

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 10TH MAY 2017 AT 7.00PM IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, GREENACRE CENTRE, STOTFOLD

Committee Members present:

B Collier	A Cooper (elected Chairman)
Mrs M Cooper	S Dhaliwal
S Hayes	D Matthews
J Talbot	Ms E Wearmouth

Also present: Councillors Mrs S Bundock, Mrs J Hyde, B Saunders and the Town Clerk – Mrs K Elliott-Turner

51/17 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Nominations were called for; Councillor Cooper was proposed and seconded. There being no further nominations it was:

RESOLVED that Councillor Cooper is elected Chairman of the Planning Committee for 2017/2018.

52/17 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Nominations were called for; Councillor Collier was proposed and seconded. There being no further nominations it was:

RESOLVED that Councillor Collier is elected Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee for 2017/2018.

53/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor C Phelps.

54/17 DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS INTERESTS ON MATTERS CONTAINED IN THE AGENDA

There were none. Members were reminded that if at any time during the meeting they feel they have an interest in an item being discussed, they should declare it at that time.

55/17 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – QUESTIONS, COMMENTS & RESPONSES

None present.

56/17 CLERK'S REPORT, CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED & MATTERS ARISING FOR INFORMATION

Nothing to report.

57/17 DECISION NOTICES

None to report.

58/17 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED that the comments made on the applications as listed and forming part of these minutes be forwarded to the Central Bedfordshire Council Planning Department.

59/17 CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS BY CENTRAL BEDS DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLVED that applications CB/17/01585/FULL (Land between Taylors Road & Astwick Road, North of 51 Astwick Road, Stotfold), CB/17/01642/OUT (Land rear of 43

to 91 Silver Birch Avenue, South of Alder Green and Aspen Gardens, Stotfold) and CB/17/01619/FULL (Land rear of 43 to 91 Silver Birch Avenue, South of Alder Green and Aspen Gardens, Stotfold) are called in for consideration by the Development Management Committee, should they be minded to approve the applications. It was noted that due to the large size of these developments, the applications would automatically be considered by the Development Management Committee.

60/17 ITEMS FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY

Nothing to report.

There being no further business, the meeting was closed at 7.38pm

CHAIRMAN

DATED

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

10th May 2017

A CB/17/01585/FULL comments due 18/05
GPS Estates Ltd
Land between Taylors Road and Astwick Road, North of 51 Astwick Road, Stotfold
Residential development of 26 dwellings to include landscaping, access, parking and all ancillary works
Town Council comments: Object – this is an opportunistic application, confirmed as falling outside of the recognised development envelope for Stotfold on previously undeveloped and predominantly high grade agricultural land. This would fail to qualify as making the most efficient use of land under NPPF.

It is not demonstrated in the application documents that this applicant has pursued other, more appropriate sites within the defined Settlement Envelope. There are many outstanding identified potential development sites across that area and within development envelopes that would suffice without 'stretching' existing Central Beds Council guidelines.

The suggested density of development on that area of land would suggest an overdevelopment of the site, leading to insufficient road widths to accommodate realistic potential vehicle ownership with on-road parking and the associated problems this creates.

Below is an extract from the NPPF:

2.2 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012

The NPPF includes policy guidance on 'Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment' (Section 1.1). Paragraphs 109 (page 25) and 112 (page 26) are of relevance to this assessment of agricultural land quality and soil and state that:

'109 ...The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils'... and

'112...Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poor quality land in preference to that of a higher quality ...

Sustainability

The entire access road system to this site in the form of Astwick Road, Taylors Road, Regent Street and Rook Tree Lane is already overloaded, narrow and dangerous. The junctions of both Astwick Road and Taylors Road with the A1 trunk road do not have adequate slip roads for safe joining of the road, and permit egress only in a northerly direction. Further loading without a major restructuring of the road pavement systems would create a dangerous and undesirable environment for residents.

- Lower schools in Stotfold are at capacity with some children having to be accommodated in schools outside of Stotfold in recent times.
- Health care is extremely stretched, the local surgery has difficulty in retaining sufficient doctors to meet the health care needs of an ever-expanding population.
- NHS dentistry is limited in Stotfold.
- There is no bank in Stotfold, simply ATM services in three places.
- Some of the public houses shown have been demolished and replaced with housing.
- The café has become a small shop.

- The development will be at the further extremity of the town placing it some distance from the library, surgery the Co-op and other very limited shops, all of which is likely to induce travel by car rather than as a pedestrian.
- Bus services for the most part are extremely sparse, stopping at most times when people would be unlikely to use them.

The list of amenities within Stotfold is very dated and needs to be readdressed – particularly as prospective residents are to be given a handbook – which will be inaccurate.

B CB/17/01642/OUT comments due 22/05
 Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
 Land rear of 43 to 91 Silver Birch Avenue, South of Alder Green and Aspen Gardens, Stotfold
 Outline application for up to 95 dwellings (including affordable housing) and all associated infrastructure and landscaping, with all matters reserved except access
Town Council comments: Object -
The site falls outside of the development envelope for Stotfold, and we believe for this reason the application should fail under CBC policy NE3.

Available data indicates that the site is designated as Grade 2 agricultural land i.e. very good with only minor issues preventing it from being grade 1. As such development in this location would fail the test of making the most efficient use of land.

The NPPF includes policy guidance on ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment’ (Section 11). Paragraphs 109 (page 25) and 112 (page 26) are of relevance to this assessment of agricultural land quality and soil and state that:

‘109...The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: ...protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils...’ and

‘112...Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality

The planning history of this site is relevant to this current application in that over the years it has been subject to several planning applications, and investigations for inclusion in the structure plan, these applications have been opposed by the council at the time, and all of which have been refused, these plans include:-

In the 70s application MB74 /1070A and B for factories on the site was refused a reason being:-

“The proposed development would form an unwarranted intrusion into an area of open and undeveloped land and would be detrimental to appearance and rural character “

This statement is just as applicable today with the present proposal.

In 1995 application 48/MB/94/889 was made for change of use for a 15mtr wide strip along the western boundary from arable land to gardens, this was refused the reasons for refusal being:-

“it was an intrusion into open country side outside the settlement boundary and was contrary to the policy NE3.”

In preparation for an earlier structure plan the site was considered for houses. During the consultation was identified as H331 and E77 the site was rejected at stage 2 of the consultation, the reasons quoted as:-

Quote “The site scored poorly within the settlement being ranked 11 out of 14, There are other sites within Stotfold that have scored higher and are more suitable for residential development for these reasons the site has not progressed to stage 3.”

Within 500 metres there are brown field sites as follows:-

- **CB/10/02061**
- **CB/15/02999**
- **CB/15/03723**
- **CB/15/04836**

Together these sites are planned to deliver over 100 houses, meeting the requirements of NPPF and therefore negating the need to develop a green field site.

Sustainability is cited as a reason for approval however, there are numerous inaccurate statements in the application submission.

- **Lower schools in Stotfold are at capacity, children are having to be accommodated in schools outside of Stotfold.**
- **Health care is extremely stretched, the local surgery has difficulty in retaining sufficient doctors to meet the health care needs of an ever expanding population. The local pharmacy has reached its capacity to service prescriptions.**
- **NHS dentistry is unavailable in Stotfold**
- **There is no bank in Stotfold, simply an ATM**
- **Some of the public houses shown have been demolished and replaced with housing**
- **The café has become a small shop**
- **The development will be at the furthest extremity of the town placing it the furthest from the library, the Co-op and the very limited shops all of which is likely to induce travel by car rather than as a pedestrian**
- **Bus services for the most part are extremely sparse, stopping at most times when people would be likely to use them**

The traffic impact assessment is 10 years old and simply to adjust the nearby junctions by a growth factor is not good enough. Traffic flow to and from other significant current developments in Stotfold will impact on and worsen the effects of additional traffic from this proposed development through the town to the A507 bypass. The application should be rejected until a new traffic impact assessment has been made.

There is a naturally high water table on the site. Land drainage after surface flooding is a serious problem that has not been properly investigated.

Central Beds Council’s Public Protection should consider noise impact from the Stotfold Town Council’s recreation ground activities and ensure that the developer installs any attenuation measures required. It should be noted that no agreement has been sought from the Town Council for links onto the recreation land and this cannot be assumed.

Stotfold Town Council’s Town Plan indicates that developments should only be on brown field sites.

- C** CB/17/01619/FULL comments due 23/05
 Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
 Land rear of 43 to 91 Silver Birch Avenue, South of Alder Green and Aspen Gardens, Stotfold
 Change of use of agricultural land to countryside recreation/informal open space (Sui Generis) including associated soft landscaping
Town Council comments: Object – this conflicts with Nation Planning Policy Framework policy guidance on ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment’ (Section 1.1). Paragraphs 109 (page 25) and 112 (page 26) are of relevance to this assessment of agricultural land quality and soil and state that:
- ‘109 ...The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils’... and**
- ‘112...Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poor quality land in preference to that of a higher quality ...**
- There is a planning history for the area going back several years, all of those outside the Settlement Envelope have been refused for reasons such as ‘the proposed development would form an unwanted intrusion into an area of open and undeveloped land and would be detrimental to its appearance and rural character’ and ‘it would form an intrusion into open countryside outside the Settlement Boundary and be contrary to the policy NE3’**
- D** CB/17/01494/FULL comments due 26/05
 Mrs D Flanagan – St Mary’s (Stotfold) Lower School
 St Mary’s (Stotfold) Lower School, Rook Tree Lane, Stotfold, SG5 4DL
 Change of use of agricultural land to green playspace
Town Council comments: No objections
- E** CB/17/01945/FULL comments due 23/05
 Mr & Mrs R Holland
 40 Common Road, Stotfold, SG5 4DB
 Single storey rear extension
Town Council comments: No objections
- F** CB/17/01714/FULL comments due 09/05
 Mr Godward & Dr Chaudhury *(extension granted to 11/05)*
 2 Champion Avenue, Stotfold, SG5 4JR
 Single storey rear extension
Town Council comments: No objections

- G** CB/17/01578/FULL comments 23/05
Mr Rainbow
32 Church Road, Stotfold, SG5 4NE
Single storey front extension
Town Council comments: No objections
- H** CB/17/01154/FULL comments 16/05
Mr G Smith
13 Hazel Grove, Stotfold, SG5 4JZ
Amendments to previous application: two storey front and rear extension following demolition of single storey front and rear extensions
Town Council comments: Object - we see very minor reduction to the proposed extensions, and therefore our previous objections still stand - the new extension proposed for the front of the property is much farther forward and nearer the road than the current frontage. This would result in more vehicles parking on the road, as there is insufficient provision for off-road parking.

Previous Town Council comments on this application: Objection, the new extension proposed for the front of the property is much farther forward and nearer the existing road than the current frontage. The committee felt this would force more vehicles to park on the road, as there was insufficient provision for off-road parking