

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 20 JUNE 2018

Item 6 – CB/18/00192/OUT – Clifton Farm, Church Street, Clifton, Shefford, SG17 5EX

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

The Housing Development Officer has provided clarity on the initial comments as follows:-

The cluster of 7 affordable dwellings is acceptable as they adjoin an existing established affordable development. The cluster of 7 affordable dwellings falls below the maximum cluster sizes outlined within the submitted draft local plan and, from a management perspective would also be acceptable.

The proposed mix of 3 x 2 bed houses and 4 x 3 bed affordable houses follows the identified needs from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) whereby the SHMA identifies the main affordable housing requirement as two and three bed dwellings.

Additional Comments

For the reasons outlined above and, as set out in the Officer Committee Report, the arrangement of separate parcels for open market and affordable units is acceptable and the mix of affordable housing is also acceptable.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

One additional third party representation has been received which criticises the findings of the Ecological Survey and considers that there will be harmful impact on small mammals within the site and, loss of habitat for other animals and insects. The Council can demonstrate a five year supply of housing and the development would be detrimental to the site and surroundings.

Additional Comments

No objections are raised by the Ecology Officer in respect of the impact on protected species and a planning condition is included within the Officer Committee Report relating to an ecological design strategy. Planning considerations relating to five year supply matters and the impact on the site and surroundings are also included within the Officer Committee Report.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Members have been provided with a white covered document entitled 'Supporting material – objecting speaker'. The document provides images and photographs of the site and immediate surroundings. The document provides several considerations including traffic impacts; impact on the character of the site and surroundings; neighbour amenity impact; impact upon wildlife.

Additional Comments

The comments made are considered in the Officer Committee Report.

Additional Comments

Members should note that the majority of the application site – i.e. the location of the proposed dwellings are outside (but adjacent to) the Clifton Conservation Area. Only the access road serving the 7 open market dwellings is within that Conservation Area.

Item 7 – CB/18/00432/OUT – Land off St Andrews Way, Langford

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

MANOP have provided additional clarification in response to the application, stating that not less than four of the proposed dwellings should be of a design and layout that makes them suitable for older people, in accordance with the MANOP standards.

Additional Comments

(a) As this application is for outline planning permission, with only access detailed, it is considered that MANOPs comments are not specifically relevant to this application. If this application is approved, then details of the layout and scale would be required, which would consider this matter in greater detail.

(b) Paragraph 4.3 of the report states that “8 car parking spaces should be provided for the proposed development”. This sentence is incorrect and should read:

*“The adopted Design Guide identifies that 8 **visitor** car parking spaces should be provided for the proposed development”*

Additional/Amended Conditions

No additional/amended conditions.

Item 8 – CB/18/00464/FULL – The White Hart Hotel, Northbridge Street, Shefford, SG17 5DH

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

An additional response has been received in relation to this application. This response is by a resident who has already objected to the application. No further planning matters have been raised as part of this additional response.

Additional Comments

No additional comments.

Additional/Amended Conditions

No additional/amended conditions.

Item 9 – CB/18/00643/OUT – Land East of 7 Biggleswade Road, Dunton, Biggleswade, SG18 8RL

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

No additional responses.

Additional Comments

Delegated Authority is requested for the Assistant Director Development Infrastructure to approve the application at the expiry of the consultation period (22 June 2018) subject to no new material planning considerations being raised which have not been addressed in this report.

Additional/Amended Conditions

No additional/amended conditions.

Item 10 – CB/18/01537/FULL – The White House, High Street, Eggington, Leighton Buzzard, LU7 9PQ

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

1 additional objection received

'I object to the fence which has already been constructed without planning consent on both safety and visual grounds. The fence is over 2 metres in height on the roadside in a conservation area and with concrete pillars and a concrete base it is ugly and will not mellow with time. The fence also blocks the view and sound of traffic exiting the premises for anyone using the pavement, I had a near miss with an ambulance which was leaving the property at speed. As the fence appears to have been erected on the boundary line according to land registry plan the proposal to grow a yew hedge on the outside of the fence is a nonsense as it would not be on land belonging to the property and would also obstruct the pavement. The property has extensive gardens at the back which could more easily be secured for use of residents as has apparently been done with another Janes property Brookfield near Huntingdon which Janes refer to in their application as rated outstanding by the CQC.

The other village fences which Janes refer to in their application are much lower in height, more sympathetic in appearance and dont pose a risk to foot traffic.'

Additional Comments

The comments made in relation to the yew hedge on highway can be addressed by the Highways Officer, in that they can apply for a licence to cultivate or request to stop up the land.

Delegated Authority is requested for the Assistant Director Development Infrastructure to approve the application at the expiry of the consultation period on 26th June subject to no new material planning considerations being raised which have not been addressed in the report.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 11 – CB/17/05974/RM – Land at East Lodge off Elliot Way, Fairfield, SG5 4AA

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None.

Additional Comments

None.

Additional/Amended Conditions

None.

Item 12 – The Proposed Extinguishment of Part of Toddington Footpath No. 58 and the Concurrent Creation of a Replacement Section of Toddington Bridleway No. 58.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Ramblers' response – "...Clearly The Ramblers do support the proposal..."

Steve Lakin's CBC cycling response – (awaiting response)

Cycling UK's response – consulted but no response received.

The Open Spaces Society's response – consulted but no response received.

Recent submissions from local Residents:

[N.b. third party names have been removed]

Mr Jon Holmes - (awaiting formal submission but he currently intends to speak at the meeting)

Mr Archie McIntosh - Thanks for the response Adam, I will get back to you formally later in the week.

I will say I think you are underestimating how the street feel about your proposal for a bridal-way. I have spoken to a few of the neighbours over the weekend and no one is in favour. However everyone would support a new improved DDA compliant footpath.

Adam, can I ask what's the statutory notification period you must give to us for this proposal. Late pm on the 7th until the 19th June seems a bit short to me? Have all the neighbours backing onto the field been notified? Your proposal will impact all the households backing onto the field as well as the 4 households on crowbush farm.

Where do we send our objections?

e-mail received Sunday 17th June

Further to the below comments I have only learnt this afternoon, Sunday 17th, that three people directly affected by your proposal living in Bradford Road have not had sight of your full proposal document. One only returned home from holiday yesterday and two ladies without computer knowledge *[who reside in Bradford Road]*. I don't know how they are supposed to make comments on something they have not been privy to. I must respectfully request therefore that you postpone the Committee hearing until you have posted them the full report so they can study what you are proposing and make any comments. One weeks' notice was a bit tight anyway. Also please can you forward me your, manager/superior's name and contact details.

On CC the residents (plus the PC) I have spoken to about your proposal. We are all in agreement this potentially could have a detrimental effect on our right to have a quiet and peaceful life. If this makes the next step to planning we will be objecting and I am in no doubt given the current situation with travellers, a proposal to open a road into a field will become a village wide issue. You should have written to all the residents of Bradford Road and Kimberwell Close, not just the handful of householders who have the path crossing their gardens.

I also represent *[another resident who]* only received notification in the post Monday 11th June which in my opinion, does not give her adequate time to make a hand written objection. This whole process has been rushed, is this a tactic to reduce the number of objections? What is the statutory notice period that should be allowed?

1. No want or need for this bridleway has been demonstrated. In your document, points 20 and 46, you have said the Parish Council identified the need for this in the Neighbourhood Plan. This simply is not true, no Neighbourhood Plan has been published, and I'm not even sure it has been submitted for approval yet? You also state, point 47, that the Parish council support this proposal. Can you provide some supporting evidence of this please.

2. Other than ticking a box and cleaning up an anomaly on a footpath map, that has been there for 60 years, what does this achieve? 300m of bridleway that goes absolutely nowhere. Linking a fast main road at one end with a housing estate at the other. Plenty of footpaths in the immediate area but no other bridleways. Can we suggest downgrading the existing bridleway to a footpath, then it will all match and your box will be ticked.

3. There is already perfectly adequate vehicle access for maintenance via Crow Bush Farm, via a locked gate with steel bollards.

4 You are proposing to re- use the existing bollards in Kimberwell Close. These are in no way fit for purpose (jpg attached), I could effortlessly push these 1960's posts over. Also attached are jpgs of the measures they have taken to stop travellers at Junction 11a. As you can see they didn't work? Toddington is under siege from travellers. Did you see the national press and TV news articles about what happened on our Junction 12. After the last visit we had on the Glebe, 100m from your proposal, it was deemed necessary to install the grass mounds on the field to deter travellers and now you want to open it up again. Please take a minute to read this newspaper article. This is on our doorstep.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-5808315/Fly-tipping-travellers-clogged-M1-underpass-tons-rubbish-just-half-mile-away.html>

5. In the report you have sugar coated my concerns over motorbikes, they are not "sporadic". It was nearly everyday last summer and we are not yet in the school holidays this year. This is well documented with reports from several residents to the Police and the PC.

6. I take it you have had official quotes for the ground works, the £2,000 budget that has been allowed seems rather low to me, can I ask what you hope to achieve? I am guessing nothing that is fit for purpose.

7. How can you take peoples gardens from them after over 60 years. Legally you can, but morally it's disgusting. You have given people sleepless nights and tears all for what?

However if you were to propose an improved footpath with DDA compliant gate that falls outside the garden boundaries and the downgrading of the existing bridleway to a footpath, this would be something we would all support.

Mr. David Knight - e-mail received Sunday 17th June

Please forward to the Committee.

I am somewhat confused by your comments in para 4. "Walkers have then tended to wander at will across the parish council's recreation ground rather than follow the line of the footpath which cuts across the ground to connect to the bridleway" and para 19; "a bridleway would decrease the legally applicable travelling distance to the recreation ground by between 150 – 600 metres depending on starting point which would be especially convenient for younger children on bicycles who can use the recreation ground as a safe off-road area to ride around."

It's not clear that you fully understand what a recreation field is. These two statements appear to totally contradict one another, you are suggesting that walkers must adhere to the footpath/bridleway whilst children on bikes can ride over the recreation ground at will. The reason this is a "recreation" field, is because it is used for recreation!! and is used by dog walkers, kite flyers, ball games and sitting on the grass enjoying the sun, not everyone walking across it is on a route march and do NOT have to follow the line of the footpath. Surely it would be those riding bikes that ought to follow the line of the proposed bridleway as that would be the only legal route for them?

Mrs Claire Goodwin – E-mail received Sunday 17th June

First of all I am a senior nurse at the local hospital, [REDACTED]. I cannot take time off work at short notice to attend the hearing and represent / defend myself. Therefore I do not feel that I have been given adequate opportunity to send my comments to oppose the taking of my land for a footpath and/or a bridleway.

From your email it appears that if I don't comment by Monday morning, my comments won't be considered and that my comments will also have to go in the 'late comments page!!' I would hardly describe my comments as 'late' considering the fact that I only knew about the hearing on 14th and I received your email on the 15th! Once again I find your manner to be rude and threatening.

I strongly oppose the making of a footpath and/or the creation of the bridleway. For what purpose is this necessary and at the cost of our privacy, safety and happiness? I feel that my human rights are being violated, my personal safety is being compromised and that I feel that if there is in fact a public footpath that hasn't been used for over 60 years, then when I purchased the property in March 2014, the Council in fact **have sold me land that wasn't the councils to sell.**

This is extremely distressing for me and I am extremely upset that a footpath that was supposed to exist and which hasn't been in place for the last 60 years at least, is suddenly being created at the detriment of my personal space, my land and my happiness. I will also say that a bridleway would just create an entrance for travellers to come and wreak havoc... as they have done so in previous years and as they are currently doing at present, less than 2 miles away from here. It would also encourage more motorbikes that are also currently causing a problem to the neighbourhood. The councils token offer of compensation being the purchase of 2 new trees of my choice to replace my large well established apple tree is also insulting and unacceptable.

I strongly oppose the taking of mine and my neighbours land for a footpath and/or a bridleway.