

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 13TH JANUARY 2016 AT 7.00PM IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, SIMPSON CENTRE, STOTFOLD

Committee Members present: S Hayes (Chairman)

B Collier	A Cooper
Mrs M Cooper	S Dhaliwal
S Hayes	D Matthews
C Phelps	L Stoter
J Talbot	

Also present: Councillors Mrs Bundock, Mrs A Clarey and B Saunders, 3 members of the public and the Assistant Clerk

138/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none as all Committee Members were present.

139/15 DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS INTERESTS ON ITEMS 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 point.

140/15 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – QUESTIONS, COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Mr Scholes spoke against application CB/15/04872/OUT and expressed his concerns that developers were exploiting loopholes in the planning system. He informed Members that letters had been sent out by Taylor Wimpey offering to purchase land from properties along Taylors Road and was concerned that this land would be used in conjunction with the designated commercial area to build more houses. He confirmed that the Residents Association had arranged a meeting with a private planning consultant to oppose this application and that a meeting would be held on Saturday 16th January at 3pm in the Roecroft Centre.

141/15 CLERK'S REPORT, CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED & MATTERS ARISING FOR INFORMATION

None

142/15 DECISION NOTICES

None

143/15 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

144/15 CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS BY CENTRAL BEDS DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

RESOLVED as application CB/15/04872/OUT would automatically be called in, it is not considered necessary to call in any applications for consideration by the Central Beds Development Management Committee. The Chairman reminded the members of the public that they could attend the meeting at Central Beds and speak on this application if they wanted.

145/15 ITEMS FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY

Nothing to report.

There being no further business the meeting was closed at 7.35pm

CHAIRMAN

DATED

PLANNING APPLICATIONS
13th January 2016

A CB/15/04872/OUT comments due 03/02
H Pattinson – Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land
Land rear of 43 to 91 Silver Birch Avenue south of Alder Green and Aspen Gardens, Stotfold
Outline application for the development of up to 100 houses with all matters reserved except for access
Town Council comments:

The site falls outside of the development envelope for Stotfold, and we believe the 5 year housing land supply has now been fulfilled, and for this reason the application should fail.
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.

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 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.”

On appeal the inspector allow change of use to be granted subject to extensive landscaping, approx 900 hedge row plants as specified by the council had to be planted, together with 12 to 15 trees also

specified by the council, the normal permitted development of erecting sheds, fences or any other structures was withdrawn, so any construction would need planning permission, these conditions are still in place today. It was reasoned by the inspector that the landscape work would enhance the settlement boundary and enhance wildlife; the use of the same section of land would not affect the viability or productivity of the farm. This reasoning by the inspector has clearly been fully justified.

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 inaccuracies 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
- 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 just to adjust the nearby junctions by a growth factor is not good enough. There could have been impacts from other significant developments in Stotfold and elsewhere including impacts on the A507, A1 and A1m junction. The application should be rejected until a new traffic impact assessment has been made.

There is standing water on all four sides of this site as well as in the centre of 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.

B CB/15/04837/FULL
Stotfold Town Council/Rowan Homes
Recreation Ground, Arlesey Road, Stotfold

comments due 13/06

Erection of a community facility/changing room, 2 no. spectator stands, flood lighting, spectator hard standing, storage building, boundary treatments & upgrade and extension of car park

Town Council comments:

No Objections

C CB/15/04836/FULL comments due 01/02

Stotfold Town Council/Rowan Homes

Roker Park, The Green, Stotfold, SG5 4DG

Development of 62 residential units following demolition of existing club house

Town Council comments:

No Objections

D CB/15/04881/FULL comments due 27/01

Mrs J Dowe

125 Church Road, Stotfold, SG5 4NG

Front porch and garage façade screen to side access, replacement of existing conservatory

Town Council comments:

No Objections

E CB/15/04927/FULL comments due 02/02

Mr D Timms

23 Arlesey Road, Stotfold, SG5 4HB

Rear extension and loft conversion

Town Council comments:

No Objections

F CB/15/04631/FULL comments due 15/01

Mr & Mrs Wainright

35 Mowbray Crescent, Stotfold, SG5 4DY

Two storey rear extension

Town Council comments:

No Objections

G CB/15/04599/FULL comments due 15/01

Mrs S Tofts

15 Mill Close, Stotfold, SG5 4AB

Single store rear extension

Town Council comments:

No Objections

H CB/TRE/15/00509 comments due 27/01

Mr McLeod

1 Walnut Close, Stotfold, SG5 4PX

Works to a tree protected by Preservation Order: Prune one Lime tree located on land on the corner of Walnut Close and Church Road. The tree is protected by Tree Preservation Order Ref: MB/TPO/00/00005 and is listed as T1

Town Council comments:

No Objections
