that the proposed spaces were used for overflow only. The applicant has demonstrated that the spaces are likely to be required on a regular basis to meet demand. Concerns over safety and security are noted. Whilst not a matter that should warrant the refusal of the planning application, they should be considered by the applicant.

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

1/ No development shall commence at the site before details of storm water design have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Internal Drainage Board. The development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To ensure that storm water provision at the site is acceptable.

*Please note that the applicant is in discussions with the IDB. If those discussions result in the Board confirming in writing that no condition or an amended condition to that above is required, the condition shall be removed or amended as necessary.*

2/ The proposed development shall be carried out and completed in all respects in accordance with the access siting and layout illustrated on the approved plan and defined by this permission and, notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995, (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) there shall be no variation without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the site is completed insofar as its various parts are interrelated and dependent one upon another and to provide adequate and appropriate access arrangements at all times.

Condition 6 should be renumbered as condition 8.

Informative:

The applicant is reminded that due care and attention should be paid to existing ecology at the site and that relevant best practice should be followed.

## ***Item 9 (Pages 57 – 72) – CB/13/03494/FULL – Land South of Potton Road, Biggleswade***

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

The following consultation response has been received from the Council's Highways Team:

I can confirm that the proposal accords with highway requirements and as such there is no highway reason why planning approval should not be considered.

The highway network has been designed in accordance with the Design Code and will be suitable for adoption as public highway where appropriate. Car parking numbers comply with latest guidance. However there is an element of shared usage of the spaces alongside the commercial and community buildings. This is not an uncommon arrangement and is seen as good practice making best use of the land available whilst reflecting the varying demands of the particular uses in terms of time of day and period of stay. Nevertheless in order for the parking spaces to be utilised flexibly there does need to be a management plan in place whether that be by a private arrangement and/or Traffic Regulation Order if appropriate. In this respect I

am suggesting a condition be included requiring the submission of a car-park management plan to be submitted.

It is acknowledged that there is an element of shared parking within the scheme, a situation not uncommon to mixed use developments and referenced in the CBC LTP3 Appendix F Parking Strategy which states "The shared use of parking, particularly in town centres and as part of existing major developments, will also be encouraged to reduce the overall amount of parking provision and to reduce land take."

The Parking Strategy Plan and Transportation Technical Note supplied within the application sets out the parking requirements and suggests that the parking requirements are met. However whilst in the main the requirements for allocated parking for each use are generally in close proximity to the premises they are intended to serve there are a number, together with the visitor parking, that will take the form of unallocated spaces open for general usage within the heart of the scheme. These spaces will be subject to a Management agreement as required by condition.

A further point for consideration which has a bearing on the level of provision for car parking, particularly for the commercial and community uses is the location of the site in relation to the surrounding overall development and its purpose as a Local Centre with good accessibility for trips by foot and cycle rather than reliance on the private car.

To conclude I believe that the level of parking provision, both in terms of number and location, within the scheme is appropriate to the mix of development proposed that is in within the heart of a new major residential settlement with good accessibility to sustainable transport.

### **Additional Comments**

For the avoidance of doubt, the following table sets out the proposed car parking provision at the site:

	<b>Policy standard</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>+/-</b>
Block A resi	29	29	0
Block A resi vistor	4	7	+3
Block A office	8	8	0
Block B resi	36	36	0
Block B resi vistor	5	5	0
Block C retail	37 (maximum)	32	-5
Block C resi	32	32	0
Block C resi vistor	5	6	+1
Block D care home	20 (maximum)	20	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>-1</b>

There is no appropriate standard against which to assess the community building. 13 spaces would be provided, which in the context of the likely use by some people who live within walking distance of it, would be an acceptable provision.



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

1/.No development shall commence at the site before detailed plans and sections of the proposed roads, including speed reduction measures and method of surface water disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no building shall be occupied until the section of road which provides access to it has been constructed (apart from final surfacing) in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed road works are constructed to an adequate standard.

2/.The proposed development shall be carried out and completed in all respects in accordance with the access siting and layout illustrated on the approved plan and defined by this permission and, notwithstanding the provision of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995, (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) there shall be no variation without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the site is completed insofar as its various parts are interrelated and dependent one upon another and to provide adequate and appropriate access arrangements at all times.

3/.No development shall commence at the site before details of construction vehicle routing, on-site parking for construction vehicles and wheel cleaning facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To minimise the impact of construction vehicles on the local area.

Advice Note 1/.The applicant is advised that if it is the intention to request the Central Bedfordshire Council as Local Highway Authority, to adopt the proposed highways as maintainable at the public expense then details of the specification, layout and alignment, width and levels of the said highways together with all the necessary highway and drainage arrangements, including run off calculations shall be submitted to the Highways Development Control Group, Development Management Division, Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford Bedfordshire SG17 5TQ. No development shall commence until the details have been approved in writing and an Agreement made under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 is in place.

Condition 22 should be renumbered as 24.

**Item 10 (Pages 73 – 83) – CB/13/04451 – Crossways Park, Hitchin Road, Arlesey**

Photographs are appended which have been supplied by a nearby neighbour.

## **Item 11 (Pages 85 – 114) – CB/14/00077 – 2 High Street Stotfold**

### **Additional Consultation Responses**

CBC Rights of Way Officer response received

Thank you for the latest application regarding Stotfold Footpath 11. With the revised location of the build at the southern end of the plot both Adam Maciejewski and I have no comments to make. Should the build require temporary closure of the footpath to the western edge of the application site, please advise the applicant there is a 6 week lead in time for applications to be processed.

### **Additional Comments**

With regard to the S106, the applicant has confirmed the document has been signed by the Mortgage company and is to be agreed by the Council's Legal Team.

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