

## **LATE SHEET**

### **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 11<sup>th</sup> November 2015**

#### ***Item 6 (Pages 15-40) – CB/15/03000/VOC – Land rear of 197 Hitchin Road, Arlesey***

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

##### **Additional Comments**

None

##### **Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**

#### ***Item 7 (Pages 41-62) – CB/15/02102/FULL – Land to the East of High Road, Shillington***

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

##### **Neighbour letter.**

1 additional Objection received on grounds of:

- Additional traffic congestion, noise and pollution.
- Existing Memorial Hall is a landmark building in the village.
- Increased impact on neighbouring residents.
- Further parking problems on High Road.

##### **NHS**

We would not have considered 19 dwellings in this area as an issue for health. However, it should be noted that there is a development of 97 dwellings in Lower Stondon and recently completed developments in Shefford, which as you will appreciate add up to additional needs for health care in this area.

Dr Collins and Carragher in Lower Stondon is the nearest surgery to the above development, with both Shefford and Arlesey a close second.

As these three practices are the nearest to the development it should be noted, their capacity to continue to take on additional patients, within the remit of the current premises:

- Dr Collins and Carragher is deemed as having capacity (but is nearing its constraints at 18.70 patients per square metre
- Dr Cakebread and Partners at Shefford Health Centre has capacity with 17.50 patents per square metre

- Arlesley Medical Centre is constrained at 22.55 patients per square metre.

'Constrained' means a practice working to over-capacity for the size of their premises and the clinical space available to provide the required services to their patients. Practice in this situation would usually need to be reconfigured, extended or in exceptional circumstances even relocated to absorb a significant number of new registrations.

Therefore the proposed additional patients (45.6 = 2.4 x 19 dwellings), NHS England would expect that these patients would have an impact on the capacity for these surgeries and would be grateful for a GMS health contribution of £621 per dwelling for the use of Primary Care.

#### Housing Development Officer (regarding the proposed change to provide 21% affordable housing)

In these situations we would normally request to see a financial appraisal to demonstrate as to why the policy requirement can not be met. However, having reviewed the affordable housing provision for the site the scheme is proposing 4 affordable rent units as 1 bed bungalows which is a type of unit welcomed by the Council. Further to this internal waiting list information received from Housing Services demonstrates a demand for 1 bed units in Shillington. However, in order to be able to agree to the 31% affordable housing from this scheme I would like confirmation that the bungalows will all be designed to Mobility Standard to 'future proof them' for the future requirements.

#### Education

Additional discussions between education and the Case Officer result in a recommendation to Members to not require education contributions in this instance given the amounts claimed in light of the likely impact it would have on the viability of the provision of the community facility.

#### **Additional Comments**

None

#### **Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**

##### Highways additional conditions.

1. Notwithstanding the details submitted in the approved plans, no development shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of a revised site layout showing an amended highway layout that includes the provision to of a formal turning head within the site and development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure adequate arrangements to accommodate for refuse collection in the interests of highway 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.

Additional condition regarding open space.

1. Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, a scheme for the provision, management and maintenance of the Public Open Space shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the management body which will be responsible for delivering the management and maintenance of the Public Open Space in accordance with the approved scheme. The Public Open Space shall be laid out prior to the occupation of the 19th dwelling and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure the provision of public open space to an acceptable standard and to ensure its future management in the interests of high quality development and policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.

Amended conditions

8. No development shall take place unless and until the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) A Phase 1 Desk Study incorporating a site walkover, site history, maps and all further features of industry best practice relating to potential contamination.
- b) Where shown to be necessary by the Phase 1 Desk Study, a Phase 2 Site Investigation report further documenting the ground conditions of the site with regard to potential contamination, incorporating appropriate soils and gas sampling.
- c) Where shown to be necessary by the Phase 2 Desk Study, a Phase 3 detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be taken to mitigate any risks to human health, groundwater and the wider environment.

Any works which form part of the Phase 3 scheme approved by the local authority shall be completed in full before any permitted building is occupied. The effectiveness of any scheme shall be demonstrated to the Local Planning Authority by means of a validation report (to incorporate photographs, material transport tickets and validation sampling), unless an alternative period is approved in writing by the Authority. Any such validation should include responses to any unexpected contamination discovered during works.

Reason: The details are required prior to commencement to protect human health and the environment in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

18. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers 12494 200 G, 12494 201, 12494 202 A, 12494 203 B, 12494 204 B, 12494 205, 12494 206 A,

12494 208, 12494 209 A, 12494 100, 12494 101, 12494 102 p1, 12494 103, 12494 104, 12494 105 and 12494 106 A.

Reason: To identify the approved plan/s and to avoid doubt.

### ***Item 8 (Pages 63-80) – CB/15/02104/FULL – Land at Memorial Playing Fields, Greenfields, Shillington***

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

Leisure Officer raises no objections following Sport England's no objection

#### **Additional Comments**

#### **Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**

The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the sports pitches have been laid out in accordance with the layouts shown on drawing Number 12495 03 Revision E.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory quantity, quality and accessibility of compensatory provision which secures a continuity of use.

### ***Item 9 (Pages 81-96) – CB/15/03228/OUT – Chalkcroft Nursery, The Ridgeway, Moggerhanger***

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

##### Additional response

I write regarding the planning application for 9 properties at Asterby & Chalkcroft Nursery, Moggerhanger (CB/15/03228/OUT), submitted by Mr. & Mrs. Aldridge.

You will be aware from previous interactions between yourselves and the MATHS group that Moggerhanger has strong views on development within our small village. Earlier this year we elected a new Parish Council with many new members in favour of taking a more active interest in our housing and development. Because of this the decision was taken to disband the MATHS group and for members to raise issues with, and give support to, our new Parish Council.

I write on behalf of the Trustees of Moggerhanger Village Hall and the Trustees of The Friends of Moggerhanger Village Hall. These two charities work in unison to support and maintain our well used and vital community hall. We recently purchased a one acre strip of land from Central Bedfordshire Council to provide a much needed car park and improved facilities at the hall, all of which will require significant expenditure. We are in the process of drawing up a planning application for submission. Currently car owners park along Blunham Road, often on the pavement,

making the road dangerous for road users and pedestrians alike. As well as the much needed car park we wish to develop an outside secure family friendly grassed area.

As part of their application Mr. & Mrs. Aldridge have committed to building a lit footpath from the proposed development to connect with Blunham Road and also to contribute £50,000 towards the car park and improvements at the village hall, both of considerable benefit to the village.

Many key points have been highlighted to your planning department by residents but despite this we understand that the case officer is recommending refusal and that this application will now come to the DMC on November 11. We would be grateful if you would give careful consideration to this application taking note of the following points we have raised.

CBC still has a requirement for additional housing and 30% of this proposed development will be affordable.

Moggerhanger is a small village and as such the right type of development is important to maintain the close community and stay in keeping with the surrounding area and properties. This is a small development on land that is already developed with good screening and good spacing so not over developed.

There will be a foot path enabling easy access to Blunham Road, school and bus facilities, the local village hall and church, making facilities far more accessible than for residents currently living within the Chalton area.

Access to the main A603 will be from the Ridgeway where visibility is good so there will be no impact on the already busy crossroads where Blunham Road joins the A603.

As you know a big issue for Moggerhanger is the service provided by Anglian Water with too low water pressure and inadequate foul and surface water disposal. Water for this development will come from Blunham not through Upper Caldecote and the proposed Biodisc treatment plant for sewage will ensure this development does not impact on the already inadequate services provided by Anglian Water.

Mr. & Mrs. Aldridge held a meeting in our Village Hall outlining their proposal and seeking support from the residents. They have a petition signed by more than 90 parishioners, a copy of which we attach to this communication.

It is true that this development would be outside the settlement envelope, however, can we take the liberty and remind you that for the recently approved development behind the Guinea public house 16 of the 18 properties are also outside of the settlement envelope.

It will be of no surprise to you to see we have compared this application to the recently approved development for 18 houses behind the Guinea public house which will be built on virgin farm land, is in our opinion over developed and not in keeping with surrounding properties, will impact significantly on the road traffic at the cross roads and is likely to break the already over stressed Anglian Water services.

It is clear from the proposal that the nursery is no longer viable so some form of alternative development will be required. If this application is not approved for residential development then the alternative would be for a different kind of commercial development. We are certain you are already aware that Moggerhanger has more than its fair share.

The case officer states that the benefit offered to the Village Hall cannot be taken into consideration. May we draw your attention to item 7 on your agenda for November 11 meeting regarding the erection of 19 properties at Shillington after demolition of the village hall. Here the recommendation is for approval and here the community hall is paramount to the recommendation.

“The development of the site for residential purposes is contrary to policies within the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009. However in this instance the development is considered acceptable as an exception on the basis that the material considerations with the scheme, that being that monies generated from the development will be directed towards the provision of a new Community Hall within the village at the Memorial Playing Fields, outweighing the noncompliance with policy.”

In conclusion we believe this is a community focused development, providing benefits and many facilities for new and existing residents alike, unlike the Guinea development where we feel the beneficiary is the developer alone.

Taking all this into consideration we would urge you to recommend this application be granted.

Yours sincerely,  
Mr Roger H Allen - Secretary, Moggerhanger Village Hall

Home : Old Vicarage, Blunham Road, Moggerhanger, Bedford MK44 3RD

98 Station Road –comments received -

This development is proposed in open countryside and well out of any village building line. The original bungalow was granted on agricultural grounds. Historically I understood from my mother that during 1939-45 a line of bombs were dropped by enemy aircraft to target railway lines but fortunately missed. Ground may need to be tested for UXBs.

Rights of Way Officer -

I have no objections to the application.

I do have comments I wish to be taken into consideration with regard to the pedestrian access as described in the application and Design Guide. The applicant is disposed to the creation of a Permissive Footpath across the site to allow public access between The Ridgeway and Blunham Road, Moggerhanger.

I would like the applicant to dedicate the intended footpath as a Right of Way rather than a permissive route. This will root the access permanently into the landscape, be able to be improved over time and give an important everlasting public access gain in this area. It would allow wider users to access the Ivel Riverside rights of way and

Sandy beyond without using the Bedford-Sandy road rat run. I would be most content with the way becoming a legal footpath. In that case Countryside Access would sign the route and maintain the surface of the way over time.

The proposed route would have to have a minimum legal width of 2metres and be level and surfaced with blinded recycled planings (680m x 1.5m approx cost £22500.00) as this would become a very popular route. I would resist the installation of structures (kissing gates) as Countryside Access policy is for as open access as is possible. In this case stock is not present.

Petition received in support of proposal.

### **Additional Comments**

Letter dated 6 November 2015 from the applicants Agent Clarke and Whalen.

Appended to the Late Sheet (also circulated to Members by email)

### Officers comments on above.

The Guinea development is not considered to be comparable to this application as the Guinea site was allocated for development under Policy HA26 of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2011). Under the site allocation process it was considered to be an appropriate location for new development.

Regarding the comments made referring to the new village hall proposed by the Shillington application (also on this agenda), in this case the Village Hall forms part of the proposal as it is to be demolished to make way for the proposed new dwellings. As set out in the committee report for the Shillington item, the proposal here will enable the delivery of a new village hall elsewhere in the village. The loss of the community facility would not be acceptable and therefore the development seeks to provide new facilities as part of the proposal. As such the new facility is relevant to the development and required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It therefore complies with the CIL regulations whereas in the Chalkcroft Nursery case, the proposed £50,000 towards a new car park is not considered to meet the tests set out in the CIL regulations as set out in the committee report.

Reference has been made to a recent planning application in the CBC Parish of Studham where three dwellings were granted permission at Studham Nursery under delegated powers on 22/09/15. In this case the nursery had ceased trading and a viability assessment submitted, it would be an overall enhancement of the site which is in an AONB and Green Belt, there was a reduction in the built footprint of the site, the enhancement of the site was considered to outweigh other considerations. In the Moggerhanger case, the site is not within Greenbelt, there would be a significant increase in built footprint on the site, the business continues to trade, the viability assessment submitted did not explicitly set out the business accounts to demonstrate the business is not viable.

Members should be aware that Annex 2 of the NPPF defines Previously Developed Land (brownfield) as excluding: land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings. Horticultural use falls within the definition of agriculture as set out by the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

***Item 10 (Pages 97-116) – CB/15/02248/FULL – Land adj to Flitwick Filling Station, High Street, Flitwick***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

Highways England: No objections.

Central Bedfordshire Council Highways officer: No objections to revised plans.

Network Rail: No further comments to make on revised plans other than those previously raised.

**Additional Comments**

None

**Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**

None

***Item 11 (Pages 117-128) – CB/15/03408/FULL – Woodcote, Woodside, Aspley Guise***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

None

**Additional Comments**

Letter dated 3 November 2015 from the applicants. Appended to the Late Sheet

**Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**

None

***Item 12 (Pages 129-146) – CB/15/03064/REG3 – Leighton Middle School, 2 Church Square, Leighton Buzzard***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

A letter has been received from the Chair of Governors of Leighton Middle School confirming that the results of the consultation with parents and staff has resulted in an agreement to alter the times of the school day by 10 minutes in accordance with the recommendations within the submitted Travel Plan.

**Additional Comments**

The additional plan showing the proposed alterations to the Dining Block has been received.

**Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**

None



***Item 13 (Pages 147-164) – CB/15/03281/FULL – 55 Jeans Way, Dunstable***

**Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses**

A further letter has been received from the occupier of No. 42. Kingsbury Gardens. She states that the sun shines at the bottom of the garden of No. 42 at around 9.30 am at this time of year and works its way towards the house over the next three hours. It then shines into the sun lounge of No. 42 until mid afternoon.

**Additional Comments**

None

**Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons**

None