



Mark Saccoccio

Town Clerk

01525 631920

info@leightonlinslade-tc.gov.uk

www.leightonlinslade-tc.gov.uk

Friday, 9 April 2021

To: Members of the Planning & Transport Committee (Councillors M Freeman, A Dodwell, D Bowater, K Cursons, F Kharawala, G Perham, D Scott, J Silverstone and S Owen)

(Copies to all Town Councillors for information)

NOTICE OF MEETING

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of **Planning & Transport Committee** to be held on **Wednesday, 21 April 2021** commencing at **7.30 pm**. This will be a remote meeting held via Microsoft Teams in accordance with The Local Authorities and Crime Panels (Coronavirus)(Flexibility of Meetings)(England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

**THIS MEETING MAY
BE RECORDED ***

<https://tinyurl.com/zdzh47pz> or by tel: +44 20 3795 5672 (Conf.ID: 231 156 871#)

M Saccoccio
Town Clerk

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Schedule 12 of the Local Government Act 1972 requires a record be kept of the Members present and that this record form part of the minutes of the meeting. Members who cannot attend a meeting should tender apologies to the Town Clerk.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(i) Under the Localism Act 2011 (sections 26-37 and Schedule 4) and in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, Members are required to declare any interests which are not currently entered in the Member's Register of Interests or if he/she has not notified the Monitoring Officer of it.

(ii) Should any Member have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in an item on the agenda, the Member may not participate in consideration of that item

unless a Dispensation has first been requested (in writing) and granted by the Council (see Dispensation Procedure).

3. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC (3 MINUTES PER PERSON; MAXIMUM 15 MINUTES)

To receive questions and statements from members of the public in respect of any item of business included in the agenda, as provided for in Standing Order Nos 3(f) and 3(g).

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 1 - 4)

(a) To receive and approve as a correct record the minutes of the Planning and Transport Committee meeting held on 31 March 2021 (**attached**) in accordance with Standing Order 12.

(b) To receive information updates on matters arising from the previous meeting (if appropriate).

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Pages 5 - 6)

To consider Planning Applications received (**attached**). An updated list will be issued on 16 April 2021 (if applicable).

6. CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL CONSULTATION ON MAIN MODIFICATIONS TO THE EMERGING LOCAL PLAN (Pages 7 - 10)

To consider a Town Council response to the Central Bedfordshire Council consultation on Main Modifications to the Emerging Local Plan (full consultation details to be found at: <https://centralbedfordshire.oc2.uk/> and at: <https://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/mmc-march-2021>).

7. TRANSPORT MATTERS

To consider any matters relating to highways/transport (if appropriate).

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

To receive and consider any items of information received (if applicable).

* Phones and other equipment may be used to film, audio record, tweet or blog from this meeting by an individual Council member, officer or member of the public. No part of the meeting room is exempt from public filming unless the meeting resolves to go into exempt session. The use of images or recordings arising from this is not within the Council's control.

LEIGHTON-LINSLADE TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES OF PLANNING & TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 31 MARCH 2021 AT 7.30 PM

Present: Councillors M Freeman (Chair)
 A Dodwell (Vice-Chair)
 D Bowater
 F Kharawala
 G Perham
 D Scott
 S Owen
 C Palmer
 R Yates

Also in attendance: M Saccoccio, Town Clerk
 S Sandiford, Head of Democratic and Central
 Services

Members of the public: 0
Members of the press 0

184/P **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor K Cursons (substituted by Councillor R Yates) and from Councillor J Silverstone (substituted by Councillor C Palmer).

185/P **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made and no dispensations were requested

186/P **QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC (3 minutes per person; maximum 15 minutes)**

There were no questions from the public.

187/P **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Committee received the minutes of the Planning and Transport Committee meeting held on 10 March 2021.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning and Transport Committee meeting held 10 March 2021 be approved as a correct record and would be signed at a later date, when safe to do so.

188/P PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee reviewed applications received up until 26 March 2021.

RESOLVED to recommend to Central Bedfordshire Council that no objection be made to application reference CB/21/00977 (Land at Leighton Buzzard Garden Centre) but the Town Council would make the following comments for consideration:

- **Concern that the proposed parking spaces are sufficient for staff and visitors.**
- **Concern regarding traffic movements during construction and that construction traffic should approach from Hockliffe.**
- **That concerns raised by the pollution officer regarding potential odour/noise issues be mitigated where possible.**

Discussion took place regarding application reference CB/21/00769 (Land between Shenley Hill Road and Heath Road to Vandyke Road). Concerns were raised that access should be maintained from Vandyke Road to Shenley Hill Road until such time as the new road was opened. The committee noted that more information on the anticipated road layout for the development area including traffic movements would have been useful. In particular, it would have been helpful to see how the proposed cycleways would join up with other routes. It was proposed that no objection be made on the understanding that there be no loss of access at any time between Vandyke Road and Shenley Hill Road. On being put to the vote, this was carried (7 in favour, 2 against).

RESOLVED to recommend to Central Bedfordshire Council that no objection be made to application reference CB/21/00769 (Land between Shenley Hill Road and Heath Road to Vandyke Road), on the understanding that there would be no loss of access at any time between Vandyke Road and Shenley Hill Road.

RESOLVED to recommend to Central Bedfordshire Council that no objection be made to the following applications:

- | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 1. CB/21/00711 | 50 SOUTHCOTT VILLAGE, |
| 2. CB/21/00928 | 6 CHILTERN GARDENS |
| 3. CB/21/01000 | 11 COPPER BEECH WAY |
| 4. CB/21/00944 | 22 ORION WAY |
| 5. CB/21/01036 | 9 ASHBURNHAM CRESCENT |
| 6. CB/21/01034 | 59 LINWOOD GROVE |
| 7. CB/21/00975 | 89 STOKE ROAD, LINSLADE |
| 8. CB/21/01146 | 82 ASHWELL STREET |
| 9. CB/21/00893 | 4 SARITOR CROFT |
| 10. CB/21/00696 | 112 VANDYKE ROAD |

TREES

1. **CB/TRE/21/00102**
2. **CB/TRE/21/00106**

- 4 **THE HEATH**
- 3 **THE HEATH**

189/P TRANSPORT MATTERS

There were no transport matters to report. The parking matters discussed previously, following the recommendation from Partnership Committee, had been passed on to Central Bedfordshire Council for a response. It was suggested that Councillors could forward details of any other parking concerns they wished to raise to officers to be collated and brought to a future meeting for discussion.

190/P INFORMATION ITEMS

The Committee received correspondence dated 11 March 2021 from Central Bedfordshire Council regarding a consultation on Proposed Main Modifications to its Emerging Local Plan. The letter set out the modifications being consulted on and the documentation which could be found on the Central Bedfordshire Council website. The consultation would run until 12pm on Wednesday, 5 May 2021.

In particular, it was noted that Main Modification 78 included reference to site HA1 HAS33 (Land North of Soulbury Road, Leighton-Linslade), inclusion of which had been strongly objected to by the Town Council.

In addition to any individual responses councillors might wish to submit to the consultation, it was suggested that committee members forward their thoughts to officers to be collated for discussion at the next meeting on 21 April.

The Committee also noted that secondary legislation was expected later this year on changes to permitted development in town centres.

The meeting closed at 8.18 pm.

I HEREBY CONFIRM THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 31 MARCH 2021.

Chair

21 APRIL 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED UP 9 APRIL 2021
All applications are FULL applications unless marked otherwise

1. **CB/21/01240** **57 WATERDELL**
Single storey rear extension.
2. **CB/20/04283** **12 CLARIDGE CLOSE**
Erection of front porch.
3. **CB/21/01236** **133 BILLINGTON ROAD**
Garage conversion.
4. **CB/21/01309** **20 BYFORD WAY**
Single-storey side extension to both sides of property
5. **CB/21/01145** **39 WINDSOR AVENUE**
Single storey side/rear extension to replace side conservatory. First floor side extension over existing garage.
6. **CB/21/01369** **TUSCANS, HEATH ROAD**
Two storey front extension, two storey side extension and single storey side extension.
7. **CB/21/01367** **53 DUDLEY STREET**
Change of use of existing small HMO (House of Multiple Occupation) (Use Class C4) to large HMO (Sui Generis) comprising of 7 units.
8. **CB/21/01225** **80 ASHWELL STREET**
Single storey side/rear extension and garage conversion with new pitched roof.

TREES

1. **CB/TRE/21/00103** **24 TAYLORS RIDE**
Works to a trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order: (T1) Oak reduce canopy over neighbour's garden by approx 40% approx 4m from canopy edge (T2) Oak reduce canopy by approx 20% approx 2-3m from extremities (T3) Beech remove two low branches to increase light into garden and reduce higher branch by approx 2m (T4) Oak neighbours tree, remove three low branches to increase light into garden (T5) Oak thin canopy by approx 20% to increase light to house & remove low epicormic growth and dead wood (T6) Oak thin canopy by approx 20% to increase light to house & remove low epicormic growth and dead wood also reduce canopy edge encroaching on house to SB/TPO/82/00009

2. CB/TRE/21/00149**STONEHILL, 52 BILLINGTON ROAD**

Works to a tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order: Crown reduction of a Horse Chestnut tree by 25% lateral reduction, 15% height reduction, crown clean & shape due to damage of house and vehicles.

3. CB/TRE/21/00119**33 RIVERSIDE**

Works to trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order: SB/71/00005/G1 Removal of 5 lowest lateral branches to left Robinia tree (False Acacia) and removal of 4 lowest lateral branches to right Robinia tree (False Acacia) and removal of dead branches

4. CB/TRE/21/00157**21 HEATH ROAD**

Works to Trees Protected by Tree Preservation Order
SB/76/00004/W1: Sectional fell Conifer (T1) to ground level, sectional fell Conifers x 5 (G1) to ground level and sectional fell Viburnum (T2) to ground level

CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATIONS, MARCH 2021

Response to Consultation Invitation

PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION MM78 Site HA1 HAS33 (Land North of Soulbury Road, Leighton-Linslade)

I would submit that the proposed main modifications in relation to this site are wholly inadequate and would fail to prevent significant environmental and ecological damage extending to the surrounding area and especially Linslade Wood should development be allowed, and would still result in unacceptable damage to the wider, valued landscape area. The evidential base would indicate that development of the site as proposed in the Local Plan would be in contravention of NPPF principles as well as the Council's own proposed policy EE3.

In consequence, I would strongly urge alteration of MM78 to effect the exclusion of the site entirely from the small and medium allocations for development as being the only satisfactory course in planning terms.

The following points would support the above position.

Analysis

MM78 simply states that, as policy requirements, when considering development of parcel HAS33 attention will need to be given to a minerals resource assessment, landscape buffers to the northern and western boundaries, and nature conservation issues (Linslade Wood). However, the site remains as one identified in principle as suitable for development with an indicative maximum of 55 houses.

I make no comment on the mineral resource assessment point.

Proposal for Landscape Buffers

Much of this sloping area of land lies within an Area of Great Landscape Value designated in the precursor South Bedfordshire Local Plan whose policies, I understand, have been carried through into the present Local Plan.

In 2013, when a planning application for a lesser number of houses than the capacity now suggested was rejected by Central Bedfordshire Council, the Landscape Planner's expert comments on that proposal included "visual intrusion across the Ouzel Valley to the opposite ridge

line including Rushmere could be highly intrusive, have a detrimental impact on landscape character and result in visual encroachment into the wider countryside”. Similarly, the Countryside Access Officer noted that “there will be a detrimental impact on the landscape setting of Linslade Wood”. It is also relevant that, over recent years, several planning applications immediately over the adjacent border with Buckinghamshire have been rejected, including on appeal, with landscape considerations very much to the fore. It is also relevant that, in a 2017 rejection of an appeal by a developer on the Buckinghamshire site, the Inspector commented that such suburban development would urbanise the rural-like character of the entrance to Leighton-Linslade along the Soulbury Road. It is clear that development of the HAS33 site would have exactly that effect especially as significant work and changes to provide pavement, access, bus stop facilities etc would be needed on this rural road.

Against this background, it is not a matter of trying to mitigate landscape damage in a situation such as this, such damage should not be permitted in the first place. The essence of a landscape (and as a geography post-graduate this is a matter of which I have some knowledge) is its overall integrity which can be destroyed by piecemeal developmental changes such as would be the case here.

Consequently, I would further suggest that the proposed modification would not accord with the NPPF principle that “Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by...protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...” (para 170). Even with the proposed modification, the development of this site with housing would run counter to that principle on the actual evidence available.

Proposal for Attention to Nature Conservation Issues

The immediately contiguous Linslade Wood includes Ancient Woodland and a County Wildlife Site. I calculate that almost 40 percent of the HAS 33 boundary runs alongside the wood, principally to the north but also with a portion on the eastern side. The Wood is rich in flora and fauna, including several bat species protected by domestic and international legislation, for which the site in question (rough pasture and hedgerows) would provide a good foraging habitat. Development of the land would undoubtedly harm the Wood and its ecosystems including through noise and light pollution and the impact of additional domestic animals.

Against this background, I would suggest that the policy requirement proposed in MM78 of attention being given to nature conservation issues when considering development proposals, is wholly inadequate in the present context. Indeed, it is difficult, if not impossible to understand how this site can be slated for substantial housing development when there are such basic outstanding questions and issues which bear so strongly on its suitability in principle. Rather, the evidence would strongly suggest that, in line with the Council’s proposed Policy EE3 that housing development on this site should not be permitted given the potential damage to the ecology of Linslade Wood and in view of the symbiotic relationship of the site in question with the Wood.

Again, NPPF guidance is relevant (section 15) including the reference to “establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures”, when housing development on this site would appear to achieve exactly the opposite.

Other Planning Policy Considerations

It is regrettable that MM78 does not consider relevant precedent in planning policy considerations relating to this site. Thus, in 2013 it was stated by the Council’s own officers that development of the site “would represent further encroachment into the open countryside” as well as harming the appearance of the Area of Great Landscape Value. Similarly, it was explicitly considered that building would be outside the natural limits of the Leighton-Linslade urban boundary. HAS 33 is bounded on by far its longest piece of perimeter by Linslade Wood, on another side by the open land of a covered reservoir area, on its third side by the firm boundary of Soulbury Road, and on its fourth by a very small number of houses with large gardens, making it, in context, clearly part of the open countryside, as was acknowledged in the early stages of the Green Belt studies for the Local Plan where a sense of separation from the nearby settlement was noted.

Conclusion

Against the above background, I would suggest that the available evidence demonstrates that the proposed modifications in respect of HAS 33 are totally inadequate and that the housing development proposed in principle for this site is wholly inappropriate and unsound.

Cllr Clive Palmer BA (Hons), PhD (Dunelm)
Leighton-Linslade Town Councillor – Southcott Ward.

This page is intentionally left blank