

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 26 APRIL 2017

Item 06 (Pages 15-34) – CB/17/00106/OUT – Oakridge, 13 Orchard Close, Upper Gravenhurst, Bedford, MK45 4JF.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Gravenhurst Parish Council has written to reinforce its previous objection to the application.

Six further letters of objection have been received, which raise the following issues:

- Concern of extra traffic and lorries
- The access to the road is dangerous
- Two storey development would reduce views over Shillington
- There is insufficient infrastructure in the village
- There would be traffic associated with the development
- The plans appear to be incorrect insofar as they relate to the boundary between No's 9 and 11
- Existing residents should still be able to reverse their cars on to their drives
- There are water meters in the highway
- The highways situation for existing users of Orchard Close would be problematic
- The development would not respect the character of the area
- This scheme should be bungalows
- There should be a flood risk assessment
- What would happen to the remaining land?
- There would be a loss of trees
- Children could be put at risk
- The development would not constitute limited infill
- The application lacks detail

Additional Comments

The first three words under the title 'Reason for Recommendation' on the first page of the report should read: 'the built development'.

References to two garage sizes in the Highways Officers comments refer to single and double garages.

Additional/Amended Conditions

- Bullet point 2 of condition 4 should continue '...or single storey dwellings with accommodation in the roof space'

Item 07 (Pages 35-56) – CB/17/00478/FULL – The Sugar Loaf, 25 High Street, Meppershall, Shefford, SG17 5LX.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Neighbours:

Further objections received from the following:

- 38 Orchard Close (x2)
- 58 High Street
- 10 Taylors Close
- Meppershall Church of England School
- Meppershall Pre-School
- 37 Monks Park, Wembley
- Additional Petition of 61 signatures

On the following grounds (in summary):

- Significant large extension would have impact on existing retail facilities in village
- In appropriate design (significant glazing and adverts)
- ATM and retail facilities exist and no further required
- Antisocial behaviour and noise as a result of the ATM and plant on store
- Highway safety and Traffic concerns
- Pedestrian safety and concerns over school pupils walking to school
- Loss of the only public house and Asset of Community Value (Contrary to Policy DM8)
- Save the Sugar Loaf have submitted viable business plans as alternative

In terms of the additional neighbour representations, these matters have been addressed previously in the officers report, where material.

Additional Comments

An additional marketing update was requested for the period since the last application submission which has been supplied for consideration which included the details of its marketing strategy for a targeted approach, marketing and mailing lists through Savills. 5 interests were made on the property but not in relation to its retention as a public house. In addition, the viability report was updated accordingly whereby the conclusion remains that the public house is unviable as a result of recessionary trends for wet led public houses and the lack of food on offer. In addition the update of the facilities and any associated extension requirements to allow the opportunity to provide food facilities would require substantial investment without confidence in its success.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 08 (Pages 57-74) – CB/17/00293/FULL – Land at 118B High Street, Clophill, Bedford, MK45 4BJ.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

1. Letter received from no. 114 raising the following comments:
 - The development should now be refused as the Council has a current 5 year land supply
 - If not refused, reduced the number of dwellings four so that they are all within the settlement envelope?
 - Limit the height to 1½ storey as per the existing dwelling;
 - If allowed as proposed, will lead to encroachment into the existing countryside;
 - If the application is approved, then consideration should be given to widening the PROW path adjoining the site to provide better access to the lakes and castle mounds;
2. Supporting documentation received for planning objection from no. 114b High Street; this is attached as Appendix 1.

Additional/Amended Comments

Insert 'Reason for Recommendation' at the beginning of the report.

The proposed development would conflict with Policy DM4 because part of the site is outside of the Clophill Settlement Envelope, within the open countryside. However, as the Council can demonstrate a 5 year land supply, appropriate weight can be attributed to Policy DM4. However assessed against the three strands of sustainable development described in the National Planning Policy Framework, the scheme would be a sustainable form of development.

Five Year Land Supply

The officer's report should be updated as follows following the Council's recent 'Five Year Land Supply Statement' release (see below)

Amend paragraph 1.2 to read:

In line with the core principles contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), there is a requirement for planning authorities to '*proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs.*' Paragraph 49 states, '*Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development*'.

Amend paragraph 1.3 to read:

As of April 2017, the Council's position on the 5 year land supply has changed and we can now demonstrate a 5.88 years supply of deliverable housing. As such, the Council has realigned the weight it is able to give to policies relating to the supply of housing (including settlement envelopes).

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 09 (Pages 75-82) – CB/17/01397/FULL – 25 Dunstable Road, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5DB.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Houghton Regis Town Council – Comments: Object. Members did not feel that the changes made to the plans would resolve the light issue to the neighbour's property, which was why the previous application was refused by CBC.

23 Dunstable Road, Houghton Regis –

'All the same objections as stated in the last two rejected applications for this property. I have been informed these plans have now been given government approval. This, in my opinion, has been granted by deception. Mainly: - Distances between neighbouring properties is incorrect. No mention in the plans regarding the removal or modification of the shared chimney. Photographs are misleading. Right to light law infringement of neighbouring properties not mentioned. Objections to plans not mentioned. There are many more misleading remarks in the plan schedule. I have been advised by my solicitor that IF these plans were approved they could immediately issue high court injunction (article 4 planning derivative) to have the building works stopped (or pulled-down if ignored) along the boarder of 23 & 25 Dunstable Road, because the Right to Light Law (which has been proven my property is covered by) would be broken. I am also in the process of having a restraining order served on the owners of 25 Dunstable Road by my solicitors because of the continuous damage caused to my property and, because of the owners aggressive and intimidating behaviour recently. This will prevent the owners or anyone associated with them from entering or damaging my property. Please note, I have requested the local Ward Councillor have this application referred to a committee for a final decision.'

Additional Comments

The neighbour's comments have been noted and addressed within the report. It should be noted that the part of the proposal that the neighbour has objected to has been granted a Certificate of Lawfulness following the two refusals. The comments relating to 'Right to Light' and Party Wall Act are outside of the planning remit. For clarity, behavioural issues between the applicant and the neighbour are considered civil matters and not material planning considerations. As is any subsequent damage which may or may not be caused between the two properties.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 10 (Pages 83-98) – CB/17/01030/REG3 – Priory House, Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford, SG17 5TQ.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Campton and Chicksands Parish Council has issued the following response:

Campton and Chicksands Parish council have considered the above application and have no objection although they do request that the minimal number of trees and hedges are removed in the process. They are also interested to know whether the Council run a car share scheme and whether they would consider subsidising some bus routes to Priory House?