

Planning Application tracking – February-November 2020

Applications to which LLTC has recommended objection

Last updated: 23/11/2020

Summary: February - November 2020

Number of applications to which LLTC has recommended objection	15
Number of applications granted	4
Number of applications refused	0
Number of applications to be determined	5
Number of applications withdrawn	6

Details

No	Application no	Address	Reason for LLTC objection	Decision taken by CBC	CBC comments
18	CB/20/00365/OUT	12-14 MARKET SQUARE	the proposed development represents overdevelopment of the site with an unacceptable housing density.	Application withdrawn	
19	CB/20/00787	REAR OF 19 DUDLEY STREET)	I) The proposal would by virtue of its size and siting result in an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy to the adjoining residential properties within this part of Dudley Street. II) The proposal makes inadequate provision for car parking given that the proposed parking spaces are already used by existing residents for this very purpose. III) Taken with the narrow width of the access road and the proposed siting of the parking area, refuse and delivery vehicles would be unable to safely access the proposed development without having to carry out considerable	Application withdrawn	

			<p>20manoeuvres to the detriment of other highway users and pedestrians alike.</p> <p>IV) The proposal would result in the loss of valuable amenity space hereabouts.</p> <p>V) The proposal would set a precedent which is likely to result in the loss of the neighbouring gardens to further development.</p>		
20	CB/20/01154	7 Harcourt, Linslade	<p>It is considered that the proposal would represent an alien and incongruous form of development that by virtue of its size and siting would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking, loss of privacy and noise and disturbance to the detriment of the adjoining residential properties. The proposal would by virtue of the rural character of this particular location have a detrimental impact upon the wildlife hereabouts through the loss of established habitat in what is considered a rural enclave within this residential area. The visibility splay is considered insufficient in order to allow a vehicle to safely manoeuvre on and off the proposed driveway thereby potentially compromising highway safety.</p> <p>Should the planning authority be minded to grant planning permission, it has the propensity to set a precedent for the use of other back gardens within the area for equally inappropriate development.</p>	Application withdrawn	
21	CB/20/01145 CB/20/01146/LB	12-14 Market Square	<p>No marketing evidence has been provided to substantiate the loss of a prominent town centre retail unit that if allowed would reduce the retail offer within the Main Shopping Area as defined within the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan.</p> <p>The building by virtue of its size and listed status would not be capable of entertaining the proposed level of</p>	Application withdrawn	

			development which if allowed, would result in cramped living conditions to the detriment of future occupiers. The proposal has not provided mitigation measures capable of addressing the noise and odour generating uses associated with this busy and vibrant town centre location.		
22	CB/20/01358	LAND AT BILLINGTON ROAD	<p>The site is identified as a Main Employment Area within the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review. Policy E1 states that favourable consideration will be afforded to B1-B8 uses which generate employment opportunities for which this use clearly fails. On this policy ground, the Town Council wishes to object to the proposal given the loss of employment land and that no new employment opportunities would be created because of the proposal.</p> <p>In highway terms, no improvement measures are proposed to address what is an already busy road junction particularly for right turning vehicles heading toward the bypass. To further add to vehicular movements to what is an already busy junction will compromise highway safety and on this basis, the Town Council would object to the proposal.</p> <p>To introduce residential development within a Main Employment Area as defined within the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review has the propensity to compromise the residential amenity of future residents given the noise and general disturbance associated with conforming employment uses thereabouts. Unless the Applicant can satisfy Public Protection that the proposal includes satisfactory mitigation measures, the Town Council would wish to object to the proposal on this ground.</p>	Application withdrawn	

			The proposed development by virtue of its bulk, height and siting would represent an incongruous, conspicuous and unsympathetic form of development at this particular location to the detriment of the town's gateway that is Billington Road.		
23	CB/20/01539/DO C	LAND AT CLIPSTONE PARK	Unless the applicant can satisfactorily demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the details submitted in order to discharge the conditions is sufficient for this purpose, the Town Council would wish to object. Conditions are attached for a purpose and therefore there is every reason to ensure that the detail submitted will deliver a high quality and sustainable development in the common interests of the parish	Discharge of condition decision released	<p>3) No development shall take place above slab level, until an ecological enhancement strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ecological enhancement strategy shall include but not limited to opportunities for bird and bat boxes and hedgehog holes. The ecological enhancement strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that biodiversity is properly protected and enhanced at the site in accordance with section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework .</p> <p>4) Prior to first use of the open space buffer between Mercury Way and the developable site, boundary treatment shall be agreed and erected as indicated on landscape plan nos 12D Sheet 4 & Sheet 5 and shall thereafter be retained.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of security by design and amenity protection in accordance with policy BE8 S.B.L.P.R and section 12 of the NPPF.</p>

					<p>6) Prior to occupation, details of turning areas suitable for light goods vehicles within the confines of the private shared drives have been approved by the Local Planning Authority and no building (within that private drive) shall be occupied until that turning area has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn outside the highway limits thereby avoiding the reversing of vehicles on to the highway.(policy BE8 S.B.L.P.R and section 12 of the NPPF.)</p> <p>9) Before the premises are occupied all on site vehicular areas shall be surfaced in a manner to the Local Planning Authority's approval so as to ensure satisfactory parking of vehicles outside highway limits. Arrangements shall be made for surface water from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.</p> <p>Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction, and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the premises.(policy BE8 S.B.L.P.R and section 12 of the NPPF.)</p>
24	CB/20/01542/DO C	CLIPSTONE PARK	Unless the applicant can satisfactorily demonstrate to the Planning Authority that the details submitted in order to discharge the conditions is sufficient for this purpose, the Town Council would wish to object. Conditions are attached for a purpose and therefore	Discharge of condition decision released	1) No development shall take place above slab level before details of the proposed lighting in terms of design & specification, siting and luminance have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

			<p>there is every reason to ensure that the detail submitted will deliver a high quality and sustainable development in the common interests of the parish</p>	<p>Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the acceptable design and appearance of the development and in the interest of future occupiers amenity. (Policy BE8 S.B.L.P.R and Section 12 of the NPPF)</p> <p>2) No development above slab level, shall take place until a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for the provision of fire hydrants at the development. Prior to the first occupation of the dwellings the fire hydrants serving that development shall be installed as approved. Thereafter the fire hydrants shall be retained as approved in perpetuity.</p> <p>Reason: In order to ensure appropriate access to fire hydrants for use in the event of emergency in accordance with policy BE8 S.B.L.P.R and Section 12 of the NPPF.</p> <p>3) No development shall take place above slab level, until an ecological enhancement strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The ecological enhancement strategy shall include but not be limited to opportunities for bird and bat boxes and hedgehog</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>holes. The ecological enhancement strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that biodiversity is properly protected and enhanced at the site in accordance with section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework .</p> <p>5) Prior to the first occupation of a dwelling at the site, details of turning areas suitable for light goods vehicles within the confines of the private shared drives shall have been approved by the Local Planning Authority and no building (within that private drive) shall be occupied until that turning area has been constructed in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn outside the highway limits thereby avoiding the reversing of vehicles on to the highway.(policy BE8 S.B.L.P.R and section 12 of the NPPF.)</p> <p>8) Before the premises are occupied all on site vehicular areas shall be surfaced in a manner to the Local Planning Authority's approval so as to ensure satisfactory parking of vehicles outside highway limits. Arrangements shall be made for surface water from the site to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge into the highway.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction, and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the premises.(policy BE8 S.B.L.P.R and section 12 of the NPPF.)</p> <p>10) No development shall commence above slab level before details of landscaping within the phase, together with a timetable for its implementation and a programme of maintenance has been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development and the quality of accommodation provided for future occupiers would be acceptable in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review 2004 and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.</p> <p>11) Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, no development shall commence above slab level before samples of materials to be used in the external surfaces of the buildings at the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development would be acceptable</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review 2004 and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
25	CB/20/01869	1 Leedon Furlong	that the proposal would by virtue of the size of plot result in a cramped form of development out of keeping with the established character of the area	Not yet decided 23.11.20	
26	CB/20/01907	54 Millstream Way	The amenity land provides natural relief within this part of the estate. To grant planning permission would result in the loss of said land to the detriment of the original layout for the development	Application withdrawn	
27	CB/20/02194/FU LL	Market Court, Hockliffe Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the proposal represented overdevelopment of the site. - that no noise or odour assessment had been undertaken. - that there appeared to be no provision for social housing. - that lack of vehicular access to the site would have a detrimental effect, given that both North Street and Hockliffe Street had limited space for traffic movement and were already subject to loading/unloading for surrounding businesses. - Lack of privacy for occupants. - Lack of light for occupants. 	Not yet decided 23.11.20	
28	CB/20/02371	113 Camberton Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the enclosure of amenity land would be contrary to its original purpose of providing relief within the estate layout to the detriment of residents and users of the footpath. 	Granted (officer delegated)	Character and Appearance of the Area. The proposal seeks planning permission for the change of use of an existing strip of amenity land to private garden located to the west of the host dwelling house which is to be enclosed by a 1.8m fence. As existing the strip of land in question is screened behind a linear line of trees,

					<p>whereby the piece of amenity land that is to be lost as a result of the conversion is a small parcel of land with minimal contribution to the amenity of the area, due to not being easily accessible or highly visible from the public realm due to the existing landscape of the amenity land in question. As a result of the proposal it is considered a buffer will be retained that incorporates a linear line of trees between the proposed fence and the public footpath. This buffer that will be retained will effectively offer the users of the public footpath the same benefits as the existing amenity space offers as the part of land that is to be enclosure is screened by the linear line of trees. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would not be detrimental upon the users of the public footpath or the residents of the local area in term of the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above, it is considered that the proposed development as a whole would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review(2004). Amenity and Living Conditions of Occupiers of Neighbouring Dwellings Given the nature of the development and its relationship with neighbouring dwellings, it is considered that the proposed development as a whole would</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					not cause any harmful implications in relation to loss of light, outlook or privacy, nor would it be overbearing upon any neighbouring dwelling within the local area. Car Parking On the basis of the scale and nature of the development, adequate access and parking can be provided. 2. Objection Received by the Town Council The Town Council have raised an objection to the proposed development on the grounds it would cause a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area. This objection has been addressed under section 1 of this report.
29	CB/20/02528	97 South Street	overlooking from the proposed juliet balcony and loss of light to the neighbouring property by virtue of the bulk and massing of the rear extensions.	Granted	The application originally proposed was for a rear dormer and a first floor addition to a rear extension. As amended, the first floor addition has been deleted and instead a new lean to roof proposed to the single storey extension. The roof would be 1.2m higher than the existing with an eaves 0.45m higher. In respect of the objections received:- Loss of light to rooflights of No. 99 The proposal would extend 1.1m above the height of the neighbouring roof. Given the limited projection, the nature of the affected windows and the fact that the neighbouring extension has other windows it is not considered that any unacceptable loss of light would result. - Impact on view from 1st floor bedroom of No.99. Loss of view is not a planning consideration and it is not considered that

					<p>the raising of the roof to the single storey extension would result in an unacceptable impact. - Loss of light, loss of privacy and overbearing to No. 95. Given the deletion of the first floor addition and the location and height of the proposed raised roof the proposal would comply with the Council's Design Guide (vertical assessment) and no unacceptable loss of light would result. Due to the single storey nature of the amended proposal it is not considered that the proposal would result in any loss of privacy to No. 95 or be overbearing on that property. - Impact on character of area. The extension would be to the rear and there are other large similar flat roof dormers including the adjoining No. 99 and 101. Such dormers in this location could be constructed under permitted development. It is not considered that the Juliet balcony results in any visual harm. As such it is not considered that the dormer or the rear roof extension would be harmful to the street scene or character of the area. - Party wall issues with No. 95 Party wall issues are not planning considerations. - Loss of privacy to 101B It is not considered that any unacceptable loss of privacy from the rear dormer would result to No. 101B or to any other neighbouring property. - Measurements not shown The drawings are scaled and considered acceptable to assess the proposal. - Contrary to Policy H8 and Design Guide For the reasons</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					detailed above the proposal is considered acceptable and complies with Policy H8 and the Design Guide. There is no existing off road parking for properties within South Street, with parking restriction locally. Notwithstanding this the amended proposal does not increase the number of bedrooms or result in any highway safety issues.
30	CB/20/02885	7 Harcourt Close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is considered that the proposal would represent an alien and incongruous form of development that by virtue of its size and siting would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking, loss of privacy and noise and disturbance to the detriment of the adjoining residential properties. - The proposal would by virtue of the rural character of this particular location have a detrimental impact upon the wildlife hereabouts through the loss of established habitat in what is considered a traditional and historic rural enclave within this residential area. - The visibility splay is considered insufficient in order to allow a vehicle to safely manoeuvre on and off the proposed driveway thereby potentially compromising highway safety. - Should the planning authority be minded to grant planning permission, it has the propensity to set a precedent for the use of other back gardens within the area for equally inappropriate development. 	Not yet decided 23.11.20	

31	CB/20/03448/OU T	Land at Spinney Park and Spinney Pool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns regarding lack of natural drainage in an area already subject to surface water flooding - Concerns regarding highways safety, due to the proposed vehicular access onto a busy roundabout - Concerns regarding the proposed re-zoning of this site from employment land to residential uses unless further detail can be provided on proposed locations for additional employment land to compensate for its loss. <p>The Town Council would also ask for information on anticipated planning gain in the form of infrastructure deliverables resulting from any permission being granted.</p>	Not yet decided 23.11.20	
32	CB/20/03746	71 Hockliffe Street	overdevelopment of the site, concerns for fire safety, increase in the number of units proposed and parking concerns given the lack of on-street car parking	Not yet decided 23.11.20	