

## **LATE SHEET**

### **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – Date 27<sup>th</sup> May 2015**

#### ***Item 7 (Pages 27-40) – CB/00470/REG3 - Clipstone Brook Lower School, Brooklands Drive, Leighton Buzzard.***

##### **Additional Comments**

The proposed extensions would result in an expansion to an existing building which provides essential social and community infrastructure in the form of an educational institution in an accessible location without a resultant impact on the local residential amenity in accordance with policy 21 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

#### ***Item 8 (Pages 41-58) – CB/15/00777/FULL – The Green Man, High Street, Lidlington.***

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

Historic England (formerly English Heritage) – Do not wish to offer any comments at recommend that the application be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist Conservation advice.

Public Rights of Way Officer – No public rights of way will be affected by this proposal.

##### **Additional comments**

The Parish Council raised concern regarding parking spaces over a right of way granted in 1936 to residents of property in Whitehall. The Council's Public Rights of Way Officer has confirmed that no public rights of way will be affected by this proposal. Any private rights of way that may be affected would be a civil matter. The agent has been made aware of the concerns raised and is content that they have addressed all the necessary aspects.

**Item 13 (Pages 99-110) – CB/15/00992/FULL – Land at Chapel Close, Clifton, Shefford SG17 5YG**

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

The following letter has been received from the owner/occupier who has requested that this be circulated to Member on the late sheet:

**ITEM NO. 13 – DMC Meeting 27/5/15 - Application number: CB/15/00992/FULL**  
**Illustrative Material for use by Emma Sewell (Objector – 3 Chapel Close)**



*Street scene in Chapel Close prior to the development of 11 new houses by the applicant in 2013/14*

**1** Original street scene showing a high quality living environment with a block paved parking space and large open grassed area maintained for around 10 years by residents. The majority of original Chapel Close residents (five out of eight properties) including ourselves still gain no benefit at all from the pumping station that was enlarged in 2014 (see below) mainly to service the 11 new dwellings in the Chapel Lea housing development built by the applicant. When the Chapel Lea development was in the planning stages, more could and should have been done by the applicant to find a less prominent site for the pumping station e.g. behind the existing close boarded fence (situated behind the green kiosk) on unused scrub land, also owned by the applicant.



Bird's eye view from first floor at 3 Chapel Close cavity



Enlargement: Second larger green kiosk and second

**2** Street scene as it is now: damaged and changed in character from residential to light industrial due mainly to the concrete, the floodlights and the aerial that were specifically refused permission in 2014. The quality of the living environment for Chapel Close residents has been substantially reduced. The applicant was given planning approval for the Chapel Lea development on the basis that no harm would be caused to the appearance of the existing street scene or to the living conditions at neighbouring houses. The considerable harm caused to the street scene by the size, design, materials and appearance of the concrete, floodlights and aerial have not been addressed in any way in this revised application.



This shows the parking space and the expanse of concrete that will remain clearly visible.

**3** The concrete hard standing directly contravenes planning policies and is not in-keeping with the other surfaces in Chapel Close. A block paved parking space was dug up in order to create the enclosure and therefore block paving should have been put back to cover the entire enclosure. Indeed in the 'Appendix To Sewers For Adoption - 6<sup>th</sup> Edition' regarding Anglian Water (AW) amendments there is a reference to '*blockwork*' being an acceptable surface for a hard standing area and so it would serve to meet AW's operational requirements. Furthermore, as there will just be a lockable bollard at the entrance to the parking area, the concrete in that area will continue to be a visible eyesore to residents at all times from the pavement side. The concrete in the main operational area will also remain visible from first floor windows.



**4** The large aerial and floodlights are very visible especially in autumn/winter and we have never seen such unsightly equipment placed in a prominent position in a quiet residential area. There are no domestic aerials on view in the Close and no telegraph poles. Emergency floodlighting will only be required on very rare occasions and so Anglian Water staff should bring suitable lighting equipment along with them in the event that it is required, as they must frequently have to do at many other locations where there is no permanent installation. The applicant's submission admits that the lights '*may never actually be switched on*' and they are therefore are non-essential. The BT line that is already in place is able to communicate with the pumping station and precludes the need for the aerial. Both these elements are 'preferred'



requirements that have been installed purely for the convenience of Anglian Water, irrespective of the significant loss of amenity that is caused to residents.

The following letter has been received from the agent on behalf of the applicant in response to the third party representations received:



**Phillips Planning Services Ltd.**  
Town Planning and Development Consultants

Our Ref: P094049  
11 May 2015

Amy Lack  
Planning – Development Management  
Central Bedfordshire Council  
Priory House  
Monks Walk  
Chicksands  
SG17 5TQ

Dear Amy

**CB/15/00992/FULL**  
**Hardstand & lighting column at Chapel Close, Clifton**

I have now had the opportunity to review the comments of local residents which you kindly forward to me.

I have a letter from 3 Chapel Close then brief email comments from 2 and 5 Chapel Close and also from a resident at 30 Knolls Way.

The main comments are set out in the letter from the resident of 3 Chapel Close and so my response responds largely to this.

***General***

The objector makes a point that the pumping station / enclosure was “enlarged” due to the development of additional dwellings within Chapel Close.

This is not correct, the pumping station has not been enlarged as a result of the additional development. The below ground pumping station is the same size as originally installed. The more recent alterations i.e. the provision of hard surfacing in part replacing a block paved parking space and the light column and aerial as well as the other works were added to the site to meet Anglian Waters adoption requirements.

As you know the works are actually far less than those normally required by Anglian Water but were negotiated by the applicant to seek to minimise the visual impact.

***Visual Impact***

The objector raises concern regarding the “unsightly” concrete surface. We do not agree with this assessment as the concrete is already beginning to weather and darken, however as you are aware, it is proposed to erect a close boarded fence and install hedge planting such that the surface would be barely visible.

The objector shows a photograph of the light column and aerial which is again described as “unsightly”.

We do not agree with this statement. As set out in our original submission, the aerial is relatively low (around 3 metres) compared to the streetlights and telegraph poles which are common place within Chapel Close. Its location is such that it stands back from the street scene and is not prominent.

It is suggested by the objector that the aerial is larger than normally required. This is also incorrect.

Anglian Water originally wanted an aerial set at 5 – 6 metres but the applicant convinced them to test this three metre column which has proved successful and so Anglian Water have agreed a reduction.

Notwithstanding this, should the Council consider it necessary the column be painted black to match other street furniture in Chapel Close. The applicant would have no objection to a condition in this respect.

Concern is raised regarding the appearance of the proposed bollards to prevent general parking in the parking space. Again this would be a matter that the Council would normally condition in terms of the need to agree materials and appearance and the applicant has no objection to this.

Despite the concerns raised we note that the objector does make a number of positive comments regarding the proposals as follows:

*"We welcome the fact that the proposal shows that the three unsightly concrete bollards will be removed and that there will be a smaller fenced off area, which should help to make the enclosure feel less overbearing.*

*The timber close boarded fencing is also a step in the right direction. A close boarded wooden fence would need to be stained in the same dark colour as the existing close boarded fence next to the enclosure to ensure that it is properly in keeping with its surroundings.*

*We are also of course pleased to see the inclusion of a good amount of hedging I am happy to go with Laurel as suggested by another objector which will help to soften the visual impact"*

The applicant would have no objection to the suggested use of staining to the proposed fence or the planting of a laurel hedge if this was considered appropriate by the Council

Despite these positive comments the objector has enclosed a photograph showing the enclosure as it stands today. As you know the application which is before the Council seeks to respond to the concerns raised by the Planning Committee when it considered the previous application and therefore proposes to reduce the size of the enclosure, provide a close boarded rather than post and rail fence and to plant around the enclosure. The photograph provided by the objector is not therefore representative of what is now proposed. I attach below a rather basic comparison using the objector's photograph of the existing situation and then with the proposed changes added.



Existing



Proposed

As I say this is fairly basic but provides an idea of how the current application proposes to change the on-site situation.



Loss of Parking Space

It is alleged that the enclosure has resulted in the loss of a communal parking space. This is incorrect. The parking space referenced was provided for maintenance vehicles for the pumping station. Whilst residents may have used this space in the past such use was effectively trespass onto the applicants land.

It is for this reason that Anglian Water require a secure parking space i.e. so it's not used generally and is available for their use at all times. If the parking space was not secure there is a risk that a car, van or caravan may be parked on it and so access cannot be gained in an emergency.

**Conclusions**

We trust that this letter is of assistance and of use to you in drafting your report for the May meeting. If you do however require anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I trust that this is helpful.

Yours sincerely

Paul Watson  
PHILLIPS PLANNING SERVICES

## **Additional Comments**

Mindful of the letter from the agent above, should Members consider it necessary to make the proposed development acceptable the following conditions could be imposed:

5. Within three calendar months of the date of this decision the close boarded timber fencing to the perimeter of the site shall be installed and treated in a darker brown coloured paint or stain finish. Thereafter the fenced shall remain and be maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the street scene (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Services 2009).

6. Within three calendar months of the date of this decision the column supporting the lighting and aerial hereby approved shall be painted black. Thereafter the column shall remain and be maintained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the street scene (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Services 2009).

7. Prior to the installation of the bollard to be installed details of its design, appearance and materials of construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the street scene (Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Services 2009).

In addition to the conditions set above the applicant has confirmed that they would have no objection to the planting of a Laurel hedgerow as opposed to the proposed Hornbeam. If Members are mindful to approve the application and wish a Laurel hedge to be implemented condition 2 recommended at the end of the officer report should be amended to read:

- 2. Within three months of the date of this planning permission, notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans 14-02, a Laurel hedge shall be planting in the position annotated with a Hornbeam hedge. The Laurel hedge shall be planted as bare root plants in suitable cultivated soil, in a single row spaced at three plants per metre. The plants shall subsequently be maintained for a period of at least 5 years from the date of this permission and any which die or**



are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season (period from October to March).

**Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of landscaping, in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).**

***Item 14 (Pages 111-120) – CB/15/00992/FULL – 84 High Street, Henlow, SG16 6AB.***

**Planning History**

In addition to the recently withdrawn planning application there was a planning application (MB/04/01264) which was refused on 18/01/2005. The application was for a four bedroom house and was refused on grounds of:

- Poor quality design
- Detract from the setting of the listed building
- Adverse impact on occupiers of No.84.
- Loss of landscaping

The refused application was larger than the dwelling now proposed and as set out in the report it is considered that in terms of design, setting of the listed building, impact on No.84 and in respect of landscaping it overcomes the previous reasons for refusal.

***Item 15 (Pages 121-132) – CB15/00424/FULL – Land at 48b Shortmead Street, Biggleswade, SG18 0AP.***

**Additional comments**

One further letter of support has been received, from the occupier of 1 Victoria Place.