

LATE SHEET

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 07.11.18

Item 5 – CB/18/02232/FULL – Land To The South Of, Arlesey Road, Stotfold

Additional Consultation Responses

Bedfordshire CCG comment that, if this development materialises, it would affect Larksfield Surgery in Stotfold.

The practice is situated within an area experiencing cumulative population growth from a number of mid-size developments and further speculative planning applications. It is expected that their combined impact will result in the practice's premises becoming constrained, and plans will need to be made to either expand/reconfigure the existing surgery or to consider relocating the premises in due course.

At this stage there are no clearly identified projects to address the premises capacity in the area, however, Bedfordshire CCG is currently in the process of devising their long term commissioning and estates plans, which would include creation of additional premises capacity in the area. There appears to be a clear consensus that any investment in the infrastructure should support the new models of care and primary care at scale strategy – providers working together to share resources across the Cluster where appropriate.

For this reason, in order to make this development acceptable to NHS commissioners, a contribution is requested supporting the delivery of the primary care at scale strategy in the South Ivel Valley Cluster (which includes Larksfield Surgery).

This application will result in circa 419 additional patient registrations and in order to mitigate the impact on local healthcare services it is requested, on behalf of Bedfordshire CCG and NHS England, that a contribution is made for £1,059.50 per dwelling towards either expansion of Larksfield Surgery or the provision of additional clinical facilities in the area. This is in line with the recent Bedfordshire CCG response to the Local Plan, and associated Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

This figure is based on the following break-down:

GP core services	£815.00	per dwelling	1/3 of the total health requirement according to a study carried out by Guildhouse UK Ltd
Community	£114.10	per dwelling	7% of the remaining 2/3 of the requirement
Mental Health	£130.40	per dwelling	8% of the remaining 2/3 of the requirement
Total	£1,059.50	per dwelling	

Additional Comments

The applicant has agreed to make this contribution and, given the justification set out by the Bedfordshire CCG, relationship of the site with the existing surgery, the contribution (which equates to £1,059.50 per dwelling or £170,579.50 in total) is considered to be CIL compliant and it is recommended that this be included in the S106 agreement.

Additional Consultation Responses

The Councils **Flood Risk Team** have now received and considered the updated Flood Risk Assessment and recommend planning conditions.

Additional Comments

This matter follows on from the details set out in para 6.2 of the Officers Report and the planning conditions are considered to be necessary and reasonable in the interests of reducing flood risk. The applicant has agreed to these conditions.

Additional Conditions

No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme, to manage surface water run off from the development for up to and including the 1 in 100 year event (+40%CC), and a maintenance and management plan for the scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The discharge rate from the development will be limited to the rate of 3l/s/impermeable hectare as agreed by the Bedford Group of Internal Drainage Boards and set out within approved FRA and Drainage Strategy (Ref:17848/FRA, May 2018) prepared by Woods Hardwick. The final detailed design shall be based on the agreed drainage Strategy (Drawing nos. 17848-ARLE-5-101A and 1748-ARLE-5-102A) and DEFRA's Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (March, 2018), and shall be implemented and maintained as approved. Maintenance will ensure the system functions as designed for the lifetime of the development. Any variation to the

connections and controls indicated on the approved drawing which may be necessary at the time of construction would require the resubmission of those details to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

Reason:

To ensure the approved system will function to a satisfactory minimum standard of operation and maintenance and prevent the increased risk of flooding both on and off site, in accordance with para 163 and 165 of the NPPF and its supporting technical guidance.

No building/dwelling shall be occupied until the developer has formally submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority a finalised 'Maintenance and Management Plan' for the entire surface water drainage system, inclusive of any adoption arrangements and/or private ownership or responsibilities, and that the approved surface water drainage scheme has been correctly and fully installed as per the final approved details.

Reason:

To ensure that the implementation and long term operation of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) is in line with what has been approved, in accordance with Written Statement HCWS161.

Additional Consultation

The Leisure Services Facilities Officer comments that the development does not provide sufficient green infrastructure nor provide net gains for biodiversity.

Additional Comments

The Officer Committee Report sets out that the development incorporates an acceptable layout and landscape design. Having regard to the comments from the Councils Ecologist and the financial contribution of £20,000 towards Etonbury Wood (para 6.4/6.5 of Officer Committee Report) it is considered that net gains can be adequately demonstrated.

Additional Publicity Responses

Since the publication of the Officer Committee Report further representations in objection have been received – there are a total of 54 representations in objection. In addition, a petition with 45 signatures has also been received.

The matters raised are generally as set out in the Officer Committee Report and include concerns with highway safety and congestion; inadequacies in the Transport Assessment; insufficient medical provision; lack of compliance with policies of the Development Plan; no requirement for additional housing; increased flood risk; harmful impact on contamination within the site; inadequate provision for sewerage.

There are additional concerns raised in relation to the publicity of the planning application; the provision of access through The Gardens and, the provision of chimneys across the development.

Additional Comments

The planning application was correctly advertised as a departure to the Development Plan through site notice display and an advert in the Local Paper. In addition to that statutory requirement, the Council wrote to those properties which adjoin the application site. The application has been adequately publicised therefore.

The plans submitted show the provision of an access through The Gardens to the east of the application site. Creating permeable and accessible development is an important design consideration and is advocated in section 1.9 of the Design Guide. Residents of The Gardens will be able to access the development site (including the proposed play space) and vice versa. No significant or demonstrable harm is identified in respect of this aspect of the proposal such that would warrant the refusal of the planning application.

The Design Guide encourages the provision of chimneys at section 5.12.34 – ‘Chimneys should be provided on traditional house styles as they are the sort of detailing that enlivens roof scapes, and enhances the overall quality of houses’. The applicant has set out in writing that the chimneys will be ‘dummy chimneys’ and be entirely for aesthetic purposes.

Additional Comments

The applicant has submitted amended landscape drawings which omits the provision of a hedge along the Pix Brook. This addresses the concerns raised by the Landscape Officer as set out in the Officer Committee Report.

Amended Conditions

Planning condition 2 in the report is amended to reflect this position and also refers to two additional drawings which were omitted in error in the drafting of the condition (plan numbers 17844-102A and 17844-109A).

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers

17844/1007, 17844/1014A, 17844/1016A, 17844/1017A, 17844/1018A, 17844/1019A, 17844/1020A, 24582, 17844/1022A, 17844/1024 HA12, 17844/100A, 17844/101A, 17844-102 A, 17844/103A, 17844/104A, 17844/105A, 17844/106A, 17844/107A, 17844/108A, 17844-109A, 17844/110A, 17844/111A, 17844/112A, 17844/113A, 17844/114A, 17844/115A, 17844/116A, 17844/117A, 17844/118A, 17844/119A, 17844/120A, 17844/121A, 17844/136A, 17844/137A, 17844/138, 17844/139, 17844/140, 17844/141, 17844/122A, 17844/123A, 17844/126A, 17844/127A, 17844/128A, 17844/129A, 17844/130A, 17844/131A, 17844/132A, 17844/133, 17844/135A, 17-128.01 RevB, 17-128.02 Rev B, 17-128.03 Rev B, 17-128.04 Rev A, 17848-ARLE-500.

5210-EcoAp.vf4/Ah/RRA Ecological Impact Assessment; JBA17-128-Doc A Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment (Rev C); JBA17/128/AR02 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Rev A); Site Investigation, Including Infiltration Testing; DBA (PR23913) Heritage Assessment – Desk Based Assessment; Heritage Assessment – Geophysical Survey; Trial Trenching Evaluation Report (PR/23913); RP01-17761 Noise Assessment; 17848/FRA Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy; 17848/TA Transport Assessment; 17848/GTPA Green Travel Plan (Rev A); 17848/UA Foul Sewerage and Utilities Assessment.

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

Item 6 – CB/18/02298/OUT – Land west of Hitchin Road Shefford

Additional Consultation Responses

Bedfordshire CCG comment that, consideration of the potential consequences of this development and the health infrastructure implications has been undertaken on behalf of NHS England and Bedfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group.

This development, should the application be successful will affect Shefford Medical Centre. The current premises were designed for a total patient list size of 22,000 to deliver core General Medical Services.

In recent years there have been increasing national requirements to provide a wider range of services to patients within their community. For example, some outpatient clinics from Bedford Hospital are delivered via the surgery premises to its patients. In addition, the practice also delivers the following clinics over and above their core general medical services:

- physio therapy
- ultrasound
- aortic aneurism screening
- retinal screening
- alcohol and substance misuse clinics

There are 14 GPs, 4 Registrars and 5 nurse practitioners, as well as further clinical staff delivering the above services. In addition some community services are also run from the surgery via community specialist staff, e.g. dressing clinics, midwifery and leg ulcer clinics. A mental health counselling service is also delivered from the practice premises.

Given the number and frequency of the services delivered to local patients, the premises are already beginning to experience challenges in relation to available clinical space. This developing challenge and that circa 1,625 additional patients are expected from development sites that are not yet completely built, but will impact Shefford Health Centre, also has to be factored when assessing the health impacts for a new development such as this application.

There are already 18,000 patients registered with the practice and with residential developments already under construction in and around Shefford it is expected to reach full capacity very shortly, especially with the requirement to offer a wider range of patient services from GP Practices, including mental health and community services and some outreach specialist services from local hospitals, delivering care locally and reducing referrals into secondary care.

This application will generate nearly 400 further patients. By the time the development proposal is built out and occupied, the current premises will reach significant constraint requiring a premises extension. An extension has already been factored into the primary care strategy by the CCG, with costings and business case studies currently being undertaken and expected to be finalised early 2019. The requested contribution is calculated only on the number of additional new registrations and patient activity requirements this development will generate and therefore will contribute in proportion towards the costs of extending the premises.

In order to mitigate the impact of this development on local healthcare services, it is requested on behalf of BCCG and NHS England that a contribution is made for £1,059.50 per dwelling towards local healthcare infrastructure.

This figure is based on the following breakdown:

GP Core services	£815.00	Per dwelling	1/3 of the total health requirement according to a study carried out by Guildhouse UK Ltd.
Community	£114.10	Per dwelling	7% of the remaining 2/3 of the requirement
Mental Health	£130.40	Per dwelling	8% of the remaining 2/3 of the requirement
Total	£1,059.50	Per dwelling	

Additional Comments

Given the justification set out by the Bedfordshire CCG, relationship of the site with the existing surgery, the contribution (which equates to £1,059.50 per dwelling or £158,925 in total) is considered to be CIL compliant and it is recommended that this be included in the S106 agreement. The applicant has agreed in principle to this contribution.

Item 7 – CB/18/00196/OUT – Land rear and side of Hampden House, Hitchin Road, Arlesey, SG15 6RS

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None

Additional Comments

None

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 8 – CB/18/01628/OUT – Land off Hitchin Lane, Clifton

Photographs for the attention of the Committee

Three Photographs have been submitted by the Clifton Action Group for the attention of the committee.

Photo 1



Photo 2



Photo 3



Additional Comments

Representation from the Bedfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above application. This development, if approved, will create circa 57 additional patient registrations. The surgery closest to the proposed site in Clifton is Shefford Health Centre which currently still has capacity to accept these numbers.

Amended Conditions/Reasons

Amendment to Condition 10 to state:

The first reserved matters application submitted to the Local Planning Authority and any subsequent reserved matters application for the approval of details including access to the site shall include details of 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).

Amendment to Condition 14 to state:

As part of any reserved matters application, details of electrical wiring to accommodate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles for dwellings shall be submitted for the approval by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles, in accordance with Policy T5 of the Emerging Local Plan and Paragraph 105 of the NPPF.

Item 9 – CB/18/03161/REG3 – The Birches, Hitchin Road, Shefford, SG17 5JB

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Trees & Landscape Officer:

An early mature Cedar is proposed for retention close to what is to be the new access point for the staff car park. Currently this tree is within a grass area, the plans show that a new access road will pass through the root protection area (RPA) of this tree which using conventional construction methods eg excavation and new surfacing will inevitably cause root damage and decline in the health of this tree. In order to retain this tree within the development will require any new surface to be of a "no dig construction" ideally using a cellular confinement system such as Geogrid which will avoid excavation within the RPA of this tree.

The information available does not indicate any landscaping for the site showing parking spaces up to the front boundary of the site. This would appear to indicate that the existing hedge and shrub area would be removed. I would suggest that retention of the hedge is ensured with any areas that are sparse filled in with new planting and some degree of additional landscaping planted along this boundary, this may involve a redesign of the parking spaces either allowing space for a strip of planting along the boundary or reduction/spacing of parking bays to allow planting in between. We should ask for details of species, sizes and densities of planting.

A letter from a neighbouring resident has been circulated to Committee Members. It can be summarised as follows:

Object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The proposal would contravene Article 1 of the Human Rights Act as it would deprive the writer of the enjoyment of their possessions and their property.
- There would be a loss of privacy as upper floor windows would look into rooms of the writer's house. This previously did not matter as the windows used to serve bedrooms, but now they will serve living rooms.
- Putting homeless people in an affluent residential area of mainly retired people will cause resentment on both sides.
- We will end up with all sorts of people, drugs, alcohol and criminals preying on the vulnerable.
- The residents are to be classified "low risk" however even "low risk" families/individuals are still clearly a risk by definition, otherwise why the "risk" classification at all? Local residents in this affluent neighbourhood should not have to face this risk.
- It has been promised that problems would be sorted the same evening of the complaint as they are currently. Therefore, by his own admission we are going to have problems which we are going to police.
- There is no police presence in Shefford.
- It was nice when old people were at The Birches.
- The existing elderly residents of the surrounding properties cannot cope with the changes and the stress.

- Anecdotal evidence of a family member living adjacent to two homeless hostels and suffering from anti-social and criminal behaviour;
- Properties in the area are impossible to sell because the proposed development has blighted the area.
- It would be preferable if the whole building could be used for office accommodation rather than the proposed use.

Additional Comments

In response to the Trees & Landscape Officer, two additional conditions are proposed, below.

In response to the neighbour's letter, the majority of the points raised have already been addressed within the Committee report.

Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act prevents a public authority from taking away a person's property or placing restrictions on its use without a very good reason.

Under the Human Rights Act, public authorities must strike a fair balance between the interests of property owners and the general interests of society as a whole.

In this case, for the reasons set out within the report, it is considered that the proposal would not restrict the use of the properties of neighbouring occupiers and there would be no breach of the Human Rights Act. It is also considered that any perceived infraction of Article 1 would be clearly outweighed by the interests of society as a whole through the provision of much needed transitional accommodation.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Amended Condition 4:

Notwithstanding the submitted details, the new access road along the north-west boundary of the site shall be surfaced in tarmac from the point shown as "New gate to staff car park" on drawing no. LE17827-BIR/AP/07 Rev A to the proposed new staff car park.

Reason: To prevent nuisance from noise to neighbouring occupiers.
(Policy DM3, CSDMP and Section 15, NPPF)

Additional conditions:

7. The use hereby permitted shall not commence until a landscaping scheme to include an enhancement of the hedgerow along the front boundary of the site and a scheme for the maintenance of the hedgerow 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 first use of any separate part of the development (a full planting season means the period from October to March). The hedgerow shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with the approved landscape maintenance scheme and any plants which

die or are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable standard of landscaping in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

(Policy DM3, CSDMP and Sections 12 & 15, NPPF)

8. The proposed new access shall not be constructed until details of a cellular confinement system to be used for the part of the access located within the Root Protection Area of the Cedar Tree have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access within the Root Protection Area of the Cedar Tree shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees and hedgerows to be retained, and to avoid unnecessary damage to their root systems.

(Policy DM3, CSDMP and Sections 12 & 15, NPPF)

Item 10 – CB/18/02439/FULL – Grange Nurseries, The Green, Beeston, Sandy, SG19 1PG

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Additional Neighbour representation received on 05.11.18, with the following comments in summary:

- Recommendations for additional planting along boundaries shared with neighbouring properties if scheme found to be acceptable
- Recommendation for additional parking provision in accordance with original s106 plan if scheme found to be acceptable
- Disagrees that the proposed building accords with para 84 nor para 127 of the NPPF and DM3 of the Core Strategy which states that it should be respectfully to its surroundings and provide for high quality development
- Disagrees with the officer's assessment of distance between building and neighbouring property
- Conditions should be imposed to limit noise potential from alarms on forklift vehicles

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

Amended Cond 6:

The building hereby approved shall not be brought into use, until a landscaping scheme to include all hard and soft landscaping along the sites shared boundary with the neighbouring properties and the boundary shared with the open countryside and a scheme for the 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 and/or first use of any separate part 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.
(Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy for the North and Sections 12 & 15, NPPF)

Item 11 – CB/18/06090/FULL – 51 Hardy Way, Fairfield, Hitchin, SG5 4GL

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None

Additional Comments

None

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 12 – CB/17/04133/FULL – Fulbrook Middle School, Weathercock Lane, Aspley Guise, Milton Keynes, MK17 8NP

Amended Recommendation

The application is recommended for **DEFERRAL** for 2 committee cycles given the comments of the Ecologist, pending further information being provided in regard to bat roosts in the adjacent Woodland.

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Ecology:

“The scheme is objected to for the following reasons;

The April 2018 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal notes that the trees in the neighbouring habitat (tree line and spinney) have potential to support foraging/commuting bats. The ponds and rougher vegetation both in the wider and neighbouring sites also offer suitable foraging habitat for bats. Bats are a European Protected Species and legislation states;

Wild animals of a European Protected Species are protected from disturbance. Disturbance of such wild animals includes in particular any disturbance which is likely:

(a) To impair their ability:

- to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or*

- *in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate, or*
- (b) To affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.*

The PEA acknowledges potential impacts on bats as a result of lighting stating 'Any increase in lighting, particularly of the boundary tree lines and spinney, could adversely impact the suitability of the site in supporting foraging/commuting bats, through the displacement of such behaviours.'. Recommendations are made within the report to limit the use of the floodlighting and for further surveys to determine the level of use of the site by bats. The planning statement acknowledges this potential impact in 5.26.

Central Bedfordshire Council now holds a District Licence for Great Crested Newts and as such the applicant could apply for this licence to cover any potential impacts on GCN.

*The NPPF states that the right information is crucial to good decision-making, as such without the necessary detail to inform a decision it is **not possible to adequately determine impacts from the proposal.***

*The updated NPPF also expects development proposals to deliver net gains for biodiversity, this site lies on the edge of the Greensand Ridge Nature Improvement Area and as it stands the scheme only appears to result in a detrimental ecological impact and is therefore **contrary to policy.**"*

Landscape:

CB/17/04133- Fulbrook MS Muga - Landscape and Visual : there are landscape concerns regarding the visual impact of this proposal, a factor which does not seem to have been given appropriate consideration within the Application. The proposal is sited in the south-eastern corner of the school site, very close to the site boundary and adjacent to the wooded features of the Golf Course. Currently there are attractive views of the woodland gained from Weathercock Lane, these are of local value, as they help retain the connection to the countryside. The site lies within the "Woburn Greensand Ridge " landscape character area, where the strategy is to "conserve and enhance" traditional landscape features. The Guidelines for Development include the need to "Conserve the strong wooded context to settlements..... (6A.1.39)"

The landscape concerns relate to the visual impact of the 6 x 15m high lighting columns and to a lesser extent, the appearance of the fencing. It is noted that there will be significant spillage of light into the neighbouring woodland. Apart from the ecological concerns, the loss of tranquillity (which is accepted as covering visual as well as noise disturbance) is an issue, as the visual impact of fencing and lighting and the artificial surface will urbanise the foreground to the wood. There is also the concern regarding the potential conflict and long-term management implications to the wooded edge - the stand-off between the development and the trees does not appear to be sufficient. Whilst the wooded edge provides some containment in the view, experience suggests that there may need to be greater management of the trees on the boundary in the future.

The Floodlighting Report, in my view, erroneously assesses the site as being within "Environmental Zone 3 ", considering it to be within a suburban area. Given the countryside and wooded setting, it would be more appropriate to design a scheme acceptable to EZ 2 - the rural area, especially as the MUGA is at the furthest point from the highway and existing developed area.

More information on alternative lighting solutions are required. Lower height columns which reduce the light spillage should be considered. The visual impact of columns can also be reduced through the use of recessive coloured coatings rather than silver grey, particularly as the columns will be seen against the dark backcloth of the wood. and this should also be explored.

The Application has not included a landscape scheme or detailed how the soils to be excavated will be disposed of.

Until a landscape scheme is submitted, the scheme cannot be considered acceptable.

If progressed, a landscape mitigation scheme will be required. There appears to be scope to establish some trees and hedging on site, e.g. between the highway frontage and the area of playing field to the west of the MUGA. Planting which creates a filtered screen, whilst still allowing views through to the woodland would be appropriate. Opportunities to create wildflower rich grassland utilizing sandy soils would also be beneficial.

nb. Woburn Sands lies just outside of the "Greensand Country " Landscape Partnership Programme, a HLF funded conservation programme aimed at halting the decline in landscape character experienced across the Greensand Ridge, part of which has been caused by the impact of minor schemes which result in suburbanisation of the rural area.

Leisure, Libraries and Countryside Policy Manager:

Support the application subject to Sport England recommended conditions being included in any permission.

Additional Comments

Response in regard to comments of the Landscape Officer:

Attention is drawn to paragraph 2.3 of the officer's report which states:

"The number of proposed floodlights have been kept to a minimum and would be designed to reduce light spill around the site. The site is well screened by existing landscaping and is contained by both the landscaping and neighbouring residential development. Given this, the proposal would not result in an undue impact on the character or appearance of the area".

Whilst the floodlights would be visible within the locality of the site they are considered to be commensurate to the scale of the proposed development, in

addition a revised light spill plan has been provided which further reduces light spill into the adjacent woodland. The proposed pitch would be located within the school field adjacent to the existing concrete playground which already benefits from external floodlighting, although on a smaller scale to that proposed. A condition has been attached to ensure that the extent of illumination is agreed prior to the instalment of the floodlighting on site as well as a condition to restrict the hours of use of the pitch and associated lighting. Given this the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on Landscape subject to the conditions attached.

Additional Conditions

No development shall take place 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 and/or first use of any separate part 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. (Sections 12 & 15, NPPF)

Amended Conditions

Inclusion of revised plan numbers NSFMS003E and HLSO2790 Rev 4 to approved plans condition 11. Removal of plan number NSFMS008 B from approved plans condition 11. Condition 11 to now read:

“The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers NSFMS001 B, NSFMS002 B, NSFMS003 E, NSFMS004 C, NSFMS005 C, NSFMS006 D, NSFMS007, NSFMS009 B, HLSO2790 Rev 4, CBC/001.

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

Item 13 – CB/18/02163/VOC – Houghton Regis Central, High Street, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5QT

Withdrawn by Applicant 6th November

Item 14 – CB/18/02171/VOC – Houghton Regis Central, High Street, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5QT

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

None

Additional Comments

None

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 15 – CB/18/03289/VOC – Houghton Regis Central, High Street, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5QT

Withdrawn by Applicant 6th November

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Houghton Regis Town Council:

The Town Council regrettably objects to the proposed variation. The proposed variation would not complement the existing environment and would have a detrimental effect on the aesthetic appeal of the building. The assurances made by Central Bedfordshire Council, to residents, should remain. The proposed new building was designed so as to compliment such buildings as All Saints Church. Allowing this variation would result in a downgrade of quality, resulting in residents being let down. The original specification should remain.

Additional Comments

The comments of the Town Council are noted; however, a high quality render finish, as now proposed, would have an acceptable appearance and maintain its aesthetic qualities over time. The use of a through-colour render would not diminish the overall success of the building as a considered architectural composition in a historic built environment context. Furthermore, it would have no impact on the approved changes to the Red House.

Following the objection from the Town Council after the Committee Report was written, the reason for committee to determine is updated to:

The application is for a major development and Central Bedfordshire Council is the applicant, and an objection has been received by Houghton Regis Town Council contrary to the recommendation to grant planning permission.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None

Item 16 – CB/18/03290/VOC – Houghton Regis Central, High Street, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5QT

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Houghton Regis Town Council:

Town Council regrettably objects to the proposed variation. The proposed variation would not complement the existing environment and would have a detrimental effect on the aesthetic appeal of the building. The assurances made by Central Bedfordshire Council, to residents, should remain. Allowing this variation would result in a downgrade of quality, resulting in residents being let down. The original specification should remain.

Members notes: This was to be a landmark building in the town centre, and the original aesthetics had been decided in conjunction with residents opinions and preferences and as such should not be altered.

Additional Comments

The comments of the Town Council are noted; however, the use of zinc, as now proposed, would have an acceptable appearance and maintain its colour and aesthetic qualities over time. The use of zinc would not compromise the architectural and aesthetic merit and quality of the development. Furthermore, it would have no impact on the approved changes to the Red House.

Following the objection from the Town Council after the Committee Report was written, the reason for committee to determine is updated to:

The application is for a major development and Central Bedfordshire Council is the applicant, and an objection has been received by Houghton Regis Town Council contrary to the recommendation to grant planning permission.

Additional/Amended Conditions/Reasons

None