MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 26th JULY 2017 AT 7.00PM IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, GREENACRE CENTRE, STOTFOLD

Committee Members present: A Cooper (Chairman)

B Collier Mrs M Cooper
S Dhaliwal D Matthews
C Phelps J Talbot

Ms E Wearmouth

Also present: Councillor B Saunders, Mrs A Clarey, Mrs J Hyde and the Assistant Clerk

85/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Hayes and the Town Clerk

86/17 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.

87/17 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – QUESTIONS, COMMENTS & RESPONSES

None.

88/17 CLERK'S REPORT, CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED & MATTERS ARISING FOR INFORMATION

Nothing to report

89/17 DECISION NOTICES

RESOLVED that the Planning Decision Notices as listed and forming part of these minutes be noted.

90/17 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.

91/17 CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS BY CENTRAL BEDS DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLVED it is not considered necessary to call in any applications for consideration by the Central Beds Development Management Committee.

92/17 ITEMS FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES, RELEVANT TO THIS COMMITTEE ONLY

Members noted that the application on Astwick Road was approved by Central Beds Council, although objections were raised from the Town Council. Concerns were raised that other applications in close proximity to this would now be approved. Further development is planned for Astwick Road raising concerns for the traffic problems, especially to the north of Stotfold. Members discussed whether Central Beds Council should be approached by the Town Council on behalf of its residents to complain on its poor attitude to the lack of infrastructure in the town to cope with further developments. The traffic survey that is currently being used for information is around 12 years old and very out of date.

It was agreed by Members to discuss this with other town and parish councils in the area to find out their views and approach to this problem. It was agreed to raise this topic at the forthcoming BATPC AGM in October.

It was also raised to improve the green aspects of the Arlesey Road site and to insist on large sustainable drainage in any further developments.

It was also noted that the NHS has made no statements at all during the developments. It was thought that the Larksfield Surgery should be more aware of the planning process and a letter should be sent to the surgery, asking them to object to improve their own structure.

It was also noted that Arlesey Town Council had an article printed in the Comet newspaper regarding the bridge over the A507. This was noted as the Arlesey Cross development and a green bridge had already been asked to be provided. This would enable another 2000 -3000 houses to be developed. Members discussed again if the area could cope with more development.

There being no further business, the meeting was closed at 7.16pm

CHAIRMAN

DATED

PLANNING APPLICATIONS 26th July 2017

A CB/17/02982/FULL

comments due 08/08

Mr N Allen 16 High Street, Stotfold, SG5 4LL Single storey front extension

Town Council comments: No Objections

B CB/17/03074/FULL

comments due 04/08

Mr Boughen

20 Norton Road, Stotfold, SG5 4PE

Single storey rear extension with part first floor rear extension and internal alterations

Town Council comments: No Objections

C CB/17/03526/FULL

comments due 17/08

Ms E Deutch 2 Chervil Road, Stotfold, SG5 4NW Single storey rear extension

Town Council comments: No Objections

D CB/17/02435/FULL

comments due 01/08

41 Rook Tree Lane, Stotfold, SG5 4DL Single storey detached dwelling

Revised proposal received drawings: 1c, 2c, 4a, 5a

Town Council comments: no material difference, as previous comments below

Previous comments: Object – there is nothing materially different in this application to a previous application for this site. We consider this application to constitute back-land development and overdevelopment of the site. There is also impractical tandem parking proposed for the site, which nullifies the hammerhead turning area provided.