

Item No. 16

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/15/03665/FULL
LOCATION	6 Periwinkle Lane, Dunstable, LU6 3NP
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two x three bedroomed semi-detached houses
PARISH	Dunstable
WARD	Dunstable Watling
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Hollick & Young
CASE OFFICER	Debbie Willcox
DATE REGISTERED	02 October 2015
EXPIRY DATE	27 November 2015
APPLICANT	Mr Alexander
AGENT	John B Lewis
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Called in by Councillor Hollick for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed build would be too close to the boundary abutting the neighbours' lean-to entrance hallway at No. 10;• From one bungalow to two 3 bed dwellings, albeit on a wider plot, would be overbearing;• Additional access required to accommodate 4 vehicles onto an already overcrowded highway;• The proposal would require four spaces which would impinge on available parking on the road, which is already crowded on both sides;• Reservations as to how the proposed dwelling will sit between a compact row of smaller homes and a bungalow at No. 10;• Loss of light given the proximity to the boundary and glass framed entrance hallway at No. 10.
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Recommended for Approval

Summary of Recommendation

The principle of development is considered to be acceptable. The proposed replacement dwellings would relate acceptably to the character and appearance of the area and would not have an unacceptable, detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. The parking provision is considered to be acceptable and it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on highway safety. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, policies BE8, H2 and T10 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide.

Site Location:

The application site comprises the curtilage of a detached, single storey dwelling located on the north west of Periwinkle Lane in Dunstable. The area is predominantly residential, comprising a mix of terraced and detached two storey dwellings and detached single storey dwellings. The application site is relatively

spacious in comparison to some within the area.

The Application:

The application seeks planning permission to demolish the existing bungalow and construct two x 3 bedroom dwellings. The dwellings would be linked at ground floor level, but detached at first floor level and would have hipped roofs with ridge heights of 6.8m.

The dwellings would have staggered side building lines, with narrower two storey rear projections, also with hipped roofs. They would each have a porch and front bay window with a canopy linking the two and would be of brick and tile construction. The rear gardens would each have a depth of 10m and an area of 75m - 80m. Two parking spaces for each dwelling would be provided on hardstanding at the front of the site.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review Policies

BE8 Design Considerations

H2 Making Provision for Housing via 'Fall-In' Sites

T10 Parking - New Development

(Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, the age of the plan and the general consistency with the NPPF, policies BE8 & H2 are still given significant weight. Policy T10 is afforded less weight).

Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire (June 2014)

At the meeting of Full Council on 19th November it was resolved to withdraw the Development Strategy. Preparation of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan has begun. A substantial volume of evidence gathered over a number of years will help support this document. These technical papers are consistent with the spirit of the NPPF and therefore will remain on our web site as material considerations which may inform further development management decisions.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Central Bedfordshire Design Guide: A Guide for Development:

Design Supplement 1: Placemaking in Central Bedfordshire, 2014

Design Supplement 5: Residential Development, 2014

Design Supplement 7: Residential Alterations and Extensions, 2014

Relevant Planning History:

Application Number CB/15/02358/PAPC

Description Pre-Application Charging Advice: Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2.5 storey block of 8 flats with roof lights to front elevation and dormers to rear elevation. 8 parking spaces, amenity space, bins and bike stores.

Decision Advice given that the proposed development would be too high density and would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the street, the amenity of neighbours and the surrounding highway network. A pair of semi-detached dwellings would be more acceptable, dependent on detailed design and adherence to national and local policies and

Decision Date design guidance.
12/08/2015

Consultees:

Dunstable Town Council (Initial Response) The Council objects to this application as it believes the development to be inconsistent with the immediate street scene; overdevelopment for this plot of land and there are concerns that the development will exacerbate congested parking issues that already exist in the area.

Dunstable Town Council (Response to revised plans) We are aware that there are still local objections, as they feel that anything other than a single dwelling is over development. They are also concerned that 2 dwellings would overload the road where parking is already a considerable problem.

Environment Agency No response.

Highways Officer (Initial Response) The proposal is for the introduction of 2 four bedroom dwellings with each having a parking bay to the front and a garage measuring 3.1 by 7.0m. The parking bays to the front measure less than 6.0m (fronting a garage door) which is substandard. There is further parking to the rear which is (assumed) accessed by way of an alley which is narrow; and goes through a right hand bend. Further, there are a number of access points where the alley rejoins the public highway but they are all substandard in the way of width and pedestrian to vehicle intervisibility. There does not appear to be a red line and this leads me to be concerned that access to the rear parking bays is not within the ownership of the application site or that they have rights over it. Further, the route to these parking bays appears to be so restricted that I doubt that they would be used.

This is all subject to further information and an adequate red line plan. Never-the-less with or without this information I would recommend that this application be refused.

In a highway context I recommend that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:-

The proposed development would make inadequate provision for the parking of cars and would lead to an increase in on-street parking thereby resulting in unacceptable traffic congestion and additional hazards for highway users and the local Residents.

and

The means of access to the rear parking area is not included within the red line plan; Restricting the ability to

lawfully secure access to part of the site which would have an adverse impact on the public highway.

and

The proposed development makes no provision for adequate pedestrian / driver intervisibility and will lead to condition of danger to pedestrians using the adjoining footway.

and

The proposed development makes inadequate provision for a satisfactory vehicular access to serve the development and is likely to lead to an increase in congestion and additional hazards for highway users.

and

The proposed development fails to make adequate provision for a safe and convenient driveway and if approved would result in obstruction on the public highway, which would create conditions of danger and inconvenience to users of the highway.

Highways Officer
(Response to revised plans)

I understand that, despite the highway reasons for refusal on the previous scheme, the revised site layout plan has been redesigned to the satisfaction of the highway engineer.

The construction works for the proposed vehicle crossing, within the public highway, shall be undertaken by Bedfordshire Highways at the applicants expense.

I recommend the supplied conditions and informatives be included.

Tree & Landscape
Officer

I refer to my previous Pre-Application consultation site notes, dated 20th July 2015, in respect of CB/15/02358/PAPC, which have been duplicated below:-

I have examined the plans and documents associated with this Pre-Application, and viewed the site on aerial photography.

The existing site shows a distinct lack of strategically useful landscaping, and given the size of the block of flats, and the need to provide adequate car parking provision, there will be a complete lack of planting space at the sides, and along the frontage of the flats, to provide any degree of effective landscaping, which should be of a quantity, size and stature that would soften the mass of the new building.

The end result of this current proposal will therefore be a harsh and stark development, with no form of complementary softening, which suggests that the site is being overdeveloped in terms of trying to maintain a satisfactory balance between new planting, when combined with the scale of built form, and the buildings's associated areas of car parking.

This factor should therefore be taken into account when deciding if mitigation measures would be adequate when determining the suitability of this building for this particular locality.

In view of the above comments, the proposal to now construct two semi-detached houses is more preferable, but I recommend that if you are minded to grant consent, then a standard landscape condition is imposed in order to secure boundary planting such as hedges and shrubs, and for the planting of suitable (eg fastigiate) tree species where appropriate for the site.

Ecologist

No objection. The NPPF calls for development to deliver a net gain for biodiversity and opportunities for enhancement should be considered. The inclusion of integrated bird bricks and use of nectar/ berry rich planting would achieve biodiversity gains.

Pollution Team

No comments

Other Representations:

Neighbours:

(4, 4A & 10 Periwinkle Lane, 6 Periwinkle Terrace, 9, 11 & 13 Garden Road, 1 Willoughby Close)

Object for the following reasons:

- The proposal represents overdevelopment and would be out of character with the streetscene;
- The proposed dwellings would dominate the surrounding dwellings;
- The dwellings are not semi-detached;
- The outer edges of the building are too close to the side boundaries with neighbours;
- The drawings omit the porch to No. 10 to give a misleading, greater impression of spaciousness;
- The proposal would position the boiler flue opposite the kitchen and bathroom windows of No. 10;
- The proposal would block light and appear overbearing to the side windows of No. 10, which serve a kitchen and bathroom. It would also block light to the side porch of No. 10;
- The proposal would block light to Nos. 4 and 4A and would appear overbearing from the gardens of these properties;
- The proposal would block views of the trees from No. 4A;

- The proposal would contravene the Human Rights Act as it would take away the rights of the occupiers of No. 10 to peaceful enjoyment of their home and garden;
- The proposal would exacerbate existing parking problems within Periwinkle Lane;
- The property has not got rights to a vehicular access to the rear of the property and thus the proposed parking spaces at the rear cannot be used;
- The garages are not wide enough to meet the Council's Design Guide requirements;
- Insufficient renewable energy provision;
- There would be insufficient garden space;
- The development would overlook surrounding rear gardens in Periwinkle Lane and Garden Road and would thus result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers;
- The dwellings would have views into the rear rooms of dwellings in Garden Road, resulting in a loss of privacy;
- The dwellings would be forward of the front building line of dwellings in Periwinkle Lane;
- There are newts in the pond of No. 11 Garden Road;
- Construction work would be disruptive and noisy and this may take place over Christmas;
- Concerns about mud on the road during construction period;

Following a consultation on the revised plans, the same neighbours wrote in and many of the objections were reiterated. The only new objections raised were as follows:

- The proposal would result in the loss of on-street parking spaces;
- The proposal would block direct sunlight to No. 6 Periwinkle Terrace in the summer evenings.

Petition signed by 2, 2A, 4, 4A, 10 & 14, Periwinkle Lane, 6 Periwinkle Terrace, 1, 4, 51, 52, 53 & 54 Willoughby Close and 11 Garden Close

Object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- It would not be sympathetic of the streetscene;
- It would exacerbate parking problems in the area and have a negative impact upon highway safety;

Determining Issues:

- 1. Principle of Development**
- 2. Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area**
- 3. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity**
- 4. Highways Considerations**
- 5. Other Considerations**

Considerations

1. Principle of Development

- 1.1 The application site is located within a built-up residential area and is not the subject of any specific planning designations. The principle of efficiently utilising unused or underused brownfield sites within built-up areas to provide additional accommodation is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policy H2 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review (SBLPR). It is noted that the application site is twice as wide as the residential plots to the immediate north and east of the application site and therefore a subdivision of the application site into two residential plots would not be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area and would represent an efficient use of the site. It is therefore considered that the principle of replacing the existing bungalow and making more efficient use of the site with two replacement family dwellings would be acceptable, providing that the proposal would be in line with the detail of policies H2 and BE8.
- 1.2 Policy H2 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review states that within built up areas excluded from the Green Belt, provision of new housing by redevelopment will be approved where it would, among other things:
- (i) Make efficient use of the site in terms of density and layout;
 - (ii) Not result in loss of open space of recreational or amenity value or potential;
 - (iii) Respect and enhance the character of the surrounding area;
 - (iv) Provide good quality living conditions for residents;
 - (v) Be readily accessible to public transport and local services;
 - (vi) Be acceptable in terms of highway safety and traffic flow;
- 1.3 Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review requires development proposals to, among other things:
- (i) Any natural and built features which are an attractive aspect of the site are protected and conserved;
 - (ii) take full account of the need for, or opportunities to enhance or reinforce the character and local distinctiveness of the area;
 - (iii) ensure that the size, scale, density, massing, orientation, materials and overall appearance of the development complements and harmonises with the local surroundings, particularly in terms of adjoining buildings and spaces and longer views;
 - (iv) carefully consider the setting of any development. Attention should be paid to its impact on public views into, over and out of the site. Those views should not be harmed and opportunities should be taken to enhance them or open up new views;
 - (vii) the proposed development should have no unacceptable adverse impact upon general or residential amenity and privacy; and
 - (viii) development likely to generate noise disturbance and other pollution emissions does not unacceptably disturb or otherwise affect adjoining properties and uses.
- 1.4 Compliance with the detailed provisions of policies H2 and BE8 will be considered further below.

2. Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

- 2.1 Following the initial consultation period, the proposal has been revised and now

features two x 3 bedroom dwellings instead of two x 4 bedroom dwellings, the proposed dwellings have been reduced in width at the rear.

- 2.2 As previously noted, the prevailing character of the streetscene of Periwinkle Lane is varied, with a mix of single and two storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. Materials also vary, including brick, stone, weatherboarding and render. Some plots are very spacious, but in other places there is little space between dwellings. It is considered that the proposed dwellings would sit well within the streetscene, with a building line consistent with the terrace of two storey dwellings to the east. The ridges of the roofs of the proposed dwellings would not exceed the heights of either the two storey dwellings to the east of the site or the chalet bungalow to the west of the site. Each dwelling would be set 1m off the side boundary of the site and the detachment between the dwellings at first floor level would provide a further impression of space within the streetscene. The detailed design and materials are traditional and also would not appear out of character with existing dwellings within the streetscene.
- 2.3 The proposed gardens would meet the Council's minimum depth requirements of 10m and would exceed the minimum area requirements of 60 square metres for family dwellings. They would also not be out of scale with other garden depths or net areas within the vicinity.
- 2.4 The development would not appear cramped or out of character with the streetscene and it is considered that the proposal would complement and harmonise with surrounding development. As such, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policies BE8 and H2 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide.

3. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 3.1 As noted above, the proposal has been revised following the initial consultation, with the width of the dwellings being reduced at ground and first floor level at the rear to reduce the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
- 3.2 It is noted that No. 10 has flank windows that serve a bathroom and a kitchen and a glazed side porch which currently receive a lot of light due to the siting of the existing bungalow. The proposal would result in a loss of light and outlook onto the flank wall for these windows and the porch. The porch and bathroom are not considered to be habitable rooms and therefore very limited weight is given to loss of light and outlook to these rooms. More weight is given to the loss of outlook from the kitchen window and as a result, the proposal was revised to limit the depth of the dwelling adjacent to the boundary of No. 10. However, the direct outlook from the kitchen window would still be of a two storey brick wall and there would still be a significant loss of daylight. It is noted that the kitchen is not a kitchen diner and does not provide a seating area, which would limit the amount of time occupants would be likely to spend within the kitchen. It is also noted that the kitchen faces north east and therefore does not currently receive much direct sunlight and that at only certain times of year. These factors both limit the weight that can be given to the impact of the proposal on the kitchen of No. 10. On balance, it is considered that the level of impact on the occupiers of No. 10 is acceptable.

- 3.3 The comments from the occupiers of No. 10 regarding the omission of their glazed porch from the proposed streetscene drawing are noted. However, the porch is included on the ground floor plan, the location plan and the block plan, suggesting that the omission is not intentional, and this has allowed officers to take full account of the porch when assessing the application, which was also noted and considered during the site visits which took place during the course of the application. The porch is a lightweight, glazed structure, set back from the front building line of No. 10 and it is considered that its existence does not have a material impact on the acceptability or otherwise of the impact of the proposal on the streetscene.
- 3.4 The revised proposal would not block notional 45 degree lines taken from the rear windows of the immediate neighbour at No. 4A or No. 4, located beyond No. 4A. This is established within Design Supplement 7 of the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide as a guide that would prevent development from causing an unacceptable loss of light or appearing unacceptably overbearing. The proposed dwelling would be some way from blocking the notional line from the closest rear window and there are no side windows that would be affected, therefore, it is considered that the impact of the proposal on the occupiers of these properties would be limited and acceptable.
- 3.5 A number of neighbouring occupiers in Periwinkle Lane and Garden Road raised concerns that the proposal would result in a loss of privacy by creating and establishing first floor windows. However, the proposal would provide back to back distances to properties in Garden Road of 27m, which is in excess of the Council's minimum standard of 21m, which is considered adequate to ensure an acceptable level of privacy. It is also noted that both neighbouring properties have first floor front and rear windows and the proposed first floor windows would not provide greater views of rear gardens than the windows of the neighbouring properties.
- 3.6 6 Periwinkle Terrace is located on the opposite side of Periwinkle Lane from the application site and the new dwellings would be located over 20m away from the frontage of the terrace in a north westerly direction. As a result, the loss of sunlight resulting from the proposal would be limited and acceptable.
- 3.7 Concerns were raised by neighbours about a potential loss of view; however, this is not a material planning consideration and cannot form part of the determination of this application.
- 3.8 Concerns were raised about the impact of construction activities on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. These concerns are noted, however, this would be a temporary impact and thus extremely limited weight can be given to these concerns.
- 3.9 The kitchens and bathrooms of the proposed dwellings have been relocated as part of the revisions to the proposal and the boiler flues are now unlikely to be positioned adjacent to the flank boundaries of neighbouring properties.
- 3.10 To conclude, the only harm identified to neighbouring amenity would be the impact on the kitchen of No. 10 Periwinkle Lane, to which only limited weight has been given. Given the benefits of the scheme and the presumption in favour of sustainable development, on balance, it is considered that the level of

impact of the proposed scheme on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers would be within acceptable limits. However, it is considered necessary to remove permitted development rights for extensions to the proposed dwellings by condition, to protect the occupiers of neighbouring properties from further loss of light. Subject to this condition, the proposal is not considered to conflict with policies BE8 and H2 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review.

4. Highways Considerations

- 4.1 The revisions to the scheme have reduced the number of bedrooms at the properties, removed the proposed parking spaces at the rear of the application site and removed the garages. The proposal now includes two parking spaces on the frontage of the site for each three bedroom dwelling, which is sufficient to meet the Council's parking standards.
- 4.2 The Highways Officer has supplied conditions which he considers sufficient to make the development acceptable in terms of the impact it would have on the safety and capacity of Periwinkle Lane and the wider highway network.

5. Other Considerations

5.1 Ecology

The comments of the Ecologist are noted and it is considered appropriate to impose a condition requiring the installation of integrated bird bricks to ensure a net gain for biodiversity. It is not considered that the presence of newts within the pond at No. 11 Garden Road would indicate that newts are likely to be found on site.

5.2 Human Rights issues:

The neighbouring occupier suggested that the proposal would violate his Human Rights under Protocol 1, Article 1 of the Human Rights Act to peaceful enjoyment of his property. However, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a loss of enjoyment of the property that would be at a sufficient level to constitute a breach of Human Rights.

5.3 Equality Act 2010

The proposal raises no issues under the Equality Act 2010.

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be APPROVED subject to the following:

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 Work shall not take place on the construction of the walls and roof of the dwellings hereby approved until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To control the appearance of the buildings in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.

(Policies BE8 & H2, SBLPR and Section 7, NPPF)

- 3 The dwellings shall not be occupied until a landscaping scheme to include all hard and soft landscaping and a scheme for landscape maintenance for a period of five years following the implementation of the landscaping scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented by the end of the full planting season immediately following the completion of the development (a full planting season means the period from October to March). The trees, shrubs and grass shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with the approved landscape maintenance scheme and any which die or are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of landscaping.

(Policies BE8 & H2, SBLPR and Sections 7 & 11, NPPF)

- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1, Class A of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions to the dwellings hereby permitted shall be carried out without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To control the depth, bulk and mass of the dwellings in the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

(Policies BE8 & H2, SBLPR and Section 7, NPPF)

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows shall be inserted into the flank elevations of the proposed dwellings, without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the privacy of neighbouring residents.

(Policies BE8 & H2, SBLPR and Section 7, NPPF)

- 6 No work shall take place on the construction of the walls of the dwellings hereby permitted until details of the type and location of bird bricks for each property have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The bird bricks shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure an enhancement in opportunities for biodiversity on the site.

(Section 11, NPPF)

- 7 Each dwelling shall not be occupied until details of the junction of the proposed vehicular access with the highway have been submitted to and

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the junction has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and the premises.

(Policies BE8 & H2, SBLPR and Section 4, NPPF)

- 8 Before each access is first brought into use, a triangular vision splay shall be provided on each side of the new access and shall measure 2.8m along the back edge of the highway from the centre line of the anticipated vehicle path to a point 2.0m measured from the back edge of the footway into the site along the centre line of the anticipated vehicle path. The vision splays so described shall be maintained thereafter free of any obstruction to visibility exceeding a height of 600mm above the adjoining footway level.

Reason: To provide adequate visibility between the existing highway and the proposed access, and to make the access safe and convenient for the traffic which is likely to use it.

(Policies BE8 & H2, SBLPR and Section 4, NPPF)

- 9 The maximum gradient of each vehicular access shall be 10% (1 in 10).

Reason: In the interests of the safety of persons using the access and users of the highway.

(Policies BE8 & H2, SBLPR and Section 4, NPPF)

- 10 Each dwelling shall not be occupied until details of the construction and surfacing of the on site vehicular areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include arrangements for surface water drainage from the site to soak away within the site so that it does not discharge into the highway or into the main drainage system. The vehicular areas shall be constructed and surfaced in accordance with the approved details before the premises are first occupied.

Reason: To avoid the carriage of mud or other extraneous material or surface water from the site so as to safeguard the interest of highway safety and reduce the risk of flooding and to minimise inconvenience to users of the premises and ensure acceptable parking of vehicles outside highway limits .

(Policies BE8 & H2, SBLPR and Section 4, NPPF)

- 11 No development shall commence until details of a method statement to prevent and deal with site debris from being deposited on the public highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved method statement shall be implemented throughout the construction works and until the completion of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to prevent the deposit of mud or other extraneous material on the highway during the construction period.

(Policies BE8 & H2, SBLPR and Section 4, NPPF)

- 12 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan, number 398-02-02 Rev A.

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

INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT

1. In accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the reason for any condition above relates to the Policies as referred to in the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review (SBLPR) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
2. 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.
3. The Council does not accept materials at their offices. Where there is a requirement for materials to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, please contact the Case Officer to arrange for them to be viewed, usually this will be on site.
4. The applicant is advised that no works associated with the construction of the vehicular access should be carried out within the confines of the public highway without prior consent, in writing, of the Central Bedfordshire Council Highways Department. Upon receipt of this Notice of Planning Approval, the applicant is advised to seek approval from the Local Planning Authority for details of the proposed vehicular access junction in accordance with condition 7. Upon formal approval of details, the applicant is advised to contact Central Bedfordshire Council's Highway Help Desk, Tel: 0300 300 8049 quoting the Planning Application number. This will enable the necessary consent and procedures under Section 184 of the Highways Act to be implemented. The applicant is also advised that if any of the works associated with the construction of the vehicular access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) then the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. To fully discharge condition 7 the applicant should provide evidence to the Local Planning Authority that Bedfordshire Highways have undertaken the construction in accordance with the approved plan, before the development is brought into use.
5. The applicant is advised that the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 will apply to any works undertaken within the limits of the existing public highway. Further details can be obtained from The Street Works Co-ordinator, Bedfordshire Highways, by contacting the Highways Helpdesk 0300 300 8049.
6. The applicant is advised that photographs of the existing highway that is to be used for access and delivery of materials will be required by the Local Highway Authority. Any subsequent damage to the public highway resulting from the works as shown by the photographs, including damage caused by delivery vehicles to the works, will be made good to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority and at the expense of the applicant. Attention is

drawn to Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980 in this respect.

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 5, Article 35

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage and during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

DECISION

.....

.....