

Planning Application tracking – February 2020 - August 2021

Applications to which LLTC has recommended objection

Last updated: 3/9/2021

Summary: February 2020 – August 2021

Number of applications to which LLTC has recommended objection	28
Number of applications granted	9
Number of applications refused	3
Number of applications to be determined	4
Number of applications withdrawn	11
Number of planning appeals dismissed	1

Details

No	Application no	Address	Reason for LLTC objection	Decision taken by CBC	CBC comments
1	CB/20/00365/OUT	12-14 MARKET SQUARE	the proposed development represents overdevelopment of the site with an unacceptable housing density.	Application withdrawn	
2	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 III) Taken with the narrow width of the access road and the proposed siting of	Application withdrawn	

			<p>the parking area, refuse and delivery vehicles would be unable to safely access the proposed development without having to carry out considerable 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>		
3	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.</p> <p>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	

4	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 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.</p>	Application withdrawn	
5	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>	Application withdrawn	

			<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> <p>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.</p>		
6	CB/20/01539/DO C	LAND AT CLIPSTONE PARK	<p>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</p>	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</p>

				<p>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>
--	--	--	--	---

					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.)
7	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 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>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 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</p>

				<p>the local planning authority. The ecological enhancement strategy shall include but not be 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>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 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>
--	--	--	--	---

8	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	Appeal dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate	
9	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	
10	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. 	Application withdrawn	
11	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, whereby the piece of amenity land that is to be lost as a result of the conversion is a small parcel of

				<p>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).</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>2.Objection Received by the Town</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					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.
12	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. 99The 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 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

					<p>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. 95Party wall issues are not planning considerations.- Loss of privacy to 101BIt 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 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.</p>
13	CB/20/02885	7 Harcourt Close	<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.</p>	Application refused	<p>The rear garden siting of the proposed dwelling would introduce an incongruous form of development, exacerbated by its footprint and size. The proposed location would not reflect the grain of development in the vicinity. The proposal would not enhance or reinforce the character or local distinctiveness of the area, and instead would detract from the verdant nature of its surroundings, contrary to Policies</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 		<p>BE8 and H2 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review, January 2004, and Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.</p> <p>2 The proposed site layout fails to provide an adequate turning facility and therefore fails to permit light goods service vehicles, and cars, to enter the site, turn and re-enter Bossington Lane in a forward gear. The proposal would therefore create conditions of danger and inconvenience to users of the highway, contrary to Section 9 (Promoting sustainable development) of the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.</p>
14	CB/20/03448/OUT	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</p>	Application granted	

			form of infrastructure deliverables resulting from any permission being granted.		
15	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	Application refused	<p>The proposed development would be an over intensive use of the site and result in a cramped form of development with the proposed units falling below the minimum space standard with an insufficient level of amenity open space for the enjoyment of proposed occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review; the National Design Guide (September 2019) and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (March2014)²</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of the increased height and excessive bulk result in a development which would dominate and unbalance the building and would be viewed within the streetscene as an over-large addition which would detract from proportions of the building and would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review, Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the principles of good design in relation to form, scale and appearance prescribed in the National Design Guide (September 2019) and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (March 2014)</p>
16	CB/20/04647	Land rear of 19 Dudley Street	i) Taken with limited on-street parking provision within Hartwell Crescent, Hartwell Grove, Albany Road and Dudley Street, the potential net loss of parking spaces through the demolition of the existing garage block	Application refused	<p>The proposed development would result in the loss of open space that provides vital amenity in an urban setting. The proposed replacement open space is not considered to be of suitable quality to offset the loss and therefore the</p>

			<p>would add to an already chronic on-street parking situation to the detriment of existing residents within adjoining roads.</p> <p>ii) Given the narrow width and circuitous design of the proposed access road, service and delivery vehicles would be forced to carry out a considerable number of manoeuvres in order to exit the site in forward gear to the highway detriment of other vehicles and pedestrians alike.</p> <p>iii) The proposed siting of the amenity area adjoining the proposed access road represents a highway safety danger given the likelihood that it will be used by children from the proposed development and neighbouring flats for informal play including ball games.</p> <p>iv) The proposal would set a precedent which is likely to result in the further loss of adjoining gardens to further development.</p> <p>Whilst not considered an objection, the Town Council maintains that 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.</p>		<p>proposal is unacceptable as a matter of principle. The proposal conflicts with the requirements of Policy R12 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review(2004) and paragraph 97 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).²The proposed development would result in the provision of an isolated residential development that is at odds with the pattern of development in the local area. The site, due to its openness makes a positive contribution to the street scene, serving to soften the appearance of the urban area and the resultant loss of open space would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The open nature of the site would be replaced by substantial built form, which along with the scale of the access road would be detrimental to the character of the area. The proposal would thereby be contrary to Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review (2004) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).³Insufficient information has been provided with respect to noise pollution. In the absence of this information it is not possible to ascertain whether any noise from commercial uses that would inhibit the use of the site for residential purposes. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).</p>
17	CB/21/00244	14 Market Square	<p>- The proposed roller shutter was contrary to Central Bedfordshire shop front policy, given its Grade II Listed status and location within a conservation area</p>	Application withdrawn	

			<p>Given the insufficient information provided in support of the application, the Town Council held concerns on the grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the hours of operation had not been specified with the potential that given the nature of the operation, the unit may well be closed for the greater part of the working day thereby contributing little to the vitality and viability of the Town Centre - That no detail on internal works had been provided and that these might have an impact on surrounding properties (smell, noise). 		
18	CB/21/00245	14 Market Square	internally illuminated signage was contrary to Design Supplement 6 – Shopfront and Signage which seeks to protect historically sensitive buildings and Conservation Areas from inappropriate development.	Application withdrawn	
19	CB/21/00178	Land at Billington Road	the site is identified as a Main Employment Area within the emerging Central Bedfordshire Local Plan and that no improvement measures are proposed to address what is an already busy road junction particularly for right turning vehicles heading toward the bypass. The Town Council would therefore object on highways safety and loss of employment land grounds. The Town Council would also agree that concerns raised by other parties must be addressed, including: the Tree Officer's concerns about the oak tree, confirmation of adequate noise and odour mitigation, incomplete ecological information, lack of clarity as to how Billington Road will be	Not yet determined Aug 2021	

			connected by intended cycle and pedestrian way to the public footpath which forms part of the Leighton-Linslade Green Wheel, confirmation of adequate separation of buildings from the Anglian Water sewage pumping station and issues to do with runoff and flooding risk.		
20	CB/21/01309	20 Byford Way	the proposed works would be overbearing on the neighbouring property and would not meet Central Bedfordshire car parking standards in an area with existing on-street parking issues.	Application granted	Due to the limited depth of the projection to the side/front it is also not considered that any undue loss of outlook, overshadowing or amenity to the adjoining property would result. The proposal does not impact on existing parking provision. Also, no additional bedrooms are being proposed and as such it is not considered that any new parking provision is necessary and it is not considered that the proposal would exacerbate any existing shortfall in the vicinity.
21	CB/21/01367	53 Dudley Street	that car parking standards could not be met in an area with significant car parking issues. The Town Council also had concerns regarding fire safety arrangements and sought assurance that Building Control Regulations would be met.	Application granted	Proposal meets necessary criteria. Condition added regarding use of garage, to retain off-street parking provision and thereby minimise the potential for on-street parking which could adversely affect the convenience of road users.
22	CB/21/00667	Heath Lodge, 210 Heath Road	the proposed fence exceeded 2m in height	Application granted	The fence is considered to be acceptable in its own right and is not considered to cause demonstrable harm to the amenity of this neighbouring property. The boundary treatment along the eastern boundary is not considered to be curtilage listed and therefore listed Building consent is not required. Objections have been raised by neighbours in regards to the damage the proposal will cause to neighbour properties as well as other issues. These matters are considered to be civil matters and

					as such cannot be considered within this application.
23	CB/21/01084	107 Camberton Walk, Linslade	That enclosure of amenity land would be contrary to the original purpose of providing relief within the estate layout to the detriment of residents and visitors alike.	Not yet determined Aug 21	
24	CB/21/01851	3 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 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 determined Aug 21	
25	CB/21/01686/OUT	MILLSTREAM WORKS, MILL ROAD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The land is not identified for housing development in the emerging Local Plan. - Concerns regarding flood risk, including surface water drainage. - Very special circumstances have not been demonstrated to include land identified as green belt within the outline application. - Narrow vehicular access to the site with no prospect of widening it, leading to concerns for safety as well as access/egress. - Concerns regarding the impact of significantly increased vehicle movements, especially at peak times, in an area with widespread traffic issues including limited traffic flow due to onstreet parking, lack of sufficient parking for Bassett Road GP 	Application withdrawn	

			<p>Surgery and high volume traffic movements relating to the clinic and lower school on Bassett Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns regarding the proximity of the sewerage pumping station to proposed housing units. 		
26	CB/21/02650	Old Linslade Manor	<p>The applicant has failed to demonstrate very special circumstances sufficient to override established Green Belt policy. The proposal by virtue of its siting and height (some 38% taller) would have a greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt when compared to the ancillary agricultural building the subject of the planning application. The proposal by virtue of the inclusion of bulky dormer windows to both the front and rear elevations is not representative of a traditional ancillary agricultural building and would do little to positively contribute to the rural setting of this part of the South West Bedfordshire Green Belt.</p> <p>The Town Council maintains its highway concerns on the grounds that the narrow restrictive vehicular access would in its opinion compromise the ability for emergency and service vehicles to access the site safely to the potential detriment of other highway users and thereafter, for vehicles to access the site by virtue of the narrow carriageway width.</p>	Application withdrawn	
27	CB/21/02956	44 Warneford Way	<p>concerns regarding adequate car parking and the impact on the street scene as seen from Nettleton Way (to the rear of the property).</p>	Application granted	The proposal will result in the provision of accommodation at 2.5 storey level, inclusive of a window to the rear elevation of the third

					<p>floor. Given the location of the dwelling and its existing relationship with the neighbouring occupiers, the occupiers of the application site already have existing views into the neighbouring occupiers' private amenity space, from the first floor windows. Therefore, whilst it is considered that the proposal will lead to a degree of intensification of this overlooking, by introducing windows at 2.5 storey level, it is considered that this increased level of overlooking would not be sufficient to warrant refusal of the application. It is also material to note that a dormer could be constructed at the application site without requiring the benefit of planning permission, under permitted development rights. The proposal will alter the application site from two to three bedrooms. However, the parking requirement for a two and three bedroom house are identical and the application will not alter the existing on-site parking arrangements. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable with regards to its impact on the highway network.</p>
28	CB/21/03336	18 Condor Drive	<p>(i) That whilst the plans indicated other uses, there was potential for the property to become a 5-bedroomed rather than 3-bedroomed property and the Town Council would therefore have concerns regarding lack of adequate car parking in an area with existing parking issues.</p> <p>(ii) Possible loss of privacy to the neighbouring property (no 20).</p>	Not yet decided	

29			(iii)		
----	--	--	-------	--	--