

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 11 MARCH 2015

Item 6 (Pages 15-42) – CB/14/04276/FULL – Goods Yard, Cambridge Road, Langford, Biggleswade.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Revised plans were received amending the general site layout and changing the elevation design. A further 14 day consultation was undertaken dated 22/2/15. The consultation period expired on 6th March.

Response from Langford Parish Council on revisions –
Langford PC remain fully supportive of this scheme

Additional Comments

The application is recommended for approval subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement which will secure the affordable housing provision in perpetuity and subject to no new issues being raised on the revised plans.

Condition 6 requires the submission of a ventilation and summer cooling scheme (for noise mitigation purposes). The applicant states it was agreed with Public Protection that a summer cooling system was not required. The cost of a summer cooling system is substantial, and could render the development unviable. Public Protection have been asked to confirm whether the summer cooling system is felt to be essential to the development.

Committee will be updated on Public Protection comments at the meeting.

For clarity – the condition which relates to the widening of the access junction with Cambridge Road is condition 24.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Minor amendments to highways conditions to correct small errors.

Item 7 (Pages 43-70) – CB/14/04634/FULL – Land to the rear of The Wrestlers, 126 Church Street, Langford, Biggleswade.

Additional Comments

The application is subject to a S106 Agreement as set out in the report – the applicant has confirmed that they agree to the Education contribution sought for this development.

For clarification, the MUGA is a requirement of the site allocation policy, however after the policy was adopted it was felt this site was not the best location for a MUGA. This application does not include the provision of a MUGA on the site, however it does provide a financial contribution to Langford Parish Council towards the MUGA so that it can be sited elsewhere in Langford at a later date (the MUGA will subject to a separate planning permission once a suitable site is agreed)

Revised plans have been received amending the depth of the garages at Plots 7, 8 and 10 to comply with Design Guide (7m depth). Plot 9 garage is integral to design of dwelling therefore this garage depth remains less than 7m, however there are three parking spaces within the plot.

On plots 1 -6 the garages have been renamed as garden store however these plots have at least three on plot parking spaces which is in accordance with the Design Guide.

These revisions are acceptable to Highways and negate the need for conditions 12 and 13. Condition 16 needs to be amended as due to alterations to garages, only Plot 9 has no space for parking of cycles.

Also for clarity, the access road is to be offered for adoption however plots 7-10 would be served by a private road.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Delete conditions 12 and 13 (as described above)

Condition 16 needs to be re-worded to read –

Before development begins, a scheme for the parking of cycles for Plot 9 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented before the development is first occupied or brought into use and thereafter retained for this purpose.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate cycle parking to meet the needs of occupiers of the proposed development in the interests of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.

Condition 18 needs to be re worded to read -

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995, or any amendments thereto, the garage/storage accommodation on the site shall not be used for any purpose, other than as garage accommodation and/or for domestic storage, unless permission has been granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for that purpose.

Reason: To retain off-street parking provision and thereby minimise the potential for on-street parking which could adversely affect the convenience of road users.

Condition 19 amended to reflect revised plan numbers –

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers Location Plan, SC-01 rev D, SC-02, SC-03 rev C, SC-06 rev C, SC-04 rev B, SC-05 rev C, SC-07 rev B, SC-08 rev B, SC-09 rev B, SC-10, WRSTRP-SEPT14, Stage 1 Road Safety Audit J-D0950.00RSA1.0, Transport Statement J-D1736.00_R2, Flood Risk Assessment ENV/0104/12FRA, Archaeological Evaluation Report No. 800 May 2012, Construction Waste and Material Recycling Statement, Phase 1 Habitat Survey, BS5837 Tree Survey.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Item 8 (Pages 71-98) – CB/15/00132/FULL – Rear of Powage House, Church Street, Aspley Guise, Milton Keynes.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Additional Individual letters:

1 further letter of Objection received and response from the Parish Council:

Charles Wells Ltd (Anchor Public House):

Whilst the company have no specific objection to the application they have concerns with regards to the final design and the associated increase in residential dwellings surround the pub.

Problems occasionally arise when purchasers of residential properties near or adjacent to a pub and its activities - beers garden, car parking etc - move into these properties, fully in the knowledge that a pub and its activities are adjoining.

Concerns regarding the balconies, making the dwellings susceptible to privacy issues at a later date. Concerns that no obvious measures have been incorporated within the build design that will assist in mitigating potential noise pollution from the pub garden.

In summery there are concerns that the balconies will overlook the pub, and vice versa, this could impact upon future expansion plans of the public house, in addition concerns have been received regarding the proximity of new residential dwellings to the pub, and that this would have an adverse impact upon its ability to continue trading in the future as a pub/restaurant with beer terrace/garden.

Officer Response to these concerns raised:

It is considered that this development would not cause a significant impact upon the public houses ability to function as a Public House. It is noted that Public Protection did not object to this development, and an assessment was made with regard to the position of the dwellings and the relationship they would have with the Public House. Should any views from the public house into the new dwellings be achievable, it is

considered that they would be at sufficient distance to ensure that an acceptable level of privacy was maintained.

Aspley Guise Parish Council:

No objection.

Additional Comments

No additional comments.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Additional Condition:

The dwelling shown as Unit 2 on plan ASP-005B shall not be occupied until details of a scheme for the provision of a 1.7m high obscurely glazed screen to be located on the eastern side of the first floor balcony (described as “Master Bed” on plan number ASP-007C) has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its approval in writing and the approved scheme implemented. The screen shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

The condition has been suggested to members following a meeting with the owner of number 13 Bedford Road, they did not raise their concerns regarding the proposed balcony to planning application CB/14/03962/FULL. This matter has been discussed with the applicant, who are happy to accept the condition, in order to reduce any possible impact of the development on the residential amenity of adjacent properties.

Item 9 (Pages 99-108) – CB/15/00239/FULL – The Paddocks, Springfield Road, Eaton Bray, Dunstable.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Highway Officer Comments

The application proposes the change of use of an existing 12 bedroom residential care home (Use Class C2) to a single domestic dwelling (Use Class C3).

No changes are proposed to the existing means of access to the highway and it is stated that no changes are proposed to the external appearance of the building. However there will be a number of internal alterations which will result in the creation of a single four bedroom dwelling.

The “blue” land identified on the application site plan shows that the existing workshop, office and storage building will continue to operate as a commercial use and the existing private stables and ménage permitted under application CB/11/01430/FULL will be retained.

The proposed change of use to a four bedroom dwelling in this location has the potential to generate 8 to 10 traffic movements per day. This is materially less than that which would be generated by a 12 place residential care home.

Therefore the proposal is unlikely to have any adverse highway impact, once completed.

As no changes are being proposed to the access to the highway, that no changes are being proposed to the other uses within the site and that traffic levels are likely to decrease as a result of the proposed change in use, I would confirm that in a highway context there should not be a restriction to the granting of permission to the above planning application.

Additional Comments

Impact Upon the Openness of the Green Belt

The property has been previously extended by way of a conservatory, lift shaft, motor room and a side extension to house the existing laundry area which amounts to 51.3 square metres, cumulatively, this results in a 39% increase in the original foot print of the building.

Planning permission was refused and dismissed at appeal in 2002 for a side extension of approximately 209 square metres, in the appeal decision, the inspector concludes that the proposal would represent *'a significant incursion of built environment onto land which is currently open, and as a result it would materially detract from the openness of the Green Belt.'* It is therefore considered that the imposition of a condition to restrict any further extensions without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority be appended to the decision notice in order to protect the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt.

Revised Plans

Plans amended to include parking area, garden area and access. Submission date 16/02/15 plan numbers 2015/01 03 03 and 2015/01 01 01.

Further plans to be submitted showing the existing conservatory which has been omitted by mistake.

Item 10 (Pages 109-116) – CB/15/00299/FULL – 23 High Street, Meppershall, Shefford.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Reasons

None.

Item 11 (Pages 117-124) – CB/15/00077/FULL – 7 Goodwood Close, Clophill.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

As referred to in the report, the scheme was amended to lower the dormer windows from the ridge line and the window removed from the dormer window facing 8 Goodwood Close.

No further consultation responses have been received in relation to the amended scheme.

Additional Comments

The application was called to Development Management Committee by Councillor Blair on the grounds of loss of privacy to the neighbouring property, lack of parking and existing drainage capacity problems in the area.

On the site there is an annexe/ log cabin that was granted a lawful development certificate in 2014. This has two bedrooms, within the proposed development there are shown to be 6 bedrooms, resulting in a total of 8 bedrooms within the site. The Council's adopted parking standards would require a total of 4 car parking spaces. The plan submitted with the application shows that 5 spaces can be accommodated on site. This involves the 2 spaces in the double garage, two in front of the double garage and one behind one of the forecourt spaces. Neighbouring residents have disputed the position of the fifth space behind one of the forecourt spaces, given issues with shared access/ rights of way. However, if this space was not available it is considered that the site can provide the required 4 car parking spaces in accordance with the Council's adopted standards.

Late representation received from 3 Old Silsoe Road – objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:

- Loss of privacy to sons bedroom
- Direct vision in to spare room window – an integral window from bedroom to bathroom with full view of the proposed dormer
- Loss of privacy to the conservatory/ family room at rear – this is a room we use a lot and is currently very private
- Loss of privacy to the family garden – where a great deal of time is spent.

All the comforts that we share in our family home will be stifled and restrained should this imposing plan go ahead.

Officer response – 3 Old Silsoe Road is to the rear of the application site, with the rear elevation being some 30 metres from the elevation with the proposed dormers

on the application site. The Council's guidance suggests that a suitable back to back distance would be 21 metres. It is therefore considered given the separation distance that there would be no detrimental loss of privacy to this property.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None

Item 12 (Pages 125-134) – CB/15/00095/FULL – 25 Millbank, Leighton Buzzard.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

The applicant has submitted the following statement:

“I have been practising as a Chiropodist in Leighton Buzzard for 20 years. I have a solid and loyal patient base. I am currently located in Old Bank House in Lake Street where my existing lease is due to expire in June.

As an experienced Chiropodist I am more than able to manage patient appointments and it should be noted that all consultations are strictly by appointment. There will only be one patient at any one time (unless a joint appointment) therefore only the one allocated car space being used. All patients will be issued with a parking instruction to use the allocated space, however many of my patients do not have their own transport and therefore walk or are dropped off, thus not requiring parking.

Finally I would submit that one patient visitor every three quarters of an hour when a patient consultation takes a maximum of half an hour will ensure no overlapping of patients causing them to have to park on road.”

Officers have considered this statement, however, the recommendation remains unchanged as the proposal to ensure that patient consultations are sufficiently spaced would not be able to be controlled by planning condition as such a condition would not be enforceable and would therefore not meet the tests for planning conditions as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Additional/Amended Reasons

None.

Item 13 (Pages 135-158) – CB/15/00210/OAC – Land at Valley Farm, Leighton Road, Soulbury, Bucks.

The applicant's agent has brought to our attention that references within the report and proposed response to the 2010 Environmental Impact Assessment being used are incorrect.

An updated Environmental Impact Assessment was prepared and submitted with the planning application; however Aylesbury Vale District Council also placed the scoping opinion documents on the website under the planning application reference number causing a significant level of confusion.

The following amendments therefore need to be made to the report and the proposed response to AVDC.

Section 1 – final paragraph to be deleted.

Section 6 – Highways Development Control comments to be deleted and replaced with the following:

The principle vehicular access to this site falls outside of the Central Bedfordshire area and as such, this office's comments will be limited to the potential vehicular impact upon CBC's highway network.

The application proposes some 300 dwellings.

In terms of traffic generation and trip distribution, this is a matter for Buckinghamshire County Council to comment on in their capacity as local highway authority.

With regards to the junction of Stoke Road/Leighton Road/Wing Road ARCADY modelling confirms its operation within theoretical capacity limits during both the AM and PM peak hours throughout the assessment profile.

During the PM peak hours, in the 2019 and 2024 scenarios, the junction experiences some capacity and delay issues, but this occurs without development and the levels increased "with development" are considered to be not severe.

With regards to the junction of Leighton Road/Vimy Road ARCADY modelling confirms its operation within theoretical capacity limits during both the AM and PM peak hours throughout the assessment profile.

During the PM peak hours, in the 2019 and 2024 scenarios, the junction experiences some capacity and delay issues, but this occurs without development and the levels increased "with development" are considered to be not severe.

With regards to the junction of West Street/Leighton Road/Bridge Street ARCADY modelling confirms that the junction currently operates above its theoretical capacity limits during the current year (2014) in both the AM and PM peaks

The introduction of development traffic further exacerbates this issue. In order for this office to be satisfied with this proposal, a TA addendum focussing on this issue would be required for further review.

With regards to the junction of Leighton Road/West Street/Bridge Street, ARCADY modelling suggests that the junction currently operates above its theoretical capacity limits during the current year (2014) in both the AM and PM peaks

The introduction of development traffic further exacerbates this issue. In order for this office to be satisfied with this proposal, a TA addendum focussing on this issue would be required for further review.

With regards to the junction of West Street/North Street/Leston Road ARCADY modelling confirms its operation within theoretical capacity limits during the assessment period.

With regards to the junction of Leston Road/Hockliffe Street ARCADY modelling confirms its operation within theoretical capacity limits during the assessment period.

With regards to the junction of Old Road/Stoke Road LINSIG modelling suggests the junction will operate with reserve capacity throughout the assessment period until the "2024 With development" scenario during the PM peak hour where degree of saturation falls below the recommended 90% for all approaches. In order for this office to be satisfied with this proposal, a TA addendum focussing on this issue would be required for further review.

As an adjoining highway authority consultation, this office makes no comment or decision upon the correctness or validity of the traffic data, trip generation data or trip assignment data used to inform the operational modelling. This is for the determining highway authority to pass comment upon; however on face value this office raises an objection to this proposal subject to the determining highway authority passing comment upon the TA data. At that point, this highway authority may lift its objection or alternatively request a TA addendum to be submitted that deals with the above concerns for further review.

Section 6 – third paragraph after "Sustainable Transport" heading to be deleted.

Section 9 – point 1 – to be deleted and the following points to be renumbered.

Section 9 – point 8 – delete first paragraph.

A revised report will be produced with the above amendments before a copy of the report and the comments in section 9 are sent in a covering letter.