

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – Date 13/09/2017

Item 6 (Pages 17 - 256) – CB/16/01389/FULL – Land off A5 at Checkley Wood Farm, Watling Street, Hockliffe

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Four additional letters of support received from 24 & 41 Timber Lane, Woburn; 24 Stoke Road, Linslade and 27 Albany Road, Leighton Buzzard.

Bedfordshire Gardens Trust

At Appendix A is an objection from the Bedfordshire Gardens Trust, responding on behalf of the Gardens Trust.

It is noted that the Bedfordshire Gardens Trust concur with Historic England that the impact on the significance of Woburn Park would be low-moderate and that the impact on Battlesden Church would be less than substantial, albeit at the higher end of the scale.

The Bedfordshire Gardens Trust also states that there would be a similar level of harm to the significance of Battlesden Park in general.

It is noted that the conclusion of the letter indicates that any harm to these heritage assets should be exceptional (wholly exceptional in the case of Grade I Listed heritage assets). However, this is not the correct policy test as set out in the NPPF. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that any harm should require clear and convincing justification, but it is only substantial harm which should be exceptional or wholly exceptional. None of the specialist heritage consultees has stated that the proposal would have substantial harm to any heritage asset.

It is considered that the conclusions set out in Section 5 of the report still apply.

Richard Buxton Environmental & Public Law

At Appendix B is a letter from Richard Buxton Environmental & Public Law writing on behalf of the Bedford Estates.

Counsel's advice has been sought on the content of the letter.

In respect of the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment, Counsel has advised that she does not think that the corrected Screening Opinion would be upheld as an unlawful approach. She has noted that the 2017 EIA regulations were not in force at the time the Screening Opinion was released and are therefore not pertinent to this matter.

In reference to Green Belt Considerations, it appears likely that the letter from Mr Buxton is in response to the previous iteration of the committee report, as it refers to a paragraph number that no longer exists in the current report and also raises issues which existed in the previous iteration of the report but have now been addressed within the updated version of the report.

In particular, the report now balances “any other harm” as well as inappropriateness of development in the Green Belt when considering whether very special circumstances exist.

The report also explains more clearly within the planning balance why it is considered that very special circumstances exist in this case.

Counsel has confirmed that whether or not very special circumstances exist is a matter of planning judgement for the decision maker. Matters of planning judgement cannot be questioned in law, unless decisions are irrational. She does not consider that the conclusions within the report are irrational.

Counsel considers that the updated report is written in such a way that, should the Committee approve the application, the Council ought to be able to resist a challenge to the decision in a Judicial Review scenario.

Savills

Attached at Appendix C is another letter from Savills. This draws the attention of Committee Members to the concerns of the Landscape Officer and considers further the Council’s Wind Turbine Guidance Note.

The Landscape Officer did raise concerns in regards to the development, but did not object to the proposal. The conclusion of the Landscape Officer was that if the proposal were to be progressed, it should be identical in design to the existing Double Arches turbine and have similar nacelle / blades height so that the two turbines should read as a single cluster. The proposal is for a turbine which would be identical in design to the Double Arches turbine and would have similar nacelle / blades height.

Section 4 of the report addresses Officer’s interpretation of the Wind Turbine Guidance Note. It acknowledges that it may be appropriate to consider that the proposal represents a cluster, as the proposed single turbine would be clustered with the existing Double Arches turbine, but then points out that the proposal would not represent more than one development within the landscape character area as the other part of the cluster would be the existing turbine at Double Arches. The cluster would therefore not compete with Double Arches, but include it. Section 4 of the report includes assessments of a cluster of turbines against the criteria set out within the guidance note.

SCWT

An additional letter has been received from the SCWT campaign, which is attached at Appendix D.

In response to this letter, the points raised are predominantly covered within the Officer's report at Section 7.

In response to point 1 of the letter, it is noted that it was Planning Officers and the Development Management Committee who considered that removing the Excessive Amplitude Modulation condition was a reasonable decision at the time, on the basis of government policy and several contemporaneous Appeal decisions.

In response to point 2 of the letter, it is noted that MAS Environmental clearly state in their response to the planning application on page 77 of the report that the conditions agreed (and recommended to be imposed) addressed their concerns in respect of amplitude modulation. This is why Officer's consider that the proposed condition would adequately protect neighbouring residents from unacceptable levels of noise pollution.

In response to point 3, the Council legally cannot impose, as part of this application, a condition on a wind turbine that does not form part of this application and is not located within the red line of the application site. As is noted in paragraph 7.14, any reports of EAM in the area would be sufficient to trigger investigation under the recommended condition for this wind turbine. It is noted that neither MAS nor the Council's Environmental Health Officer has outstanding concerns in respect of EAM.

Additional Comments

Additional information was submitted to the Enforcement Team to support a noise complaint for the existing wind turbine at Double Arches in relation to properties at Overend. The Enforcement Team will proceed with an investigation in accordance with the measures set out within the planning conditions which control the Double Arches turbine.

Item 7 (Pages 257 - 272) – CB/17/01236/OUT – Land at Sorrell Way, Biggleswade

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None

Item 8 (Pages 273 - 296) – CB/17/01277/OUT – Land at Saxon Drive, Biggleswade

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Change to description of application from 'up to 230 dwellings' to 'up to 200 dwellings'

The change in description also means a pro-rata reduction in the amount of s106 contribution for education and leisure will be required.

The change in description also means that the percentage of affordable housing provided when shared with the Sorrell Way scheme will increase to up to 46%.

Amendment to Condition 9, so that it reads:

No dwellings shall be occupied until a timetable for the implementation of the scheme has been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Amendment to Condition 10, so that it reads:

No dwellings shall be occupied until a timetable for the implementation of the Enhancement Scheme has been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Additional comment from Town Council regarding potential covenant on the land – Covenants on land are not material planning considerations, and there is no covenant on the land that the Planning Department is aware of.

Comments from Highways Officer below:-

No objection.

The access road off the roundabout is shown at 7.3m in width with 2m wide footways on both sides. This would lead to an increase in traffic on a route that dissects the leisure route and so it would be appropriate for a zebra crossing which can accommodate cyclists as well as pedestrians under new TSRDG (Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions) provisions.

The Transport Assessment has looked at the following junctions in terms of operating capacity and accident data,

Saxon Drive/Foxglove Drive – Saxon Drive, Site Access Roundabout
Saxon Drive/Foxglove Drive/Dunton Lane, Roundabout
Saxon Way/Sorrel Way/Baden Powell Way, Roundabout
Chambers Way/A6001 London Road, Priority Junction

All the junctions are below the capacity level RFC (Ratio to Flow Capacity) of 0.85 with the exception of Chambers Way/London Road which will already be above its theoretical

maximum of 1.09 in 2026 (do nothing scenario) with the worst case being 1.16 (do something scenario) which is not considered severe in-line with NPPF guidance.

A crossing for pedestrians and cyclists to the Saxon Centre is proposed and it is recommended that a signalised TOUCAN crossing is provided on Saxon Drive to aid crossing in the location of where the Public Right of Way is located which is about 65m south of Saxon Way/Sorrel Way/Baden Powell Way Roundabout.

The following planning conditions will be required:-

Conditions

1/No building shall be occupied until the junction of the proposed vehicular access (altered roundabout) with the highway 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.

2/Visibility splays shall be provided at the junction of the access with the public highway before the development is brought into use. The minimum dimensions to provide the required splay lines shall be 2.4m measured along the centre line of the proposed access from its junction with the channel of the public highway and 43m measured from the centre line of the proposed access along the line of the channel of the public highway. The required vision splays shall for the perpetuity of the development remain free of any obstruction to visibility.

Reason

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

3/Visibility splays shall be provided at all internal road junctions within the site. The minimum dimensions to provide the required splay lines shall be 2.4m measured along the centre line of the side road from its junction with the channel to the through road and 25m measured from the centre line of the side road along the channel of the through road. The vision splays required shall be provided and defined on the site by or on behalf of the developers and be entirely free of any obstruction.

Reason

To provide adequate visibility at road junction in the interest of road safety.

4/The development shall be served by means of roads and footpaths which shall be laid out and drained in accordance with the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide September 2014 or other such documents that replace them, and no building shall be occupied until the roads and footpaths which provide access to it from the existing highway have been laid out and constructed in accordance with the above-mentioned Guidance.

Reason

In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the proposed estate road.

5/The detailed layout plans to be submitted for approval of reserved matters in connection with this development shall illustrate an independent vehicular turning head areas for an 11.5m refuse collection vehicle. Car and cycle parking shall also be provided in accordance with the relevant parking standards at the time of the submitted reserved matters.

Reason

To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn outside the highway limits thereby avoiding the reversing of vehicles on to the highway and parking to meet the needs of occupiers of the proposed development in the interests of encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport.

6/The detailed layout plans to be submitted for approval of reserved matters in connection with this development shall include car and cycle parking in accordance with Central Bedfordshire Design Guide September 2014 or other such documents that replace them has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented and made available for use before the development is occupied and the car and cycle parking areas shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

Reason

To ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide September 2014.

7/No dwelling shall be occupied until a zebra crossing in the near vicinity of the development entrance (roundabout eastern arm) has been provided in accordance with details of a scheme to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Any Statutory Undertakers equipment or street furniture shall be resited to provide an unobstructed footway to the crossing.

Reason

In the interests of road safety and pedestrian movement.

8/No dwelling shall be occupied until a TOUCAN crossing, south of the Saxon Way/Sorrel Way/Baden Powell Way Roundabout),has been provided in accordance with details of a scheme to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Any Statutory Undertakers equipment or street furniture shall be resited to provide an unobstructed footway to the crossing.

Reason

In the interests of road safety and pedestrian movement.

Clarification of financial contribution request from Leisure Services below:-

The wording for the S106 legal agreement will need to reflect more general refurbishment works instead of just the wet side changing rooms. Therefore, please can it state that the contribution is to be used for "refurbishment works at Saxon Pool Leisure Centre". The amount sought remains the same at £193,231.00.

Additional condition requested by Archaeological Officer set out below:-

"No development shall take place within each phase of the development until a written scheme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The said development shall only be implemented in full accordance with the approved scheme of archaeological resource investigation. This written scheme will include the following components, completion of each of which will trigger the phased discharging of the condition:

(i) A method statement for the investigation and recording of any archaeological remains present;

(ii) A post-excavation assessment and updated project design (to be submitted within six months of the completion of fieldwork at (i), unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing by the Local Planning Authority);

(iii) Completion of post-excavation analysis, preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store approved by the Local Planning Authority, completion of an archive report, and submission of a publication report (to be completed within two years of the completion of fieldwork at (i), unless otherwise agreed in advance in writing by the Planning Authority);

(iv) A Programme of interpretation, public outreach and community engagement."

Reason: To record and advance understanding of the archaeological resource which will be unavoidably destroyed as a consequence of the development in accordance with Chapter 12 of the *National Planning Policy Framework*. This condition is pre-commencement as a failure to secure appropriate archaeological investigation in advance of development would be contrary to paragraph 141 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* that requires the recording and advancement of understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part).

Item 9 (Pages 297 - 325) – CB/17/02682/REG3 – Kennel Farm, Saxon Drive, Biggleswade

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Additional comments received from the Council's Archaeologist raising no objection subject to a condition which is drafted below.

Landscape Officer

The proposals are well considered and will help to integrate the numerous buildings and units, eg from views from Dunton Lane.

There is some concern regarding potential views from the west.

The species selection is acceptable but it would be preferable to include a wider range of native shrubs eg to include dogwood. Wild cherry would also be an addition to the tree stock proposed and the use of orchard trees should also be considered.

Native shrubbery should be used to underplant the grouped trees proposed for the southern boundary, to increase the screening value and to benefit the habitat.

Consideration should also be given to establishing mixed native hedgrows rather than just hornbeam.

A Management Plan will be required to aid the longterm care of the trees, shrubs and wildflower grassland.

A detailed planting specification is also required - this needs to detail the proportions of shrubs used in the mix; eg an equal mix of species is not ideal. Blackthorn is invasive and should be planted at a lower rate. A reduced planting density for the native shrubbery is required - 3/m will lead to management issues in the future.

Green Infrastructure Coordinator

The application site is near the route of the Biggleswade Green Wheel network; a spur of the Biggleswade Green Wheel follows the route of the footpath to the south of Kennel Farm.

The Parish GI plan identifies the aspiration to upgrade this to a bridleway / cycleway. Opportunities to deliver this enhancement should be sought through the development if appropriate.

In terms of the site's wider context, there is a good RoW network around the site, and woodland belts planted to the south and east. The development should complement these through further woodland belt planting / landscape screening.

Additional Comments

Clarification on need.

The proposal for Travelling Showpeople plots is distinctly different to that of Gypsy and Traveller pitches. Therefore Para 1.6 does not reflect a need for travelling showpeople plots, rather, as it states, gypsy and traveller pitches. The GTAA identifies a need for up to 31 Travelling Showpeople plots in Central Bedfordshire over the period 2015 - 2035, and therefore the development of this site would assist in meeting this need.

In respect of comments from the Landscape Officer the views from the west will show the site in the context of its surroundings however this is to be considered against existing views from this location which go through the site to the commercial and agricultural buildings to the east. The impact will change but it is not considered to do so to a detrimental extent.

In respect of comments from the GI Coordinator the scale of development proposed is such that a contribution towards identified GI projects would not be considered reasonable or necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms in this instance

Additional Conditions

No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation; that includes provision for post excavation analysis and publication, has

been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby approved shall only be implemented in full accordance with the approved archaeological scheme.

Reason: To protect *in situ* or record and advance understanding of the heritage assets with archaeological interest which will be unavoidably affected as a consequence of the development. This condition is pre-commencement as a failure to secure appropriate archaeological investigation in advance of development would be contrary to paragraph 141 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) that requires developers to record and advance of understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) as a consequence of the development.

No works to show equipment or machinery and no operation of machinery shall take place on the plots hereby approved before 7:00 am on weekdays and 8:00 am on Saturdays nor after 19:00 pm on weekdays and 17:00 pm on Saturdays, Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity which the occupiers of neighbouring properties might reasonably expect to enjoy.
(Section 7, NPPF)

Item 10 (Pages 325 - 368) - CB/15/01657/OUT – Samuel Whitbread Community College, Clifton, SG17 5QS

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Cllr Liddiard

I would of liked to of had the opportunity to address you in person at DMC on Wednesday but due to work commitments I am unable to make the meeting hence this email arriving to you before you carry out your site inspections tomorrow. As a ward member for Shefford for the last 5 months, traffic congestion and parking are a major concern for residents. Over 3500 children a day go to school in Shefford and Clifton and it at these times that severe congestion occurs despite the best efforts of the schools to educate parents and their pupils.

We all have a 'Place Making' responsibility to ensure that Central Bedfordshire is a great place to live and work and that proposals presented to the Council, wherever possible should significantly outweigh the impact caused. There is always a balance to strike between residents living close to schools and the fact that we want the best outcomes for children in Central Bedfordshire through our schools.

I have set out below my reasons below as to why DMC should debate this proposal afresh, to ensure that you are comfortable that the applicant has exhausted all avenues to prove that the proposal is the best that can be achieved and strike that fine balance. There might be alternative options.

Members also need to be aware of the following:

- I have 3 children attending all 3 tiers of schools in the town.
- Mark Liddiard is employed by The Football Association as a National Project Manager. The Football Association has commented upon this application to Sport England as part of its MOU Planning Agreement.
- Mark Liddiard is a director appointed Governor to the Local Governing Body of Robert Bloomfield Academy by BEST Directors but does not act as a BEST Director.
- Mark Liddiard is a Director at Shefford Sports Club, the club would receive investment into its facilities if the proposal is granted.

Clifton Parish Council

Clifton Parish Councillors have the often stated concerns with regard the lack of infrastructure particularly in Education with regard the introduction of so many more houses into this area.

However a particular concern of Clifton Parish Council with regard this site/ application is that it fails to link access with the adjoining proposed site of 64 dwellings and address safety issues.

At present Clifton and Shefford suffer from over 20 buses arriving and departing through the centre of our respective village / town taking children to and from SWCC. This presents a physical risk to other road users and pedestrians, as well as negatively impacting our quality of life as these aging vehicles emit high levels of noxious fumes.

An earlier proposal was for these vehicles to use the 64 house /SWCC development access road to enter / leave the school thus gaining close access to the bypass etc. This proposal was rejected by CBC due to the nature of the T junction onto Hitchin Road.

This latest application however shows no sign of the demolition of 99 Hitchin Lane and the proposed road to replace it, despite clearly showing the proposed properties. The new proposal access is via a large roundabout.

Clearly the issue of two separate access roads in such close proximity needs to be addressed whilst at this early planning stage, and the safest practical solution found that meets the needs of Transport to and from SWCC and the 64 homes as well as the needs of these 80 or so homes.

We believe that no further permissions should be given on either application until this Safety issue is addressed by CBC and the developers. I understand that there is a lack of cooperation between these developers but this should be overcome in the interests of all concerned, not least the Parishioners of Clifton, Shefford, SWCC pupils and of course the new residents.

Additional Comments

The comments from Clifton Parish Council relate to this site but also a site immediately south of this one which is currently subject to an outline application to be developed to provide 80 dwellings. In respect of the merits of this application the access from Hitchin Road is not considered to be technically safe for busses to manoeuvre into and out of the site. In respect of the adjacent site this will be considered separately under that application.

Additional Conditions

None

Item 11 (Pages 369 - 396) - CB/17/00358/RM - Land east of Hitchin Road and south of the Former Pig Testing Unit, Hitchin Road, Stotfold

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None

Additional Comments

None

Additional Conditions

None

Item 12 (Pages 397 - 410) - CB/17/02023/OUT - Land adj. to Haynes Turn, South of High Road, Haynes, MK45 3PA

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Additional comments from Haynes Parish Council – comments repeated verbatim

Dear Colleagues on the Parish Council,

1.0 I have read the *Highway Network Impact Assessment* statement completed by Open Road Associates (ORA) in regards to the proposed development of Haynes Turn on behalf of the developer LSF Properties.

1.1 I make these initial observations.

1.2 NB: There are currently 4 large detached houses at the site, and this new application proposes to add a further 5 detached houses, consisting of 2 bungalows and 3 detached dwelling houses.

1.3 At paragraph 1.5 of the ORA statement, it is intended that '*no proposed alterations to the existing access, which connects Haynes Turn to the A600*' is needed. The rationale provided is '*vehicular movements in and out of the site are currently low (estimated average of 7 vehicular movements per 'average' dwelling per day) and it is not foreseen that the addition of five new dwellings would result in an unacceptable increase to the number of vehicles looking to access and egress the site*'. I would like to know the source of the figure given by ORA in regards to the average number of vehicular movements per average house. Is this an accepted and verifiable figure within Highway legislation? As I say it is not sourced so I cannot accept this on face value. I have conducted some crude research and found in England there is one car for every two persons – *source Ministry of Transport 2015* – and so it is reason to believe the number of vehicular movements at this proposed site will be considerably higher than led to believe. For example, if each household had 2 cars with 4 cars movements each day, then for 9 houses there would be 72 vehicular movements. On the other hand, if each household had 5 cars with 4 cars movements each day, then for 9 houses there would be 180 vehicular movements. These numbers can be moved around, but the purpose of these theoretical calculations is to highlight the high number of vehicle movements, which will undoubtedly occur.

1.4 At paragraph 1.6 of the ORA statement, it is suggested '*any increase in vehicle movements to and from the site will be accommodated without detriment to highway safety*'. Of course, this opinion is based on the number of vehicular movements ORA have proposed, which others might believe to be conservative. I would add to this that ORA have not made any reference to amount of vehicles which will visit the site e.g. friends/family, postal and Internet deliveries. In regards to Internet purchases, which are a preferred option for a considerable amount of people, large vans, and heavy goods vehicles of course complete such deliveries. Such large numbers of vehicular movements and size of such vehicles, which require large turning arcs, bring into question road safety at this site.

1.5 At paragraph 1.7 of the ORA statement, it is suggested '*the existing access is a suitable width to accommodate two-way vehicle flow*'. As I understand it, it is LSF's intent to continue to have the site and associated roads, un-adopted by the Local Authority. The existing site is a small cul-de-sac serving 4 detached dwellings, this new application proposes to extend this to 9 dwellings and as such I have significant concerns there will be a build up of traffic on an unregulated private road, which will affect vehicles on the A600 trunk road. Consequently, I believe such congestion without regulation will cause an accident involving residents as well as road users from the wider community.

1.6 At paragraph 2.2, it is clear from the ORA statement, that the visibility splays for this site **does not** confirm to the legal/advisory requirements as spelt out in the *Specification for Highways Works Volume 6, Section 2, Part 7 TD 41/95*. On this point, ORA are proposing for others to merely accept their assertion such speeds of 60mph cannot be achieved, and so everything will be all right. No survey, and no evidence have been provided by ORA as to the volume and/or speed of vehicular movements, and so I do believe their declaration can be accepted. NB: It is my intention to conduct my own survey and provide my findings to the Parish Council and Local Authority Highways.

1.7 At paragraph 3.2 and 3.4, the ORA statement indicates the visibility splays are controlled by the developer and the Local Authority, then explains this could be improved by '*clearing back some of the existing vegetation*'. Is the developer making arrangements for this to be

agreed upon, not only for the proposed development but continued management of the site for proceeding years?

1.8 On the 6th of July 2017, between 7am and 8am Parish Councillor James and myself conducted a traffic survey at the T-junction of Silver End Road/Haynes Turn/A600 High Road. At the junction, the A600 is subject to a 60mph speed limit; whilst Silver End Road is restricted to 30mph. Currently, the cul-de-sac known, as Haynes Turn is unregulated and so consequently it has no street furniture, no street lighting or road markings relevant to the highway. The A600 is a single carriageway with one lane in each direction – the northbound carriageway conveys traffic to Bedford and the southbound carriageway to Shefford. The A600 is subject to a 'no stopping' regulation and there is a bus layby on the east and west side of the carriageway on top of the junction. The road surface particularly on the A600 is in a poor state of repair, and the road markings are barely visible, presenting a danger to all road users. The street furniture is adequate for the junction in its current form. The junction is liable to flood in times of heavy downpours due to poor drainage in the village. Anglian Water, who often manages this hazard, will confirm this point. The visibility splays at Silver End Road and the Haynes Turn cul-de-sac contradict each other due to their close proximity. They both lay on the west side of the main road meaning drivers using the A600 are confused as to which exit other drivers are to take when indicating to leave the carriageway. Also, as the splays are so close, there is often a 'stand-off' between drivers who wish to enter the A600 at the same time. This creates confusion and a danger to all road users.

1.9 During the hour survey, a total of 1,133 motor vehicles passed through the junction. Of these, 115 motor vehicles either exited or entered Silver End Road onto or from the A600 trunk road. The types of vehicle were predominantly cars but a total of 112 vans, 13 buses, and 19 heavy goods vehicles were recorded. Frequently, drivers entering the A600 from the give-way markings in Silver End Road caused other road users to brake. This was partly caused by the volume of traffic on the A600, which caused a build up of vehicles on the side road. Drivers wishing to enter the main carriageway would become impatient opting *not* to 'give way' but instead take the best opportunity to enter the A600 when clearly it was unsafe to do so. With the advent of more housing on the main highway this situation would become quite complex and dangerous for all road users.

2.0 Lastly, this parish council commissioned a traffic survey in 2011 in regards to speeding at Deadman's Cross/A600. It should be noted Deadman's Cross is less than half a mile from Haynes Turn, and on the same section of the A600. I have included the data provided by the commissioned authority for your perusal. If I can direct your attention to the 'cumulative' data: on an average week day approximately 9,500 motor vehicles used this section of the A600 of which 1100 exceeded the speed limit at a recorded speed of 46mph or more. This of course prompted the introduction of a permanent speed camera at Deadman's Cross to enforce the 40mph speed limit, which exists there. This is a very clear indication that this application has not properly considered the dangers of introducing an unregulated road directly onto an exceedingly busy trunk road and T-junction, which connects our county town to Mid-Bedfordshire, and the A1 Motorway.

2.1 I submit this report for your consideration.

Steve Collin, Parish Councillor for Haynes dated the 6th of July 2017.

Item 13 (Pages 411 - 438) - CB/17/03294/FULL – Henlow Middle School, Church Road, Henlow, SG16 6AN

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

2 neighbours letters received from Nos 25 and 67 Groveside – concerned about highway and pedestrian safety impact, suggest road improvements.

Comments from CBC Senior Engineer - No objection or comment on this application and are happy for Building Control to manage the surface water drainage details through their application and inspection process.

Additional Comments

Applicant has submitted a response to the Council's Overview & Scrutiny Committee (list of 16 recommendations) – see attached.

Additional comments from agent regarding condition 7 below -

Additional comments from Highways Officer below –

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Agent comments: Unfortunately, this would actually make the scheme untenable, as the modular unit needs to be used as classroom space by the Academy right up until the point that the new sports hall and classroom block is completed and ready for occupation. Ideally, Condition no 7 would be omitted from any resulting planning permission.

To allow a transition period for the school to move over to the proposed new classrooms it is suggested condition 7 be amended as follows:

The existing modular unit shown omitted on drg no 453.101 Rev A (proposed block plan) shall be demolished and all resultant detritus completely removed from the site within 6 months of the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and for the avoidance of doubt in accordance with policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009) and Section 7, NPPF.

Highway Officer:

Suggest delete Conditions 9 and 10 and replace with the following:

Prior to the development being brought into use measures to improve pedestrian safety will be implemented in the vicinity of the school, these measures to include but not limited to:

- A footway on the south side of Groveside and adjacent to the bowling green, from the Henlow Pavillion car park, to a drop kerb crossing point linking to the existing footway.
- Improved pedestrian facilities linking the Boyd Activity centre to the footway on the south side of Church Road. Pedestrian facilities to include but not limited to additional footways and enhanced crossing facilities.
- Enhanced crossing point at the junction of Groveside and Church Road.

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

(Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009))

Also please remove the informative relating to the s278 works and Streetworks – first 2 bullet points at no.8

Committee report error

There is an error in the report relating to 'Reason for committee to determine'. This should read as follows:

REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE

Called in by Cllr Wenham

Highways safety grounds - Transport assessment and travel plan inadequate. No consideration of Executive adopted policy from OSC on travel improvements when schools are extended including 20mph zones, completion of safer route to school along Church Rd.

Parking - Transport assessment and travel plan inadequate. Parking considers only incremental impact and should be rebased on current policy (for all staff)

Other - High concern by residents in Groveside about parking and safety at school arrival and pick-up times. 60 signature petition presented to Henlow PC in June 2017.