

## **LATE SHEET**

### **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 11/02/2015**

#### ***Item 07 (Pages 43-68) – CB/14/01589/FULL – Pig & Whistle, 40 Brook Street, Stotfold***

##### **Additional informative:**

The following note to the applicant is recommended to advise of the impact that piling could have upon the nearby residential properties during the construction phases of the development:

12. The applicant is advised that the proposed works will be in close proximity to nearby residential properties. As such, due consideration should be given to the potential impact that the demolition and construction phases of the development may have upon the structural stability and integrity of nearby buildings. Accordingly impact piling should be avoided. If however this method is to be adopted the applicant is advised to first seek the advice of Building Control on telephone number 0300 300 8635 or via email address [building.control@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:building.control@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)

#### ***Item 08 (Pages 69-122) – CB/14/03056/FULL – Land at Bedford Road, Houghton Regis***

##### **Content of Report:**

Paragraph 8.1.3 details Green Belt issues and should refer to Section 8.6 of the report.

Paragraph 8.1.4 details design considerations and should refer to Section 8.8 of the report.

##### **Anglian Water -**

To provide additional clarification, the site is within the area covered by Anglian Water. Anglian Water were commissioned by the developers to undertake a Pre-Planning Assessment Report in relation to the site, a copy of the report has been submitted as part of the Flood Risk Assessment and Foul Sewerage and Utilities Report supporting the application. This confirms that there is currently sufficient capacity within the existing foul sewerage network to accommodate the development (as set out in section 8.19 of the report). Also as set out in section 8.16 of the Officers Report, Anglian Water are satisfied that all options for the disposal of surface water have been explored and that attenuating water onsite prior to discharge to the Anglian Water sewer at the agreed greenfield rate is therefore the most sustainable surface water drainage strategy available.

##### **Additional Comments:**

The following neighbour representation was received however was not reported within the Officer report.

Bidwell Farmhouse

22/08/2014:

- Concern is raised regarding the cumulative impact of this development together with other development and the loss of existing green spaces which have been planned to be retained/undeveloped as part of the proposed urban extension.
- Given existing traffic levels on Bedford Road, and other planned development in the area which will also increase traffic, the proposal would have a negative effect on people's ability to travel freely and their quality of life. New roads provided as part of the planned urban extension are unlikely to change this and there will still be congestion on Bedford Road.
- Given the scale of planned development in the area, concern is raised regarding the cumulative impact on natural drainage which could affect older properties not built to current building standards for foundations and drainage.

*[OFFICER NOTE: The matters raised are addressed within the existing report].*

A late representation has also been received from Barton Willmore on behalf of the Houghton Regis Development Consortium in respect of the two applications on Bedford Road (CB/14/03056/FULL and CB/14/03047/OUT). The following observations are made:

- No assessment work has been undertaken with the A5-M1 Link and Woodside Link in place. We understand that this is because a run of CBC's AECOM model has not been undertaken. We believe that it would have been prudent for this model run to have been completed to properly assess the impact of the proposed developments and deliver a suitable mitigation package; and
- No allowance has been made for the permitted early release development on the HRN1 scheme – up to 375 houses in the A5120 area and 450 houses in the Pastures Way area, prior to the opening of the Woodside Link. At the time of the original assessment HRN1 did not have planning permission. The TA and associated base case in the modelling should have been updated to take account of the change in circumstances.
- We note the comments from highways in the committee reports about the TA.
- We hope that both transport schemes (Woodside Link and A5-M1 link) are fully committed prior to decisions on both planning applications being issued.

- The committee report sets out a range of contributions towards infrastructure. It does not, at this juncture, set out timing of provision of new infrastructure such as schools. We hope that the S106 agreement will control and co-ordinate the amount of new development that takes place in advance of the provision of new facilities on the HRN1 site. We would recommend that further discussions take place in this regard.
- Finally, we would also like to point out that we have not had any discussions with either developer about the schemes. We would be happy to enter in dialogue with both the developers, and with CBC regarding these schemes prior to their determination.

Highways colleagues advise that while there has not been any A5-M1 Link and Woodside Link modelling presented in the Transport Assessments, there was an acknowledgement from those managing the Model that the site under consideration had been included within the final scenario (with the links in place). While there is an argument to include this information within the application it was decided that it was not necessary and the only horizon year which had to be a consideration was that just before opening of 'The Links'.

The Applicant's highway consultant (Matrix Transport Planning) have submitted a supplementary transport analysis dated 5 February 2015. This analysis demonstrates the predicted delays which will be experienced when considering the permitted development known as HRN1 (375 dwellings onto Bedford Road) on the Bedford Road corridor plus the proposed development. This analysis reported the following:

*Bedford Road/High Street Junction:*

In the worst case scenario the difference between the 'ratio of flow to capacity' (RFC) will change from 1.20 to 1.21 on Bedford Road and 1.12 to 1.16 on High Street East. The change in High Street west is negligible as the figure of 0.95 is unchanged.

*Thorn Road Junction:*

In the worst case scenario the difference between the RFC at Bedford Road North will change from 1.525 to 1.570 and Bedford Road South from 1.542 to 1.586. The change in Bedford Road is negligible as the figure of 0.325 is unchanged.

The maximum practical RFC should be 0.85. The permitted development of 375 dwellings as part of HRN1 increases the RFC significantly while the proposed 169 dwellings only marginally increases that figure and hence the delay.

The delays and congestion mentioned above is only short term as it is proposed that the A5-M1 and the Woodside Links will be in place in 2017.

It is sound to conclude therefore that it could not be demonstrated that the proposed development would cause significant detriment (in the short term) to the highway network and for that reason, in highway terms, could not be refused.

*[OFFICER NOTE: Transport and highways matters are addressed in detail with Section 8.9 of the Committee report. CBC Highways have advised that the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed development cannot be determined as*

*'severe'. Therefore the development should not be refused on transport grounds in line with NPPF paragraph 32.]*

**Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons/ Informative Notes:**

- Condition 7 – Bird and Bat boxes

A further sentence is recommended to be added to this condition to provide for the implementation of the approved work:

*"The bat and bird boxes and bricks shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the dwellings on which they are situated."*

- Condition 12 – Play equipment provision

The final sentence of Condition 12 (provision of play provision) currently states: -

*"The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of any part of the development"*

It is recommended this be amended to: -

*"The approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with a timetable to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority."*

This suggested amendment is for reasons of health and safety for any children that are within the first occupations on site whilst construction is continuing.

- Condition 17 – Noise attenuation – Gospel Hall

The following re-wording of this condition is recommended to provide clarification on the noise sources that may require mitigation: -

*Prior to the construction of the dwellings hereby approved on plots 1, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18, the applicant shall submit in writing for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority, a scheme of noise attenuation measures for the Gospel Hall's external ventilation and extraction equipment which will ensure that internal noise levels from these sources shall not exceed 35dB LAeq, 07:00 – 23:00 in any habitable room or 30dB LAeq 23:00 – 07:00 and 45dB LAmax 23:00 – 07:00 inside any bedroom, and that external noise levels from these sources shall not exceed 55dB LAeq, (1hr) in outdoor amenity areas. Any works which form part of the scheme approved by the Local Planning Authority shall be completed and the effectiveness of the scheme shall be demonstrated through validation noise monitoring, with the results reported to the Local Planning Authority in writing, before any permitted dwelling is occupied, unless an alternative period is approved in writing by the Authority.*

- Condition 23 – Roads

This condition is reworded for consistency purposes to accord with the wording of the other pre-commencement conditions and is also shown as bold for this reason: -

**23) No development shall commence until the detailed plans and sections of the proposed roads, including gradients and method of surface water disposal have been approved by the Local Planning Authority and no building shall be occupied until the section of road which provides access has been constructed (apart from final surfacing) in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To ensure that the proposed roadworks are constructed to an adequate standard in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan and policies 25 and 43 of the Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire Pre-Submission Version June 2014.**

An additional note is recommended with regards to the Environmental Impact Assessment: -

12) All environmental information has been taken into full consideration by the Local Planning Authority in reaching this decision.

***Item 9 (Page 123-177) – CB/14/003047/OUT – Land to the rear of The Old Red Lion, Bedford Road, Houghton Regis***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

1. CBC Green Infrastructure Co-ordinator

04/09/2014:

- Based on the Houghton Regis North Framework Plan, development in relation to the identified green infrastructure and open space corridor make the principle of development unacceptable.
- The location and scale of the green corridor identified on the framework plan are important to the green infrastructure policy component of the proposed urban extension.
- The identified green infrastructure and open space infills the area adjoining the Plaiters Way open space, Bluewater Wood and a woodland copse and complements the planned Bidwell West and HRN1 developments.
- The application contends the green corridors within the Framework Plan are indicative without reference to features on the ground. This is not the case. The Framework Plan has been developed with awareness of the existing green infrastructure assets and opportunities. The strategic corridor comprises Plaiters Way, Bluewater Wood and the adjoining copse.
- The scale of green buffer proposed is not of the strategic scale required under the Framework Plan in the context of the scale of the urban extension as a whole.
- The application refers to neighbouring children's play space and open space as poorly maintained. This is unsubstantiated and inaccurate. Bluewater Wood and Plaiters Way are maintained as informal, semi-natural spaces. Survey data does not reflect a user perception that the sites are poorly maintained.
- Concerns are raised regarding the relationship between the adjoining play space and the proposed housing. There is a need for a suitable buffer, natural surveillance and a positive interface to address the potential for anti-social use.
- Central Bedfordshire Sustainable Drainage Guidance SPD reinforces the priority for infiltration SuDS to manage surface water. The application indicates the use of piped conveyance and an attenuation pond but does not provide any testing rationale behind the design of SuDs in this way. The design

approach is untested and is not therefore in line with the Council's drainage guidance.

*[OFFICER NOTE: The matters raised are addressed in detail with Sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Committee report.]*

## 2. Barton Wilmore on behalf of Land Improvement Holdings.

2/2/2015:

- No assessment work has been undertaken with the A5-M1 Link and Woodside Link in place. We understand that this is because a run of CBC's AECOM model has not been undertaken. We believe that it would have been prudent for this model run to have been completed to properly assess the impact of the proposed developments and deliver a suitable mitigation package; and
- No allowance has been made for the permitted early release development on the HRN1 scheme – up to 375 houses in the A5120 area and 450 houses in the Pastures Way area, prior to the opening of the Woodside Link. At the time of the original assessment HRN1 did not have planning permission. The TA and associated base case in the modelling should have been updated to take account of the change in circumstances.
- We note the comments from highways in the committee reports about the TA.
- We hope that both transport schemes (Woodside Link and A5-M1 link) are fully committed prior to decisions on both planning applications being issued.
- The committee report sets out a range of contributions towards infrastructure. It does not, at this juncture, set out timing of provision of new infrastructure such as schools. We hope that the S106 agreement will control and co-ordinate the amount of new development that takes place in advance of the provision of new facilities on the HRN1 site. We would recommend that further discussions take place in this regard.
- Finally, we would also like to point out that we have not had any discussions with either developer about the schemes. We would be happy to enter in dialogue with both the developers, and with CBC regarding these schemes prior to their determination.

## 3. The applicant's Highways consultant Peter Evans Partnership has submitted two supplementary traffic notes which can be summarised as follows.

5/2/2015:

- The applicant has been asked to provide further information on traffic generation and distribution both with and without the A5/M1 and Woodside Link roads in place. Consideration has been given to the following Bedford Road junctions; the site access; Thorn Road; and the High Street.
- Various development scenarios have been modelled including those with and without the planned link roads and housing on HRN1. All scenarios modelled show that the development would only result in one additional vehicle at the High Street and Thorn Road junctions every 2 to 4 minutes during the AM and PM peak periods. The development would not therefore materially increase traffic levels at the key junctions.
- The proposed development is would not materially increase traffic on the local road network, and thus would have no impact on junction capacity test modelling. Therefore with or without the A5-M1 and Woodside links the

development would not impact on the operation of the Bedford Road junctions with High Street or Thorn Road.

- Given the low level of traffic proposed as a result of the development, junction capacity testing would not provide any meaningful results as the increase in traffic is minimal.
- As a result in the interim when additional HRN1 traffic may use Bedford Road the development traffic would still not have a material impact on the level of vehicles passing along this road, given the low level of development traffic proposed.
- The cumulative traffic impact of the proposed development cannot be determined as 'severe'. Therefore the development should not be refused on transport grounds in line with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 32.

6/2/2015:

- Additional development scenarios have been modelled including those with and without housing on HRN1, the proposed Taylor Wimpey development and 62 houses proposed as part of this application. In all scenarios it is assumed that the A5-M1 Link and Woodside Link roads are not in place.
- The Thorn Road junction and High Street junctions with Bedford Road are anticipated to be at capacity in 2017. However the proposed development would not materially increase traffic on the local road network. Therefore the junction modelling has indicated that the addition of this development traffic does not impact on the results determined and would not severely impact on existing conditions.
- The cumulative impact of the proposed site and Taylor Wimpey would marginally increase the proposed queues at both Thorn Road to the north and Bedford Road to the south. However again this increase is not material in relation to the overall predicted queue lengths noted.
- The cumulative traffic impact of the proposed development cannot be determined as 'severe'. Therefore the development should not be refused on transport grounds in line with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 32.
- To address the concerns of the Highway Authority as part of the development of the 62 houses a financial contribution has been agreed as a contribution to the Woodside link.

*[OFFICER NOTE: Transport and highways matters are addressed in detail with Section 9 of the Committee report. CBC Highways have advised that the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed development cannot be determined as 'severe'. Therefore the development should not be refused on transport grounds in line with NPPF paragraph 32.]*

## **Amended and Additional Conditions**

The following recommended condition is amended to more accurately describe the purpose of the condition:

- 9 **No development shall commence until a scheme of habitat mitigation, enhancement and conservation measures has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be informed by the following ecological survey data undertaken in support of the Ecological Assessment (July 2014) forming part of the application:**
- a) **Three on-site bat activity surveys undertaken between the months of April and October to cover Spring, Summer and Autumn seasons. One or more of these surveys should comprise a dusk/dawn survey in line with BCT survey guidance.**
  - b) **One on-site reptile survey undertaken between the months of April and June.**

**The outcomes of the ecological survey data shall in turn inform the details required by Condition 1 of this permission and the scheme of habitat mitigation, enhancement and conservation measures shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development.**

**Reason: To ensure the development will not have an adverse effect on a protected species in accordance with Policy 57 of the Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire Revised Pre-Submission Version June 2014.**

In line with the advice of CBC Archaeology and Officer's recommendation under Section 10 of the committee report, the following additional condition is required to secure further investigation and recording of any archaeological deposits that may be affected by the development:

- 15 **No development shall commence until a written scheme of archaeological investigation for an open area excavation followed by 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 in accordance with Policy 45 of the Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire Revised Pre-Submission Version June 2014.**

Accordingly the recommended Condition 15 is renumbered Condition 16.

**Item 10 (Page 179-192) – CB/14/04605/MW – Kiln Farm, Steppingley Road, Flitwick.**

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

**Condition 2. Date of commencement**

Steppingley parish suggest that the development permitted under permission CB/09/06977/MW had not commenced in accordance with condition 2.

Condition 2 of permission CB/09/06977/MW dated 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010 states:

*“The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiry of three months from the date of this permission. Written notification of the date of commencement shall be sent to the Local Planning Authority within seven days of such commencement.*

*Reason: To comply with section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.”*

An email sent from Broughton Beatty to the Local Planning Authority on the 4<sup>th</sup> January 2011 confirmed that development commenced during the week commencing 28<sup>th</sup> June 2010. Whilst the LPA recognise that written confirmation was provided after the one week deadline, it has no reason to believe the permission had not been implemented in time.

**Condition 3. Time period to carry out the development**

Steppingley parish suggest that the development had not been completed in accordance with condition 3 of permission CB/09/06977/MW.

Condition 3 of permission CB/09/06977/MW states:

*“Unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the development shall be carried out in accordance with details shown on Drawing Nos. 7768/EW21 Rev. A and 7768/EW22 (received on 5/01/10) and shall be completed within 6 months from the date of commencement, which shall include spreading of the indigenous topsoils, ripping and grass seeding (but excluding aftercare requirements).*

*Reason: To ensure that a good standard of restoration is achieved within an acceptable timescale (Policies GE5 and GE26 of the MWLP)”*

The condition therefore requires the development to be completed by 28<sup>th</sup> December 2010. The site was inspected on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2010 by the case officer and the CBC monitoring officer. The monitoring report that followed the visit states:

*“Spreading of indigenous topsoils, ripping and grass seeding was completed by mid November 2010. Frosty weather during the latter part of November is likely to mean that seed has not germinated. To be assessed at next monitoring visit.”* This means Central Bedfordshire Council has evidence of compliance with condition 3.

## **Contaminated waste**

Steppingly parish suggest that the land has become contaminated with diesel waste and that an investigation has been carried out by CBC.

According to the CBC public protection officer concerns regarding land contamination were raised in March 2011 but as the site has been capped, turfed and is used as a paddock the risks from any potentially buried material to human health are likely to be minimal. For this reason the site has been ranked on CBCs list of potential Part 2A investigations as lower than many other sites and has not been investigated further.

Nevertheless the public protection officer advises that the database of “Potentially Contaminated Land” has been updated with a new risk profile for potential future investigation. This will be considered if proposals to redevelop the site and the surrounding area come forward.

## **Condition 8 HGV movements**

Condition 10 of Permission CB/09/00816/Full states:

*“No vehicle shall enter or leave the site in connection with the development hereby permitted and no operations authorised or required under this permission shall take place on site except between 0800: and 17:00 Monday to Fridays, and no activity whatsoever shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays.  
Reason: To safeguard local amenity (policies GE5 and GE18 of the MWLP).”*

The site is currently in its final year of restoration and as such no HGVs will be required to enter or leave the site in connection with the development. For this reason the condition will be updated with the following wording and renumbered to become condition 8:

*“No HGVs associated with this development shall access the site at any time.”*

***Item 12 (page 209-224) CB/14/04532/Full Toddington Manor, Park Road, Toddington***

## **Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

Response received from London – Luton Airport

*“The proposed development has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, London Luton Airport Operations Ltd. has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.*

*As the plans make provision for a Helicopter pad and Hangar I have forwarded the proposal to our local air traffic provider (NATS) for review and possible comment”.*

### **Additional Comments**

The due to the scale of the development it will be necessary to refer the application to the secretary of state. As such the decision will read as following:

‘Recommended for Approval subject to referral to the Secretary of State.’

### **Additional/Amended Conditions or Informatives**

#### Informative Note to Committee

3. 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.

#### Ecology (condition 6)

We have received additional information from the applicant with regards to condition 6. Following discussions with the Ecology Officer condition 6 now reads as following:

*“The development shall be implemented in accordance with the relevant mitigation, compensation and monitoring requirements as set out in (i) “Proposed Leisure Building, Toddington Manor, Bedfordshire: Maintenance of Favourable Conservation Status of great crested newts in light of the proposals to demolish the disused commercial rare breeds farm and the construction of a leisure building” dated November 2014; (ii) “Extended Phase 1 Survey and Bat Survey” dated June 2014; and (iii) the document dated 5<sup>th</sup> February 2015 from Chris Damant of Bernwood Environmental Services Ltd relating to bat mitigation, in each case subject to any differing requirement imposed by Natural England under any protected species licence issued by it in respect of the development”.*

*Reason: to ensure that all impacts from development on biodiversity area taken into account and mitigated.”*

### **Item 13 (page 225-246) CB/14/02717/Full Land West of Barton Road Silsoe**

#### **Additional response from Local Development Framework Team**

Sam,

Further to my email below:

In light of the marketing report received for the application site, we have no objection to this application.

Kind regards  
Saskia

**Item 15 (Page 271-278 ) – CB/14/04324/OUT, Bridge Farm Shefford**

**Additional information received - Applicants response to comments from Highways Officer dated 29/01/15**

Dear Mark,

We have received your response to the above planning application dated 23 January 2013 and are pleased that you have been able to offer your general support for the scheme subject to highways conditions C1, C2 and C3.

We note that the planning officer has drafted her report to committee in accordance with your recommendations and that the application is to be heard by Members at the Planning Committee Meeting on 11 February with an officer recommendation for approval.

Ahead of the committee meeting we would be grateful if we could explore with you the potential for amending two of the clauses that you have put forward under condition C3. This relates to the first two bullet points requiring the provision of a footway along the entire highway frontage of the site and the provision of a raised pedestrian crossing point of Ivel Road south of the Churchill Road roundabout. We deal with these in reverse order as the arguments are sequential.

With regards to the requirement for a pedestrian crossing on Ivel Road, whilst we appreciate that there may be an aspiration for such a crossing to serve the wider development of land at Ivel Farm (of which the application site forms only a small part) we do not believe that the care home scheme necessitates this requirement in its own right. Given that proposals for the remaining part of the site are uncertain it is similarly considered unreasonable for the first part of any development on the wider site to trigger the need for any such provision, particularly when substantially fewer pedestrian movements will be generated by the care home than by the existing residential development or any of the proposed uses on the remaining part of the site. Moreover, there are already crossing points installed with tactile paving as part of the approved roundabout improvement works that would suffice to accommodate the few pedestrian movements associated with the care home. We do not therefore consider that the need for the crossing is warranted under the terms of the CIL Regulations in that it goes beyond a site specific impact mitigation.

Without prejudice to the above position, in the event that the Council does consider the proposed use to generate a need for a new pedestrian crossing and can substantiate such a need, the applicant would potentially be willing to contribute towards the provision of such a crossing on a proportional basis. The care home site comprises 0.48ha of a wider 1.82ha site. On this basis the care home scheme might reasonably contribute 26% of the costs of these works which could be ring-fenced until such time as a scheme for the remaining part of the site is approved and for the works to then be delivered by others. This is in fact considered to be generous on the basis that the care home is a lower traffic generator than either the approved B1 scheme or other proposed residential schemes.

The applicant's highways consultants estimate that the total cost of providing a new pedestrian crossing would be in the region of £40,000 and applying a ratio of 26% the care home might therefore reasonably contribute a total of £10,400. This could be agreed by means of a unilateral undertaking.

We would welcome your response on the above in order to determine whether a more proportionate contribution would be acceptable to the Council in this case. If in agreement, we would request that the second bullet point of C3 be removed and a new requirement be put forward requiring a part-contribution towards the provision of a raised pedestrian zebra crossing point of Ivel Road south of the Churchill Road roundabout. Although the implementation of any works would be carried out by others, the care home applicant would ensure that the land within their control that is required for a pedestrian visibility splay is made available under their reserved matters application.

In respect of the first point, and in line with our approach outlined above, we question the need for a footpath running the full length of the Ivel Road frontage. A footpath takes pedestrians from the care home to either the existing or proposed crossing points on Ivel Road where they are able to cross the road to reach the footpath on the western side of Ivel Road. The footpath then continues south on the opposite side of the road as far south as the petrol station and convenience store. There are no facilities directly to the south of the site that would benefit from a footpath running the length of the Ivel Road frontage and its provision would in fact be likely to impact upon highways safety by encouraging people to proceed to its southernmost extent to cross the road other than at the existing traffic islands and the proposed pedestrian crossing. Additionally, the installation of the footpath would necessitate the removal of the important existing hedgerow and the culverting of a substantial length of ditch that runs along the line of the proposed footpath, between the hedge and the road. We therefore request that the first bullet point of condition 1 be removed or, at the very least, amended as follows: 'Pedestrian and cycle linkages to existing routes including the provision of a footway along the access frontage and as far south on Ivel Road as the proposed pedestrian crossing point'.

I have copied the planning officer into this email to ensure that the local planning authority are party to these discussions in full.

#### **Further comments from applicant dated 05/02/15-**

Mark,

Further to the ongoing discussions in respect of the care home application at Bridge Farm, Shefford I set out below a technical review of the requirement for the Zebra crossing on Ivel Road.

#### **Pedestrian Flows**

In terms of the potential pedestrian crossing movements that could occur on Ivel Road south of the roundabout in the morning and evening traffic peak hours our view in principle is that these would be minimal. This is because at these peak times the majority of local residents from the Bovis scheme travelling to work would either be driving, cycling or walking northwards to the town centre to work or to catch a bus.

Children walking to school would also be traveling to the west on Churchill Way or to the north and would therefore be walking on the northern side of Harvest Rise from the Bovis site.

In practice the only reason to walk to the south of the roundabout and cross Ivel Road would be to visit the convenience store at the petrol filling station or potentially for car passengers to meet with their lift to work.

Based on multi-modal TRICS residential sites for a scheme of 85 dwellings around 20 pedestrian trips would be undertaken in the morning peak hour and some 17 in the evening peak hour. The number of TRICS multi-modal care home sites are limited but these indicate that for a 60 unit care home around 7 pedestrian trips would be undertaken in the morning peak hour and some 9 in the evening peak hour. The maximum number of pedestrian movements at the care home would be about 18 between 14:00-15:00 which is around the typical shift change period and when visitors could be leaving after lunch with residents.

The care home pedestrians would consist of staff and visitors only as residents because of their frailty would not walk outside of the care home grounds. In any case the care home is a self-contained facility and provides for all the residents' needs. A small number of staff could walk to and from the convenience store to purchase day to day personal supplies.

Given the low number of pedestrians that would cross Ivel Road adjacent to the care home site the existing dropped kerb crossing at the roundabout island is satisfactory and on the natural desire line. The provision of the island minimises the individual crossing distance by providing a refuge halfway across the road and therefore pedestrians do not need to cross the whole width of Ivel Road in one go. The roundabout and therefore crossing point are also located within the 20mph Zone which further benefits safety conditions.

## Vehicular Flows

The Opus International Consultants Transport Assessment, March 2012 accompanied the planning application for the Bovis residential and commercial developments. The TA includes details of traffic surveys undertaken on Ivel Road in January 2012 as well as the permitted development traffic for the residential and commercial schemes. Total flows growthed to 2017 and allowing for additional permitted development traffic in the area are provided for the Ivel Road/Churchill Way/Harvest Rise roundabout from which the flows on Ivel Road south of the roundabout can be confirmed.

We have calculated the total flows on Ivel Road south of the roundabout and deducted the commercial scheme flows given that this element has not come forward. This gives the agreed traffic flows based on the existing and permitted traffic growthed to 2017 plus the Bovis residential traffic.

On this basis in the morning peak hour there are some 292 vehicle movements northbound and 212 movements southbound which is 504 movements two-way. In the evening peak hour there are some 386 vehicle movements northbound and 266 movements southbound which is 652 movements two-way. The higher flows in the

evening equate to only some 6-7 vehicles per minute northbound and 4-5 vehicles per minute southbound.

Based on the PEP Transport Statement for the care home application the care home traffic would be some 10 two-way movements in the morning peak hour and 11 in the evening peak hour. Even assuming that all movements arrive from and leave to the south of the roundabout the additional care home traffic would make no difference to the traffic conditions.

### Assessment Criteria

Previously the numerical criteria for assessing whether a Zebra or signalised crossing could be required was based on the PV2 calculation where P is the number of two-way hourly pedestrian crossing movements and V is the two-way hourly vehicular movements. If PV2 is greater than 108 for an undivided road then this provides justification to fully assess the requirement for a crossing in consideration of Local Transport Notes 1/95 and 2/95. Whilst the PV2 methodology is not current in England, as indicated in DMRB Vol.8 TA 68/96 'The Assessment and Design of Pedestrian Crossings', the approach is generally accepted for the practical assessment of a crossing requirement.

Based on the 108 threshold and using the higher 652 two-way hourly vehicle movements a minimum of some 235 pedestrian two-way movements in the hour would be required to trigger an assessment for a crossing. Even if all of the Bovis and care home pedestrians diverted via the convenience store to and from their destination this would only amount to a maximum of some 26 two-way movements in the peak hour. However given the site context and location of the town centre and local facilities as described above we would expect the number of pedestrians crossing Ivel Road south of the roundabout to be only a small percentage of this.

### Conclusions

On the basis of the PV2 calculation the levels of existing and future pedestrian and vehicle movements do not meet the minimum technical criteria that would be required to consider the provision of a Zebra crossing on Ivel Road south of the roundabout. There is therefore no technical justification for providing the Zebra crossing on Ivel Road and no reasonable grounds for requiring the care home developer to provide this.

In any event the existing dropped kerb crossing point at the roundabout island provides an appropriate and convenient facility for the few pedestrians that would need to cross Ivel Road in this location.

I trust this provides a satisfactory review of the practical context of the crossing related matters and helps confirm that in principle a Zebra crossing is not required in this location. It would therefore be unreasonable to require the care home developer to provide a Zebra crossing.

**Additional information (letter and leaflet) from applicant sent directly to Members in support of their proposals.**

**Officer s comments on additional information regarding highways concerns.**

Based on discussions with Highway Officers and the applicants, there appears to be no technical justification for the installation of the new Zebra crossing on Ivel Road. Therefore it is recommended that the condition relating to the provision of the crossing be removed.

Further discussions with the applicant have taken place and the applicant has offered a financial contribution towards additional highway works. Members will be updated further on this matter at the meeting.