

Item No. 10

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/14/02263/CA
LOCATION	The Norman King, Church Street, Dunstable, LU5 4HN
PROPOSAL	Conservation Area Consent: For Demolition of remains of former Norman King building and removal of associated hard standing prior to redevelopment of the site as set out in a further application.
PARISH	Dunstable
WARD	Dunstable Icknield
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs McVicar & Young
CASE OFFICER	Abel Bunu
DATE REGISTERED	11 June 2014
EXPIRY DATE	06 August 2014
APPLICANT	MGM Hotels Ltd
AGENT	David Lock Associates
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Brought to Committee by the Interim Assistant Director for Planning due to the degree of public interest and member interest.
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application For Relevant Demolition - Recommended for Approval

Summary of Recommendation

The proposed demolition of the remains of the Norman King Public House is acceptable in principle, having regard to the condition of the site following the destruction of the building by a fire which led to its de-listing by English Heritage. Furthermore, the development would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and better reveal the significance of the heritage assets which comprise the Grade II Listed Kingsbury Old Court Palace Lodge Hotel to the west, the Grade II Listed Marshe Almshouses to the east, the Grade II Listed K6 Telephone Kiosk in front of the Almshouses, the Grade I Listed St Peter's Church and the scheduled site of Dunstable Priory to the south of the site thereby conforming to the development plan comprising Policies BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and 43 & 45 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire and national advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Site Location:

The application site is situated within the Dunstable Conservation Area and comprises the remains of the former Norman King Public House which lies at the junction of Church Street and Kingsway in Dunstable and the Old Palace Lodge to its immediate west beyond which are sheltered dwellings on Kingsbury Court. To the east of the site are the Marshe Almshouses (Ladies Lodge, 97-107 Church Street) which are Grade II Listed and to the south of the site is the Grade I Listed St Peter's Church. Next to the Almshouses is a Grade II Listed telephone kiosk.

The Application:

seeks planning permission to demolish the remains of a building and the associated hardstanding in the Conservation Area.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

National Planning Policy Framework (27 March 2012)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012 and replaced most of the previous national planning policy documents PPS's and PPGs.

South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review Policies

The NPPF advises of the weight to be attached to existing local plans for plans adopted prior to the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, as in the case of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review. Due weight can be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the framework. It is considered that the following policy is broadly consistent with the framework and significant weight should be attached to it.

BE8 Design Considerations

Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire

The draft Development Strategy was endorsed for Development Management purposes on the 27th May 2014 and is due to be submitted to the Secretary of State in October 2014. It is therefore considered that having regard to the stage of the plan preparation, the ones listed below are given limited weight in the determination of this application :

Policy 1 : Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 43: High Quality Development

Policy 45: The Historic Environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Central Bedfordshire Design Guide: A Guide for Development (2010):

Planning History

Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/14/01919/DEM
Validated:	19/05/2014	Type:	Demolition Determination (PD)
Status:	Withdrawn	Date:	11/06/2014

Summary:

Description: Demolition Determination: Demolition of remains of former Norman King building and removal of associated hard standing prior to redevelopment of the site as set out in a further application.

Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/14/01924/FULL
Validated:	19/05/2014	Type:	Full Application
Status:	Registered	Date:	

Summary:

Description: Demolition of remains of existing former Norman King PH and removal of plant equipment adjacent to the Old Palace Lodge, Erection of two storey building to accommodate 12 No. aparthotel rooms, thatched covered parking structure, alterations to hotel entrance, introduction of revised access, and associated works.

Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/14/01925/LB
Validated:	19/05/2014	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	14/07/2014
Summary:	Granted		
Description:	Demolition of remains of existing former Norman King PH and removal of plant equipment adjacent to the Old Palace Lodge, Erection of two storey building to accommodate 12 No. aparthotel rooms, thatched covered parking structure, alterations to hotel entrance, introduction of revised access, and associated works.		
Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/14/00069/FULL
Validated:	14/01/2014	Type:	Full Application
Status:	Decided	Date:	11/03/2014
Summary:	Erection of a semi detached pair of dwellings including associated works		
Description:	Erection of a semi detached pair of dwellings including associated works		
Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/13/02729/REN
Validated:	02/08/2013	Type:	Replacement PP sub to new time limit
Status:	Decided	Date:	27/09/2013
Summary:	Erection of three storey rear extension to provide 18 no. double/twin en-suites bedrooms (Application for new planning permission to replace extant planning permission SB/TP/07/0709 and CB/10/03172/REN in order to extend the time limit for implementation.		
Description:	Erection of three storey rear extension to provide 18 no. double/twin en-suites bedrooms (Application for new planning permission to replace extant planning permission SB/TP/07/0709 and CB/10/03172/REN in order to extend the time limit for implementation.		
Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/13/00153/TD
Validated:	15/01/2013	Type:	Telecommunications Development
Status:	Decided	Date:	08/02/2013
Summary:	Telecom Prior Approval not required		
Description:	Telecommunications Development: Installation of Openreach Broadband electronic communications cabinet.		
Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/10/03163/REN
Validated:	31/08/2010	Type:	Replacement PP sub to new time limit
Status:	Decided	Date:	19/10/2010
Summary:	Erection of single storey extension to provide staff accommodation. (Application for a new planning permission to replace extant planning permission SB/TP/07/0707 in order to extend the time limit for implementation		
Description:	Erection of single storey extension to provide staff accommodation. (Application for a new planning permission to replace extant planning permission SB/TP/07/0707 in order to extend the time limit for implementation		
Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/10/03172/REN
Validated:	31/08/2010	Type:	Replacement PP sub to new time limit
Status:	Decided	Date:	19/10/2010
Summary:	Erection of three storey rear extension to provide 18 no. double/twin en-suites bedrooms (Application for new planning permission to replace extant planning permission SB/TP/07/0709 in order to extend the time limit for implementation.		
Description:	Erection of three storey rear extension to provide 18 no. double/twin en-suites bedrooms (Application for new planning permission to replace extant planning permission SB/TP/07/0709 in order to extend the time limit for implementation.		
Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/10/03176/REN
Validated:	31/08/2010	Type:	Replacement PP sub to new time limit
Status:	Decided	Date:	19/10/2010
Summary:	Erection of single storey extension to provide staff accommodation. (Application for replacement of associated Listed Building Consent in order to extend the time limit for SB/LB/07/0705		
Description:	Erection of single storey extension to provide staff accommodation. (Application for replacement of associated Listed Building Consent in order to extend the time limit for SB/LB/07/0705		
Application:	Planning	Number:	CB/10/03177/REN
Validated:	31/08/2010	Type:	Replacement PP sub to new time limit
Status:	Decided	Date:	19/10/2010

Summary:

Description: Erection of three storey rear extension to provide 18 double/twin en-suite bedrooms (application for replacement of associated Listed Building Consent in order to extend the time limit of SB/LB/07/0708)

Application: Planning **Number:** CB/10/03374/LB
Validated: 22/07/2010 **Type:** Listed Building
Status: Decided **Date:** 08/11/2010

Summary:
Description: Retention of storage container unit in car park

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/04/00057
Validated: 03/02/2004 **Type:** Listed Building
Status: Decided **Date:** 22/03/2004

Summary:
Description: REPLACEMENT THATCH ROOF.

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/97/00013
Validated: 18/11/1997 **Type:** Lawful Development Cert - Existing
Status: Decided **Date:** 19/12/1997

Summary:
Description: USE OF PREMISES AS A PUBLIC HOUSE INCORPORATING BEER GARDEN

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/97/00013
Validated: 18/11/1997 **Type:** Lawful Development Cert - Existing
Status: Decided **Date:** 19/12/1997

Summary:
Description: USE OF PREMISES AS A PUBLIC HOUSE INCORPORATING BEER GARDEN

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/97/00013
Validated: 18/11/1997 **Type:** Lawful Development Cert - Existing
Status: Decided **Date:** 19/12/1997

Summary:
Description: USE OF PREMISES AS A PUBLIC HOUSE INCORPORATING BEER GARDEN

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/97/00013
Validated: 18/11/1997 **Type:** Lawful Development Cert - Existing
Status: Decided **Date:** 19/12/1997

Summary:
Description: USE OF PREMISES AS A PUBLIC HOUSE INCORPORATING BEER GARDEN

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/97/00013
Validated: 18/11/1997 **Type:** Lawful Development Cert - Existing
Status: Decided **Date:** 19/12/1997

Summary:
Description: USE OF PREMISES AS A PUBLIC HOUSE INCORPORATING BEER GARDEN

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/97/00013
Validated: 18/11/1997 **Type:** Lawful Development Cert - Existing
Status: Decided **Date:** 19/12/1997

Summary:
Description: USE OF PREMISES AS A PUBLIC HOUSE INCORPORATING BEER GARDEN

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/97/00013
Validated: 18/11/1997 **Type:** Lawful Development Cert - Existing
Status: Decided **Date:** 19/12/1997

Summary:
Description: USE OF PREMISES AS A PUBLIC HOUSE INCORPORATING BEER GARDEN

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/97/00099
Validated: 07/02/1997 **Type:** Full Application

Status:	Decided	Date:	20/03/1997
Summary:			
Description:	CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM RESIDENTIAL TO PUBLIC HOUSE BEER GARDEN		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00022
Validated:	05/08/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	27/09/1996
Summary:			
Description:	CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FIREPLACE		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00022
Validated:	05/08/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	27/09/1996
Summary:			
Description:	CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FIREPLACE		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00022
Validated:	05/08/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	27/09/1996
Summary:			
Description:	CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FIREPLACE		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00568
Validated:	25/07/1996	Type:	Full Application
Status:	Withdrawn	Date:	16/09/1996
Summary:			
Description:	CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM RESIDENTIAL TO PUBLIC HOUSE BEER GARDEN		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		

Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/96/00003
Validated:	26/01/1996	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	09/05/1996
Summary:			
Description:	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REDECORATION		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/89/00004
Validated:	03/02/1989	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	29/03/1989
Summary:			
Description:	INSTALLATION OF ILLUMINATED SIGNS		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/89/00004
Validated:	03/02/1989	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	29/03/1989
Summary:			
Description:	INSTALLATION OF ILLUMINATED SIGNS		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/89/00004
Validated:	03/02/1989	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	29/03/1989
Summary:			
Description:	INSTALLATION OF ILLUMINATED SIGNS		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/89/00004
Validated:	03/02/1989	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	29/03/1989
Summary:			
Description:	INSTALLATION OF ILLUMINATED SIGNS		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/89/00004
Validated:	03/02/1989	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	29/03/1989
Summary:			
Description:	INSTALLATION OF ILLUMINATED SIGNS		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/89/00004
Validated:	03/02/1989	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	29/03/1989
Summary:			
Description:	INSTALLATION OF ILLUMINATED SIGNS		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/89/00004
Validated:	03/02/1989	Type:	Listed Building
Status:	Decided	Date:	29/03/1989
Summary:			
Description:	INSTALLATION OF ILLUMINATED SIGNS		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/89/00005
Validated:	20/01/1989	Type:	Advertisement
Status:	Decided	Date:	29/03/1989
Summary:			
Description:	DISPLAY OF ILLUMINATED BOARDS AND SIGNS		
Application:	Planning	Number:	SB/89/00005
Validated:	20/01/1989	Type:	Advertisement
Status:	Decided	Date:	29/03/1989
Summary:			

Description: DISPLAY OF ILLUMINATED BOARDS AND SIGNS

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/89/00005
Validated: 20/01/1989 **Type:** Advertisement
Status: Decided **Date:** 29/03/1989
Summary:
Description: DISPLAY OF ILLUMINATED BOARDS AND SIGNS

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/89/00005
Validated: 20/01/1989 **Type:** Advertisement
Status: Decided **Date:** 29/03/1989
Summary:
Description: DISPLAY OF ILLUMINATED BOARDS AND SIGNS

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/89/00005
Validated: 20/01/1989 **Type:** Advertisement
Status: Decided **Date:** 29/03/1989
Summary:
Description: DISPLAY OF ILLUMINATED BOARDS AND SIGNS

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/89/00005
Validated: 20/01/1989 **Type:** Advertisement
Status: Decided **Date:** 29/03/1989
Summary:
Description: DISPLAY OF ILLUMINATED BOARDS AND SIGNS

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/88/00050
Validated: 21/12/1988 **Type:** Listed Building
Status: Decided **Date:** 14/02/1989
Summary:
Description: NEW EXTERNAL DOOR AND INTERNAL LOBBY

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/88/00050
Validated: 21/12/1988 **Type:** Listed Building
Status: Decided **Date:** 14/02/1989
Summary:
Description: NEW EXTERNAL DOOR AND INTERNAL LOBBY

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/88/00050
Validated: 21/12/1988 **Type:** Listed Building
Status: Decided **Date:** 14/02/1989
Summary:
Description: NEW EXTERNAL DOOR AND INTERNAL LOBBY

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/88/01649
Validated: 21/12/1988 **Type:** Full Application
Status: Decided **Date:** 14/02/1989
Summary:
Description: ERECTION OF NEW ENTRANCE LOBBY TO KINGSWAY

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/84/00009
Validated: **Type:** Listed Building
Status: Received **Date:** 03/04/1984
Summary: Unknown
Description: REAR CONSERVATORY AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/84/00009
Validated: **Type:** Listed Building
Status: Received **Date:** 03/04/1984
Summary: Unknown
Description: REAR CONSERVATORY AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS

Application: Planning **Number:** SB/84/00009
Validated: **Type:** Listed Building
Status: Received **Date:** 03/04/1984
Summary: Unknown
Description: REAR CONSERVATORY AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS

Application: Planning
Validated:
Status: Received
Summary: Unknown
Description: REAR CONSERVATORY AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS

Number: SB/84/00009
Type: Listed Building
Date: 03/04/1984

Application: Planning
Validated:
Status: Received
Summary: Unknown
Description: REAR CONSERVATORY

Number: SB/84/00207
Type:
Date: 03/04/1984

Application: Planning
Validated:
Status: Received
Summary: Unknown
Description: Erection of a semi detached pair of dwellings including associated works.

Number: CB/14/00412/ARCH
Type: Archaeology
Date:

Representations: (Parish & Neighbours)

Town Council
Neighbours

16 Richard Street, 1, 42
Kingsway

No objection.

- This is a historic site and a part of the history of the town. The Norman king needs to be restored to its former glory and not re-developed into an extension of an existing hotel that is not a requirement for the people and town. A fully restored Norman King would generate more interest in the town than a extension of an hotel that is in need of a refurbishment.
- Proposal to demolish the Norman King Public House to make way for a mini hotel is most distressing.
- This has financial benefits for the rich owners of the business at the expense of a lovely historic building.
- Options could have been explored to re-build the fire damaged building to its original standard as happens elsewhere.
- Objection on the grounds of the age and sensitivity of this ancient monument. It has always been held very dear to the town and pre-dates any other building in the area.
- This building was originally a timber framed building, mostly a barn with the old Norman wall facing Church Street. It stood in the yard opposite the farmhouse and was called Kingsbury Farm. It was used for stabling the livestock and mostly a livery for horses. This is known to be an ancient site, certainly the barn would have been medieval. The wall is Norman and is possibly part of the original Kingsbury Palace built 1109 by King Henry 1 (son of William the Conqueror)so it is over 900 years old and its walls are still standing. Hence the extreme sensitivity of this place, the Palace would have been demolished (old habits!) and probably the wall was left standing, they would have then incorporated it as part of a large barn.

It was beautifully constructed.

- The Norman King stands as a unique site of special interest with many different era's and influences providing a wonderful gateway to the town. It has been the victim of a mindless arson attack. The fire took the roof and timber but the walls are still standing. I feel that we must retain the site for future generations, we can rebuild a barn. If it is done to the satisfaction of everyone concerned it will be an asset to the owner's business and surely an asset to this town.

The Norman King, Old
Palace Lodge Hotel,
Church Street
Petition (about 2016
petitioners)

Fully support the application. (Note: Owners of site and applicant).

Covering note to the petition states that :

This building was the victim of an arson attack 10/08/2011 at 1215am. The structure was listed with English Heritage as Grade 2 – a Medieval Thatched Barn – in 1975 by local historians, it has been cherished locally for many years, and provided a beautiful gateway to our town. Tragically the fire has taken away all the medieval barn structure leaving only it's walls standing. The wall facing Church Street is thought to be very old indeed. This building has been subject to many influences and alterations over hundreds of years that it is thought to have stood there. It is thought that it may be possible that it stands on or near the remains of KINGSBURY, a Royal Palace built by King Henry 1 (The Norman King) Circa 1109.

Our petition has seen an informed attempt to discredit it, from the Dunstable & District History Society Chairman Mr John Buckledee and the Dunstable Town Council. We respect and bow down to his superior knowledge in this matter, but he does refer to the documented evidence of it being Medieval. This building in parts could be much older than that, no one knows. We believe an archaeological survey has been included with the above application, but it will risk the resulting complete demolition of this site. It is far too important for that to happen and we must find another more sympathetic way forward.

We would urge the planning committee to consider the sensitivity of this ancient site and we would like to see the barn rebuilt using the existing walls where possible, in its original timber and thatched style. Please listen to the people who have responded very passionately regarding this issue.

CBC facebook postings
(Snapshot taken 20:42
Sunday 3rd August from
Facebook Post)

Discussion on the heritage significance of the former Norman King building including its historic origin.

Conservation and
Design Officer

It firstly needs to be emphasised that the proposed demolition would leave a substantive section of the 'iconic' stone rubble walling fronting Church Street intact, to be incorporated, and left prominently open to display, within the new build proposed for the site.

I will require full assurance as to the adequate protection of this walling during, and after, the demolition process (see recommended Conditions below).

The importance of building recording as part of any approval of demolition has been picked up and fully dealt with, as part of the required archaeological investigations, by the CBC Archaeologists, and requested to be secured by Condition. I am grateful for the thoroughness of the CBC Archaeologists in this matter.

Additionally, I note that the extant (fire damaged) building retains, within its wall fabric, remnants of historic timber framing. This is of intrinsic interest, and I would require that such framing is carefully set aside following wall dismantling for Local Planning Authority inspection, and instructions for appropriate disposal then confirmed. (Recommended Conditions)

Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application

....

- Following the dismantling of the building hereby approved no part of the extant structural timber framing shall be removed from site or destroyed until inspected by an appropriate Officer of the Local Planning Authority, and appropriate disposal of the framing sections confirmed by the Local Planning authority thereafter in writing. Full provision for the appropriate and safe storage of such structural items, and notification arrangements inviting Local Planning Authority inspection shall be confirmed in writing to, and approved by, the Local planning authority prior to the commencement of works of demolition on site, and the approved works of demolition shall thereafter be implemented strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the adequate recording and appropriate disposal of particular architectural details surviving in the extant building in accordance with paragraph 141 of the NPPF.

- No works of demolition shall take place until a written method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority confirming arrangements for the complete protection, during and after the works of demolition hereby approved, of the extant stone frontage walling to be retained and incorporated in

situ within any new build on the site. The approved works of demolition shall thereafter be implemented strictly in accordance with the approved details.

No works of demolition shall take place until drawn 'as existing' details in elevation and section, and at an appropriate scale between 1:10 and 1:20, as appropriate, showing in detail the existing stone walling to be incorporated in situ within any new build on the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the required works of wall protection shall thereafter be implemented strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Archaeologist

The proposed development site lies within the core of the Roman and medieval towns of Dunstable (HER's 135, 11270 and 16986). The site is also close to the suggested location of a Royal residence (HER 148) built by Henry I in the early part of the 12th century AD, following his foundation of the medieval town. Under the terms of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) these are all heritage assets with archaeological interest.

The application area includes the Old Palace Lodge (HER 4355, LB 724/2/13) which is a Grade II Listed Building, and prior to its devastation by fire in 2011, the Norman King Public House (HER 4353), which is the subject of this application, was also a Grade II Listed Building. To the east of the site lie the Marshe Almshouses (HER 6253, LB 724/2/14) and a K6 Telephone Kiosk (HER 15172, LB 724/2/133) which are also Grade II Listed Buildings. Under the terms of the

NPPF the Listed Buildings are designated heritage assets.

In addition, the application area lies within the Dunstable Conservation Area (HER DBD6475) and within the setting of the Priory Church of St Peter (HER 132, LB 2/1: Grade I Listed), the Priory Gateway (HER 6329, LB 724/2/61: Grade I Listed) and the remains of the Augustinian Priory of St Peter Scheduled Monument (HER 131 and SM 3). The Church, Gateway and remains of the Priory are all designated heritage assets of the highest significance.

In summary, the historic environment within this part of Dunstable is extremely important to the identity of the town and to Central Bedfordshire as a whole. This report represents a summary of the Central Bedfordshire Council Archaeologist's comments on the development proposals. The full comments can be obtained by contacting Hannah Firth (archaeology@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk).

The Roman town at Dunstable (HER 135, HER 11270 and HER 11284) recorded as *Durocobrivae* or *Durocobravis*, appears to have developed around the crossroads between the prehistoric routeway known as the Icknield Way (HER 353) and Watling Street (HER 5508), one of the major arterial roads in Roman Britain; Church Street, on which the application site lies (also formerly East Street), may lie over part of the Icknield Way.

Durocobrivae may have been one of a series of mansios (stopping points/staging posts) along Watling Street. Numerous small archaeological investigations have demonstrated the survival of a range of archaeological deposits dating to the Roman period and features including ditches, pits and wells have been found to the west and north-west of the Norman King site (HER 11270, HAT 2000 and OA 2006) and more ephemeral remains have been found adjacent, at the Old Palace Lodge/Kingsbury (HER's 15008 and 14965, Manshead Archaeological Society 1988 and 1989 and Heritage Network 2007 and forthcoming).

The decline of *Durocobrivae* is likely to have taken place some time during the 5th century AD following the official withdrawal of Roman rule from Britain. At present there does not appear to have been any continuity between the Roman and Saxon settlements.

In approximately 1119 AD Henry I founded the medieval town (HER 16986) in Dunstable and in similarity to the Roman settlement this was focussed upon the Icknield Way/Watling Street crossroads. The town had a planned market place and was laid out in burgage plots, some of which may be preserved in the surviving property boundaries today, particularly along High Street South. Medieval features dating to this period have been recorded at a number of locations within the modern town (Albion Archaeology 2003). Documentary sources, now supported by archaeological evidence, suggest that Henry I also had a Royal residence within the town (HER 148) located on the northern side of Church Street (see below).

Around 1131/32 AD Henry I established the Augustinian Priory of St Peter (HER 131, SM 3). Located on the opposite side of Church Street to his residence, the Priory was endowed with significant lands and properties within the town and surrounding area. The upstanding remains of the Priory buildings include the nave of the Church of St Peter (HER 132, LB 2/1), part of the Gatehouse (HER 6329, LB 724/2/61) and the undercroft at Priory House (HER 6311, LB 1/17). Sub-surface remains relating to the Priory have been recorded in a number of locations within Dunstable (Mathews 1984, ASC 2005 and 2007, Archaeological Solutions 2012 and KDK Archaeology

2014). The majority of the Priory site lies within Priory Gardens (between Church Street and High Street South) and part of it is protected as a Scheduled Monument, in planning terms: a nationally designated heritage asset of the highest significance.

Historical documentation indicates that Henry I had a Royal residence (HER 148) in Dunstable (presumably constructed around the time that the town was founded) and it was located on the northern side of Church Street. The residence is often referred to as a “palace” and this is even reflected in the name of the hotel (the Old Palace Lodge), which may now occupy the “palace” site. However; it is as likely that building was more simply an opulent house, and probably a combination of masonry and timber framing. Henry I spent Christmas in 1122 in Dunstable and the Pipe Rolls of 1129-30 show that there was a housekeeper for the residence, who was paid the rate of one penny a day.

When the Augustinian Priory was created in 1131/32 the lands associated with this residence were granted to the Priors, a Royal Charter specified that the King retained the house and gardens. King Stephen stayed there in 1137 and it was reserved for the use of Henry II and Richard I. In 1204 King John gifted the residence to the Augustinian Priory, although there is little within the annals of the Priory to explain what the Priors did with it. By 1277 the Priors were engaged in building a “great chamber” within the precinct of the Priory for the King to stay in, so it would seem that the Royal residence was by then not considered appropriate for Royalty.

By the time of the Dissolution of the Priory in the late 1530's, the Royal residence or at least its site had become farm known as “Kingsbury”. The early post medieval history of the site is sketchy; however, there are a number of 17th century references that mention the conversion of the King's residence to a farmhouse. The earliest known cartographic source for Kingsbury farm dates to 1762 relating to the Bedford Estate (held in BLARS). It depicts a fairly substantial farmstead with barns/outbuildings projecting back from the main house and the Church Street frontage. An early 19th century engraving (sketched 1812, dated 1815) shows the Church Street elevations of the property and elements of what was to become Kingsbury House/Court, the Old Palace Lodge and the Norman King are easily recognisable. The south wall of the Norman King is shown as a rubble wall, and the accompanying note refers to the use of Totternhoe stone.

In 1987 and 1988 prior to the erection of Kingsbury Court accommodation for the elderly, a number of features associated with the post medieval and Georgian Kingsbury property; including latrines, foundation

trenches and cobbled yard surfaces were discovered and investigated by the Manshead Archaeological Society. At least three phases of remodelling were noted but no evidence on the western half of the site was found for the medieval Royal residence (Warren, 1988 & 1989).

Ordnance survey mapping (the earliest dates to 1880) shows Kingsbury House (to the west), as the main residence with associated gardens. The farm is depicted arranged in a courtyard fashion to the east. Kingsbury continued as a farm until the early 20th century and there are a number of photographs which show the whole site, including the thatched barn (later to become the Norman King). Between the end of the First World War and the 1924, extensive remodelling of Kingsbury took place, including the erection of the eastern extension (now part of the Old Palace Lodge).

It is reported that in 1927, the barn (later to become the Norman King public house) was converted for use as the town museum and a branch of the Bedfordshire County Library. Between 1934 and 1937 the whole property was divided up into the Old Palace Lodge (which was acquired by Creasey Hotels in 1959 and became a hotel in 1960), Kingsbury Stables (the Norman King) and Kingsbury Court/House (a private residence).

In 1960, the Flowers Breweries obtained the former Kingsbury Stables and converted it into a public house, opened as the Norman King in 1961. In order to convert the building extensive remodelling apparently took place. This is said to have included the re-building of the south wall. Several sources including the English Heritage List entry suggest that re-used stone was imported from Cambridgeshire to do this. However, this seems a little spurious, given that Totternhoe quarries were still in operation at that time and the site in Cambridgeshire which is said to have been "quarried" for the clunch was in fact built from timber. This information should therefore be considered anecdotal unless proven.

There has been some speculation (also noted within the Heritage Statement that accompanies application CB/14/01924/FULL) regarding the true location of Henry I's Royal residence. The historic records do not give an exact position either for the location of the residence or for the Priory itself. The residence is generally believed to have been north of the Church, but it should be noted that the Church as it stands today has been modified and re-built significantly since it served the Priory. There is now, however, a growing body of archaeological evidence from the Kingsbury/Old Palace Lodge/Norman King site, which suggests the presence of a high status medieval building within the application area.

In 1981, before the construction of an extension to the

Old Palace Lodge Hotel, the Manshead Archaeological Society recovered medieval and Roman pottery from the new foundations, as well as observing the presence of a large robbed-out buttress (Manshead Archaeological Society 1981). In 2007, an archaeological field evaluation was undertaken prior to the determination of a planning application for an additional extension to the Old Palace Lodge Hotel. The results of the evaluation demonstrated the presence of archaeological deposits dating to the Roman, medieval and post medieval periods. Of particular interest was the recovery of worked medieval Totternhoe stone. The stone has a series of floral motifs carved into it and probably dates to the 12th/13th century (Heritage Network 2007). It is the type of decorated stone, one would expect to find on a high status building. In 2012, follow up excavation produced further evidence for Roman and medieval activity. More worked Totternhoe stone was recovered, along with a quantity of medieval window lead and evidence for small scale metal working. A large medieval boundary ditch, running parallel with Church Street was also recorded (Heritage Network, forthcoming). The buttress, carved Totternhoe stone and the window lead, which would not have been used in standard domestic buildings, strongly suggest the Kingsbury/Old Palace Lodge Norman King site overlies a significant medieval building, possibly Henry I's Royal residence.

The fire at the Norman King in 2011 was so devastating that when the case was reviewed by English Heritage in 2012 they reported that *"much of the building, including the upper storey and the roof structure have been completely destroyed by fire..."*. This led to the conclusion that *"the special architectural interest of the building has been irrecoverably diminished as a result of comprehensive fire damage"* (English Heritage, Advice Report 22nd August 2012), and as a consequence the building was de-listed. Nevertheless, even the remains of the building hold significance and it is positive that this significance is acknowledged in application CB/14/01924/FULL with the design of the proposed new building retaining part of the surviving clunch wall and the parking area at the rear being covered by a thatched roof.

The commitment to retain part of the surviving fabric of the building should be applauded, but is also vital that if this proposal is to gain consent, a full record of the surviving fabric of the building takes place. Pre-application discussions with the agents for these proposals have indicated that the applicant is able to commission a laser survey of the remains of the Norman King. The inclusion of the *Topon Ltd* letter (dated 14th March 2014) in the supporting documents entitled *"The Former Norman King Public House, Dunstable: Redevelopment of the Site, Phase 2 – The Main Site"* (David Lock Associates, May 2012), that accompanies

CB/14/01924/FULL which refers to the purchase of a GLS-2000 scanner demonstrates that applicant shall be undertaking the laser survey. This commitment recording the remains of the former designated heritage asset is in line with requirements of paragraph 141 of the NPPF and it is very welcome.

The *Heritage Statement* (Rev C, Ward-Booth with contributions by Collins, undated) that accompanies CB/14/01924/FULL provides a useful summary of the known historic environment data for the site and the surrounding area. There are however a few minor errors; for example the reference to the “*Central Bedfordshire Heritage and Environment Record*” (it is the Historic Environment Record) and the fact that on page 26 the Archaeology section states that “*The proposed development site is just outside the presumed boundary of the NE Quadrant of the Roman Town...*” – it is within the boundary. There is also an updated photograph on page 20 which is accompanied by the label “*Photograph showing the appeal site during the period of its use as stabling*”. As this is the first application for the re-development of the site, I am not sure why the term “appeal” has been used and the fact that the date of the photograph has not been included does not actually provide any assistance in understanding the historic use and development of the site.

I am also rather disappointed that in the Justification and Weighing Up section on page 27 it is concluded that “... *the impact of the proposed development of identified heritage assets within the locality will be essentially neutral*”. The re-development of this site will have a negative and irreversible impact on the remains of the Norman King and the surviving archaeological resource, neither of which can be justifiably called “neutral impacts”. I do not however disagree with the conclusion that the proposals will not harm the setting of the Scheduled Monument, which after all is intrinsically linked with the application site.

My concerns notwithstanding, I am generally content that the applicant and his agents have demonstrated a commitment to the historic environment associated with the proposed development site within application CB/14/01924/FULL, which is the partner application to this one.

The Norman King was a Grade II Listed Building and formed a group with the Old Palace Lodge, which may have overlain the site of Henry I’s Royal residence in Dunstable. Under the terms of the NPPF, like the Old Palace Lodge, before it was devastated by fire, the Norman King was a designated heritage asset. The de-listing of the site means the building is no longer a designated heritage asset. Nevertheless, it is still a non-

designated heritage asset and consequently the requirements of paragraph 141 of the NPPF to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost still apply to the remains of the building, even more so given that it will substantially be demolished.

The application site lies within the core of the Roman and medieval towns of Dunstable (HER's 135, 11270 and 16986) and may overlie the site of Henry I's Royal residence (HER 148). A number of archaeological investigations in the surrounding area have shown that archaeological deposits relating to both the Roman and medieval periods, including human burials, survive well in this part of the town. These are heritage assets with archaeological interest as defined by the NPPF. Consequently, the proposed development site is considered to have the potential to contain archaeological deposits relating to the Roman, medieval and post medieval development of Dunstable. Research into the origins and development of small towns, their inter-relationships with their hinterlands and early town planning from the Saxon through to the early Post medieval periods are local and regional archaeological research objectives (Ayers 2000, 27-32, Going and Plouviez, 21, Oake et al 2007, 11 and 14 and Medlycott 2011, 47-48, 58, 70 & 79). In addition, it is acknowledged that little is known about the character of the medieval town at Dunstable and further research into this area is a local priority, including whether it is possible to confirm of the location of the Royal residence on Church Street (Oake et al 2007, 15).

Given the high profile nature of this site and its location within the heart of historic Dunstable, if this proposal is consented it is also necessary for the re-development of this site to directly benefit the local community. This will be achieved by the promotion of the historic environment and the creation of a heritage focussed public engagement programme.

Paragraph 141 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets before they are lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible (CLG 2012). Policy 45 of the *Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire* (pre-submission version, June 2014) echoes this and also requires all developments that affect heritage assets with archaeological interest to give due consideration to the significance of those assets and ensure that any impact on the archaeological resource which takes place as a result of the development is appropriately mitigated.

The proposed development will have a negative and irreversible impact upon the remains of the Norman King and any surviving archaeological deposits present on the site. Consequently, there will be an impact upon the significance of the surviving heritage assets within the application area. This does not present an over-riding constraint on the development providing that the applicant takes measures to record and advance understanding of the heritage assets affected by the development. This shall be achieved by the completion of a laser survey of the remains of the building before it is demolished; the investigation and recording of any archaeological deposits present at the site and the preservation *in situ* of any significant archaeological deposits. The laser survey shall also generate a report and the archaeological investigation shall include post-excavation analysis of any archive material generated, the publication of a report on the works and the completion of a programme of community engagement. In order to secure this, please attach the following conditions to any permission granted in respect of this application:

Buildings Survey

"No demolition or development shall take place until a method statement for a laser buildings survey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The results of the laser building survey shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any demolition or development takes place."

Reason: In accordance paragraph 141 of the NPPF; to record and advance the understanding of the significance of the former designated heritage asset before it is lost.

Archaeology

"No demolition or development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation, which reflects the final foundation design, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The written scheme shall include details of the following components:

- **A method statement for the investigation of any archaeological remains present at the site;**
- **A method statement for the preservation in situ of any significant archaeological remains present at the site;**
- **A outline strategy for post-excavation**

- assessment, analysis and publication;
- A programme of community engagement

The said development shall only be implemented in full accordance with the approved archaeological scheme and this condition shall only be fully discharged when the following components have been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority:

- The completion of the archaeological investigation, which shall be monitored by the Local Planning Authority;
- The implementation of a programme of preservation in situ of any significant archaeological remains present at the site.
- The submission within six months of the completion of the archaeological investigation (unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing by the Local Planning Authority) of a Post Excavation Assessment and an Updated Project Design, which shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- The completion within two years of the conclusion of the archaeological investigation (unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing by the Planning Authority) of the post-excavation analysis as specified in the approved Updated Project Design; preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store approved by the Local Planning Authority, completion of an archive report, and submission of a publication report;
- The implementation within one year of the approval of the publication report (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) of the programme of community engagement.”

Reason: In accordance with paragraph 141 of the NPPF; to record and advance the understanding of the significance of the heritage assets with archaeological interest which will be unavoidably affected as a consequence of the development and to make the record of this work publicly available. In accordance with Policy 45 of the emerging *Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire* (pre-submission version, June 2014); to give due consideration to the significance of the heritage assets with archaeological interest and ensure that any impact on the archaeological resource which takes place as a result of the development is appropriately mitigated.

following reasons :

- The existing Norman King Public House has suffered fire damage and is beyond repair, hence was de-listed.
- The proposed aparthotel rooms would be appropriate in scale and proportion to the surrounding buildings and would not detract from the setting of the Grade II Listed Marshe Almhouses.
- They would preserve the elements that made positive contribution to the significance of the Dunstable Conservation Area and would comply with paragraphs 132 and 137 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Should the application be granted, the Local Planning Authority may wish to condition samples of materials and landscaping.
- No objection. Full comments made in respect of the full planning application.

Highways Officer

Public Protection

No comment

Determining Issues

1. Impact of the proposed demolition of the remaining part of the former Norman King building on the character and setting of the Conservation Area.
2. Other considerations

Considerations

1. Impact on the character and setting of the Conservation Area

National advice within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is quite clear that one of the core principles of planning should be to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. (paragraph 17). Fundamentally, paragraph 137 places an obligation on Local Planning Authorities to look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably. This advice is echoed in Policies 43 and 45 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire (DSCB).

In this case, as confirmed by the Archeological Officer, the fire at the Norman King in 2011 was so devastating that when the case was reviewed by English Heritage in 2012 they reported that “much of the building, including the upper storey and the roof structure have been completely destroyed by fire...”. This led to the conclusion that “the special architectural interest of the building has been irrecoverably diminished as a result of comprehensive fire damage” (English Heritage, Advice Report 22nd August 2012), and as a consequence the building was de-listed. Nevertheless, the Archaeological Officer comments that the

proposed development would have a negative and irreversible impact upon the remains of the Norman King and any surviving archaeological deposits present on the site and consequently, there would be an impact upon the significance of the surviving heritage assets within the application area. Whilst this would be the case, it does not present an over-riding constraint on the development providing that the applicant takes measures to record and advance understanding of the heritage assets affected by the development.

Whilst the de-listing of the site means the building is no longer a designated heritage asset it is still a non-designated heritage asset and consequently the requirements of paragraph 141 of the NPPF to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost still apply to the remains of the building, even more so given that it would substantially be demolished. It is therefore considered reasonable to attach conditions as suggested by the Archaeological Officer and the Conservation Officer to secure these measures and as such, the proposed demolition of the remains of the building would preserve or enhance the character and setting of the Conservation Area and thus would conform with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review (SBLPR), 43 & 45 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire (DSCB) and national advice within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2. Other considerations

Representations

The objections from some of the local residents including views expressed by petitioners are noted and can only be material to the determination of the application in so far as they are considered relevant. As discussed comprehensively in the response by the English Heritage and the Archaeologist, the former Norman King building was destroyed beyond repair and the proposed demolition of its remains including the re-development of the site within the setting of the existing heritage assets would enhance or better reveal their significance. Overall, the English Heritage is supportive of the proposal. Furthermore, the Conservation Officer and Archaeological Officer do not object to the application subject to conditions. The representations do not, therefore, provide an overriding reason to resist the application.

Procedural matters

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) is quite clear that demolishing an unlisted building in a Conservation Area, without first obtaining planning permission where it is needed, is an offence under section 196D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and there is no fee for submitting an application for planning permission for the “relevant demolition” of certain unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas.

The Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (Abolition of Conservation Area Consent) (Consequential and Saving Provisions) (England) Order 2013 which came into force on 1 October introduced abolition of Conservation Area Consent and replaced it with a requirement to obtain planning permission for the demolition of unlisted buildings in Conservation Areas.(SI 2013 No.2146).

Human Rights issues

The application raises no significant human rights issues.

Equality Act 2010

The application raises no issues regarding equality.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission for Relevant Demolition in a Conservation Area be **GRANTED** subject to the following:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted 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 **Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application following the dismantling of the building hereby approved no part of the extant structural timber framing shall be removed from site or destroyed until inspected by an appropriate Officer of the Local Planning Authority, and appropriate disposal of the framing sections confirmed by the Local Planning Authority thereafter in writing. Full provision for the appropriate and safe storage of such structural items, and notification arrangements inviting Local Planning Authority inspection shall be confirmed in writing to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works of demolition on site, and the approved works of demolition shall thereafter be implemented strictly in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the adequate recording and appropriate disposal of particular architectural details surviving in the extant building in accordance with paragraph 141 of the NPPF.

- 3 **Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, no works of demolition shall take place until a written method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming arrangements for the complete protection, during and after the works of demolition hereby approved, of the extant stone frontage walling to be retained and incorporated in situ within any new building on the site. The approved works of demolition shall thereafter be implemented strictly in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To control the appearance of the development in the interests of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

(Policies BE8, S.B.L.P.R and 43 & 45 DSCB)

- 4 **Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, no works of demolition shall take place until drawn 'as existing' details in elevation and section, and at an appropriate scale between 1:10 and 1:20, as appropriate, showing in detail the existing stone walling to be incorporated in situ within any new building on the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the required works of wall protection shall thereafter be implemented strictly in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To control the appearance of the development in the interests of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

(Policies BE8, S.B.L.P.R and 43 & 45 DSCB)

- 5 No demolition or development shall take place until a method statement for a laser buildings survey has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The results of the laser building survey shall also be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any demolition or development takes place.**

Reason: To record and advance the understanding of the significance of the former designated heritage asset before it is lost in accordance paragraph 141 of the NPPF;

(Policies 43 & 45 DSCB)

- 6 No demolition or development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation, which reflects the final foundation design, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

The written scheme shall include details of the following components:

- A method statement for the investigation of any archaeological remains present at the site;**
- A method statement for the preservation in situ of any significant archaeological remains present at the site;**
- A outline strategy for post-excavation assessment, analysis and publication;**
- A programme of community engagement**

The said development shall only be implemented in full accordance with the approved archaeological scheme and this condition shall only be fully discharged when the following components have been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority:

- The completion of the archaeological investigation, which shall be monitored by the Local Planning Authority;**
- The implementation of a programme of preservation in situ of any significant archaeological remains present at the site.**
- The submission within six months of the completion of the archaeological investigation (unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing by the Local Planning Authority) of a Post Excavation Assessment and an Updated Project Design, which shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**
- The completion within two years of the conclusion of the archaeological investigation (unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing by the Planning Authority) of the post-excavation analysis as specified in the approved Updated Project Design; preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store approved by the Local Planning Authority, completion of an archive report, and submission of a publication report;**
- The implementation within one year of the approval of the publication report (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) of the programme of community engagement.”**

**Reason: To record and advance the understanding of the significance of the heritage assets with archaeological interest which will be unavoidably affected as a consequence of the development and to make the record of this work publicly available in accordance with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework and to give due consideration to the significance of the heritage assets with archaeological interest and ensure that any impact on the archaeological resource which takes place as a result of the development is appropriately mitigated.
(Policies 43 & 45 DSCB)**

- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers DRW SK10, 11,12 Rev. B,13Rev.A,14,15 and 16.
Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

Notes to Applicant

1. In accordance with Article 31 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010, the reason for any condition above relates to the Policies as referred to in the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review (SBLPR) and the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire (DSCB).
2. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

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

Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through early engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and during the determination of the application 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

.....
.....
.....
.....