

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 19th August 2015

Item 6 (Pages 15-30) – CB/15/02292/FULL – Land at Braeburn Way, Cranfield

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Since the writing of the report for committee, a further letter was received from 41 Lordsmead who had previously objected to the application (included within the main report). The letter provided greater clarification on the objection, however did not raise new concerns or issues.

The main issues contained within the letter relate to the Travel Plan, the inappropriate location for a school on a minor road, the need for onsite visitor parking, and the possibility of a land swap between this site and the existing recreation ground.

Additional Comments

None

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

The development and use of the school site shall be carried out in accordance with the measures set out within the submitted Travel Plan (June 2015).

Reason: To ensure sustainable forms of transport to and from the school site.

Item 7 (Pages 31 - 46) – CB/15/00269/Full – Land adjacent 29 Sand Lane Northill

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Three additional letters from neighbours received - Comments summarised below

- Sand Lane cannot support another housing development
- Sand Lane is narrow and cannot support additional traffic without imposing parking restrictions on existing residents. This is unacceptable and unfair to those without garages while parking is available to newcomers at current resident expense.
- There is already an affordable housing scheme next door
- Have suffered environment loss of glow worms due to inappropriate urban lighting at Chantry Piece
- If there is a need for affordable housing, there are other places in the parish or nearby towns which are more accessible with more amenities
- There is a blind spot at the end of the road, the proposed layout would make this worse.

- Children play in the area.
- On road parking towards Ickwell Road end causes a back up along the lane.
- No street lights makes it difficult for the elderly and children in Sand Lane
- Already difficult for emergency vehicles
- Character should be kept agricultural
- Development goes beyond village limits
- There are more sensible places to build in the parish
- Loss of privacy – ground floor window facing the site. Views from existing windows will be compromised as well as peace and quiet.

Northill Parish Council comments –

Northill Parish Council confirms its support for Affordable Housing in principle, but continues to question the site location proposed in this application. The amended application including the updated Housing Needs Survey has been re-considered, and all previous objections are still considered valid apart from the previous Housing Needs Survey being out of date. Although the new survey indicates a need for smaller homes(1/2 bed) and bungalows, there is still a need identified for 3 bed homes, and Northill Parish Council continues to consider the mix of housing proposed here to be inappropriate. We are aware of a local family in urgent need of at least a 3 bedroom house to rent, for 2 adults and 3 children

Could I add one personal comment re the Housing Needs Survey, a comment that I have already passed to Jon Boswell at BRCC. The survey continually refers to Northill without making it clear as to whether it is talking about Northill as a parish, or the settlement of Northill. Taken out of context this can cause confusion. For example, the June 2010 HNS recommended 7 units in the settlement of Northill (with a further 10 – now built- in Upper Caldecote, and 4 units in Ickwell). This is undoubtedly why the present application is for 7 homes, as it was put together before the update. My interpretation of the updated HNS survey is that it recommends 14 units in the parish, not just the settlement of Northill, so not such a big increase as stated in your report under section 5, entitled CBC Housing Needs Strategy.

Additional Comments

Amendment to Section 4.5 of committee report - second from last line of paragraph should read ...'as set out below in section 4.10 '

For clarity the rear garden serving Plot 7 (a two bedroom bungalow) equates to 58 sq m. The CBC Design Guide recommends a minimum of 50 sq m garden size for a two bedroom property.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 8 (Pages 47-146) – CB/15/01626/REG3 – Land Thorn Turn, Houghton Regis (Waste Park)

Additional consultee comments on re-consultation:

Dunstable Town Council

Response received on 12 August to re-consultation – No objection.

CBC Highways Development Management Team

The Highways Development Control Officer has clarified that a condition relating to detailed highway design should be imposed which is consistent with the condition approved at the previous meeting of this Committee in relation to the outline application for employment development at Thorn Turn (ref. CB/15/01628/REG3).

Officers therefore recommend an additional condition as follows:

No part of the development shall be brought into use unless and until a scheme of highways improvement works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall include construction details of approved access arrangements and crossing facilities at Thorn Road and footway / cycleway provision along the site frontage. The scheme as may be approved in writing shall be implemented in full prior to the waste park hereby permitted coming into operation.

REASON: To ensure that the proposed highway works are constructed to adequate standard, are appropriate and proportionate to the mitigation required to serve the development and that public rights of way are protected, enhanced and promoted as part of the development in accordance with the saved Policies GE23 and GE21 of the Bedfordshire & Luton Minerals & Waste Local Plan 2005 and the NPPF.

Additional Objector comments:

Some further objections set out in several emails have been received from a Chalk Hill resident. It is noted that the issues have since been encapsulated in a handout, received Tuesday 18 August, covering issues of development in the Green Belt, noise impacts, fire risk and ecology. It is understood that this handout has been circulated to Committee members and therefore the content of the earlier e-mails are not duplicated here. The issues raised in the handout in respect of this application are covered in the report with the exception of two matters.

- Firstly, a comment has been received regarding the amount of vacant industrial units, including a link to available property, and questioning the need to build on Green Belt land. Committee are advised that the application was accompanied by an alternative site search as referred to in the report in order to identify the availability of any preferable site outside the Green Belt.
- Secondly, it has been questioned whether the area has been assessed for fire risk taking into account the close proximity of the residential areas at Chalk Hill and Sewell. It is argued that these areas should be treated as high sensitivity receptors given that they comprise surrounding land where users can

reasonably expect enjoyment of a high level of amenity and people would reasonably be expected to be present here continuously, or at least regularly for extended periods, as part of the normal pattern of use of the land. The application does not address the health and safety concerns of local residents or the risk to the environment. Committee are advised that the issue of fire risk is covered on page 119 – 120 of the report. Officers would further comment that the Chief Fire Officer has twice been consulted on the application. In addition, the objector's comments were forwarded to the Chief Fire Officer on 10 August and attention was drawn to the Fire Strategy accompanying the application, which outlines high specification fire detection and control systems included in the site design. Although a response was invited ahead of today's meeting, no comments have been forthcoming. Officers would wish to emphasise the point that there is no reason in land use planning terms why the development is unacceptable from the point of view of fire risk. Before any waste handling operations can take place on the site, the applicant would need to obtain a Permit from the Environment Agency under the appropriate pollution control regime, this being the Environmental Permit Regulations 2010 (as amended). It is considered that fire risk will be examined in a greater degree of detail as part of this permitting process and any Permit would be expected to contain day-to-day fire prevention and safety measures. Furthermore, a fire certificate would need to be obtained and the Council's insurers would need to be satisfied that adequate precautions are in place.

Item 9 (Pages 147-240) – CB/15/01627/REG3 – Land at Thorn Turn, Houghton Regis (Highway Depot)

Additional consultee comments on re-consultation:

Dunstable Town Council:

A response has been received dated 12/08/2015 raising no objection.

CBC's Public Protection Officer:

A further response dated 12/08/2015 has been received but this does not depart from the previous position as set out in the report. The latest response suggests conditions in respect of noise, dust and light, although Committee are advised that these do not materially alter the content of those set out in the recommended conditions.

CBC Highways Development Management Team:

The Highways Development Control Officer has clarified in a response dated 05/08/2015 that a condition relating to detailed highway design should be imposed which is consistent with the condition approved at the previous meeting of this Committee in relation to the outline application for employment development at Thorn Turn (ref. CB/15/01628/REG3).

Officers therefore recommend an additional condition as follows:

No part of the development shall be brought into use unless and until a scheme of highways improvement works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall include construction details of approved access arrangements and crossing facilities at Thorn Road and footway / cycleway provision along the site frontage. The scheme as may be approved in writing shall be implemented in full prior to the highways and winter maintenance depot hereby permitted coming into operation.

REASON: To ensure that the proposed highway works are constructed to adequate standard, are appropriate and proportionate to the mitigation required to serve the development and that public rights of way are protected, enhanced and promoted as part of the development in accordance with the NPPF.

With reference to Condition 1 on Page 227, the Works Information relating to Landscape and Ecology (6 bullet points from the bottom of the page) should relate to the version dated 5 August 2015.

Late Representations:

Some further objections set out in several emails have been received from a Chalk Hill resident. It is noted that the issues have since been largely encapsulated in a handout received on 18 August 2015, covering issues of development in the Green Belt, noise impacts and ecology. It is understood that this handout has been circulated to Committee members and the content of the earlier emails are therefore not duplicated here. The issues raised in the handout in respect of this application are covered in the report with the exception of one issue raised in earlier correspondence regarding the amount of vacant industrial units, including a link to available property, and questioning the need to build on Green Belt land. Committee are advised that the application was accompanied by an alternative site search in order to identify the availability of any preferable site outside the Green Belt, as referred to in the report.

Item 10 (Pages 241-248) – CB/15/02323/FULL – 18 Seamons Close, Dunstable

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Another letter has been received from the occupier of No. 28 Seamons Close. The author of the letter cannot attend the committee meeting but hopes that his previous representation has been made available to Members. He also hopes that the matter he raised in regards to the building onto the vacant plot of No. 16 has been properly investigated.

Additional Comments

As noted in the report, plots 16 and 18 have been amalgamated and the proposed extension would not increase the footprint of the dwelling.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 11 (Pages 249 -265) – CB/15/02657/Full – Bridge Farm, Ivel Road, Shefford

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Letter from Savills on behalf of adjacent land owners (Copy attached to Late Sheet)

Summary of comments -

- Adjacent land owners not notified.
- Timing of application. It is not possible for Member to be aware of the all the issues while the consultation period is still open.
- Marketing period of 3 years has not expired. It began in December 2013 according to submitted documents.
- Marketing information is not supported by Economic Growth team.
- MA6 requires route to be safeguarded to land to south and east.
- Development should not impact on the adjacent working farm

Shefford Town Council - Object. Summary of comments

LAPS shown are close to road junctions and have been removed from other plans? Where are they? Are the plans accurate?

Officer comment: the play areas have been removed from the site at the suggestion of the CBC Play and Open Space Officer given the scale of the site.

Development will overload the existing sewers. They system is unable to cope with additional demand at present are requires continual remedial pumping out.

There is insufficient lower school places in Shefford.

Further – there is insufficient parking provision provided. The developer should be responsible for yellow lines on main feeder road to the estate.

Full details of the Town Council comments are appended to the Late Sheet.

CBC Archaeology Officer - No objections subject to condition requiring archaeological investigations.

CBC Tree and Landscape Officer - Landscape details provided are acceptable.

CBC Highways Officer –

Further to my initial response dated 4th August I make the following additional comments and recommendation of conditions and advice notes to be included on the late sheet for members consideration at planning committee. For clarification, these are in addition to the Grampian condition requiring the provision of the controlled pedestrian crossing on Shefford Road prior to first occupation of any dwelling.

In terms of on-site detail, the design of the estate roads comply with the CBC design guidance and will be appropriate for adoption as highway maintainable at public expense, subject to detail design and construction requirements to be finalised and agreed as part of any subsequent Highways Act S38 agreement. The provision of car parking, including minimum garage size can be argued is design guide compliant Appendix F compliant (they have provided 7.0 x 3.3m external dimension to comply with the text of the design guide whereas the sketch indicates internal dimension) and appropriate resident cycle parking provision is achievable in either the garages or free standing stores.

In these circumstances I confirm that there is no highway reason why planning approval should not be granted.

CBC Sustainable Growth Officer –

The development should meet 10% energy demand from renewable sources. This can be secured by a condition.

Additional Comments

The press advert expires on 28th August

Whilst it has been suggested by the Highways Officer that the provision of a new crossing between Shefford Road/Churchill Way roundabout and the A507 could be dealt by a condition, it is recommended to Members that the provision of the crossing is secured via the S106 Agreement.

Although no comment have yet been received from Anglian Water, based on the previous application for 49 dwellings, their comments stated that there is adequate capacity for the development.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Highway conditions

1.If the proposed roads are not constructed to the full length and layout illustrated on the approved plan, a temporary turning space for vehicles shall be constructed within the site in a position to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any building taking access from the road is occupied.

Reason: To avoid the need for vehicles to reverse into or from the highway in the interest of road safety.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995, or any amendments thereto, the garage accommodation on the site shall not be used for any purpose, other than as garage accommodation, 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.

3. Development shall not begin until the developer has made provision for;

- A Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing access arrangements for construction vehicles, routing of construction vehicles, on-site parking and loading and unloading areas.
- An on-site materials storage area.
- On-site wheel cleaning arrangements.

Reason: To ensure that the development of the site does not compromise highway safety on the surrounding highway network.

4. No development shall commence at the site before details of how the development will achieve a reduction in carbon emissions of at least 10% more than required by current Building Regulations through the use of on-site or near-site renewable or low carbon technology energy generation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: Required prior to the commencement of the development in order achieve 10% of energy from renewable sources in the interest of sustainability.

5. No dwelling shall be occupied until a controlled pedestrian crossing has been constructed on Shefford Road at an appropriate point between the Churchill Road roundabout and the roundabout junction with the A507, together with a 2.0m wide footway linking the site with the crossing in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of road safety and pedestrian movement.

Additional information regarding marketing

The S106 agreement relating to the B1 employment land (CB/12/01123/OUT) required a marketing period of three years from the date of the planning consent. The marketing on site originally commenced in December 2011 and has since been carried out by various agents such as Robinson and Hall, EG Property, Rightmove etc. The marketing strategy has been subject of quarterly updates and Additional marketing was undertaken by Robinson and Hall in December 2013 following discussions with CBC Officers.

The submitted Marketing Report sets out the level of interest in the site over the marketing period. There have been a number of interests, but no further follow up inquiries. In 2011 H-Squared, a Shefford based company expressed an interest for a 1 acre plot on the land. H Squared are a battery and torch distribution company, a use that would fall within B2/B8 use class. In order for H-Squared to operate on the site a new access may have been required onto Ivel Road and would rely on the transfer of a portion of land from CBC Estate. Planning consent would also need to be sought for B2/B8 use which may not have been compatible with the adjacent residential use. H-Squared do not appear to have made any further enquires therefore it is assumed their interest in the land has since declined.

In early 2014 Castleoak, a Registered Care Home provider expressed an interest in a section of the land for the development of a care home which has subsequently been granted Outline planning consent.