

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 12 September 2018

Item 5 – CB/18/00223/OUT – Land to the rear of Stondon Lower School and playing fields, Upper Stondon SG16 6QB

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses NONE

Additional Comments NONE

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons NONE

Item 6 – CB/18/00231/FULL – Land adjacent to 6 The Pastures, Upper Stondon, Henlow SG16 6QB

Additional Comments

In the Officer report, at the summary and at paragraph 6.2, reference is made to Holywell Middle School. Please replace this with Stondon Lower School.

The wildflower meadow identified at paragraph 5.6 will be provided in the residential application, adjacent to the entrance road.

Given this application is a standalone application, it is not considered necessary to grant subject to a S106 agreement (this will remain recommended for associated application ref. CB/18/00223/FULL). Accordingly, a new recommendation is as follows:

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to highlighted conditions.

Item 7 – CB/18/01424/OUT – Land to the west of Everton Road, Everton Road, Potton SG19 2PD

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Revised representation received on 10/09/2018 from the Bedfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (BCCG) on behalf of the BCCG and NHS England seeking a

financial contribution from the development of £815 per dwelling for GP Core Services, to be used by Greensands Medical Practice (Potton Premises), to mitigate the impact of this development.

Additional Comments

The agent of the application has confirmed that the application is willing to accept the contribution for GP Core Services as outlined by the NHS.

The agent of the application has also written a letter to Members which is appended to the late sheet.

Additional Condition

No dwelling shall be occupied until a new location for the existing bus stop has been agreed in writing with the Local Highway Authority.

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

Item 8 – CB/13/03433/OUT – Superstore, Bells Brook, Biggleswade SG18 0NA

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

When originally consulted, in 2013, Northill Parish Council raised no objection to the application. Following further discussions in September 2018, the Parish Council have confirmed that they maintain no objection against the application, provided access issues to Sainsburys, the Tidy Tip and the petrol station are not acerbated.

Additional Comments

The committee report omitted the reason for recommendation. This has been included below:

"The proposal is located outside of the Settlement Envelope and therefore represents a departure from the development plan. However, the site, due to its location and the nature of the proposal, is considered to represent sustainable development, which outweighs non-compliance with Policy DM4. The development would also provide significant economic benefits.

There is not considered to be any material harm in terms of highways safety, residential amenity, character, ecology or flood risk, and the development is considered to be acceptable in principle."

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons NONE

Item 9 – CB/18/01278/FULL – Land to the rear of 3 Grove Road, Dunstable, LU5 4BY

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses NONE

Additional Comments NONE

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons NONE

Item 10 – CB/17/01525/FULL – 74 Church Lane, Arlesey, SG15 6UX

Additional Comments

Neighbour consultations – It should be noted that a total of 9 letters of objection have been received from a total of **5** addresses.

Item 11 – CB/18/01001/FULL – 10 Copper Beech Way, Leighton Buzzard LU7 3BD

Additional Comments

A revised plan was received which satisfies the Highways Officer's concerns.

Typos:

Para 1.13 'The Agent has revised the design of dwelling by reducing it to by one storey.....'

Para 3.6 'this will provide a softer edge to the development and will be no different to the existing conifer hedge that currently ~~existing~~ exists along the boundary in part.'

Item 12 – CB/18/01461/FULL – Center Parcs Woburn Forest Holiday Village, Fordfield Road, Millbrook, Bedford MK45 2GZ

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses NONE

Additional Comments NONE

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons NONE

Item 13 – CB/18/00875/FULL – 102 Markyate Road, Slip End, Luton, LU1 4BX

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

1. CBC Archaeology additional comments received on 04.09.18 (following the receipt of Archaeological information supplied on the same date);

The proposed development site lies within an area that has produced archaeological remains dating to the Palaeolithic period and under the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) these are heritage assets with archaeological interest.

The amended details represent the results of a geophysical survey (Phase Site Investigations Ltd, dated 29th August 2018) supplied to the Archaeology Team on 3rd September 2018. The results of this survey indicate that the site may contain a number of dolines, which as the Archaeology Team's previous comments noted have the potential to contain Palaeolithic deposits. If these features were found to contain Palaeolithic remains, then the discovery would be of national significance and would require specialist archaeological investigation, and this may affect the viability of the development proposals. However, at present, the exact nature of the geophysical anomalies remains unknown and therefore it is not possible for the Archaeology Team to advise on the impact of the development proposals on the archaeological resource.

Recommendation

The Archaeology Team recognise that the applicant has now provided the results of a geophysical survey of the site and that the survey suggests that some of the anomalies recorded could contain deposits that may relate to the known Palaeolithic sites at Caddington which are nationally significant. However, the exact extent and nature of those anomalies is unknown. The Archaeology Team have already advised that if the geophysical survey produced anomalies that could be dolines some intrusive evaluation may be required. The number of features recorded, their distribution across the site and the need for specialist archaeological intervention which could affect the viability of the scheme all mean that pre-determination intrusive field evaluation must now be undertaken. If the applicant or their agent is not prepared to provide the required archaeological information then the Archaeology Team will object to this proposal on the grounds that insufficient information has been provided on the potential archaeological resource of the application area and the application is contrary to paragraph 189 of the NPPF.

2. CBC Highways additional comments received on 11.09.18 (following the receipt of revised parking schedule and supporting appeal decision information received on 04.09.18 and 07.09.18)

Whilst it is acknowledged that additional spaces have been provided, overall the layout remains deficit in the appropriate parking provision for the nature of uses on the site.

N.B. An additional revised layout plans with further parking provision up to the 200 spaces required, was supplied on 07.09.18 however these plans were declined to be accepted as a consideration of this application due to the fact that the plans were materially different (with the loss of an amenity feature for future residents) and as such would have required the benefit of reconsultation.

3. CBC Viability Consultant (11.09.18) - Based on our assessment, we conclude that the proposed development could viably provide the full policy requirement (30% Affordable Housing at 73% Affordable Rented / 27% Shared Ownership tenure mix) on site. This equates to the following: Affordable Rented – 29 & Shared Ownership – 11.

N.B. In accordance with the requirements of the revised NPPF, viability assessments are required to be made available in the public domain. As such a copy of the assessment is available on the council's website via the case reference under supporting documents.

Additional Comments

Additional information was supplied by the agent in rebuttal to some of the officer's reasons for refusal outlined in the committee report. In particular in relation to the sustainability of the site covered under reason for refusal 6. The agent advises that the sites distance and connectivity to core services are only some 550m away and therefore the site should be considered sustainable in that regard.

In addition, a rebuttal was supplied in respect of the officer's reason for refusal no. 5 in respect of the impact on existing residents and the lack of amenity for future residents. The agent advises in summary, that the internal spaces conforms to nationally prescribed standards and that the design was such to minimise impact and maximise capacity of the site. In addition to the conservatory and other planned facilities to the site, the landscaping around the units provides external amenity and the heritage greenway provides connectivity those contributing to appropriate external amenity.

Both of these rebuttals are available on the council's website via the case reference annotated as the date of receipt 07.09.18.