

**Roxton Parish Council (RPC) comments on Amended/Additional Plans submitted under reserved matters application ref: 21/03333/MAR Land North of School Lane, Roxton**

Roxton Parish Council (RPC) object to the above application on the following grounds.

Reserved Matter 3 of the Decision Notice dated 8<sup>th</sup> Sept 2021 ref: 21/00014/MAO states:

*No development shall take place until details of the following matters (in respect of which approval is expressly reserved) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: (1) the external appearance of the development; (2) the landscaping of the site; (3) the layout of the development; (4) the scale of the development; and (5) access roads within the site. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.*

1. With respect to external appearance of the development RPC object to the lack of variety of building heights, ridge heights, roof pitches, roof materials, window & door styles, window & door materials. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
2. With respect to external appearance of the development RPC object to the submitted proposals due to the lack of chimney pots on the social housing units resulting in the social housing have less design features then the open market properties. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
3. With respect to the landscaping of the site RPC object to the submitted soft landscape plan as it fails to align with the soft landscape plan approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
4. With respect to the landscaping of the site RPC object to the submitted soft landscape plan as it indicates a shortfall in provision when compared to the soft landscape scheme approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
5. With respect to the landscaping of the site RPC object to the submitted soft landscape plan as it proposes new trees within the view corridor towards St Mary Magdalen Church. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
6. With respect to landscaping of the site RPC object to the submitted soft landscape plan as it fails to recognise the existing local feature use of golden privet hedging to the external fontange of properties. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
7. With respect to landscaping of the site RPC object to the submitted soft landscape plan as it fails to offer the comparable variety of fruit bearing trees and shrubs as proposed in the approved soft landscape plan. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
8. With respect to landscaping of the site RPC object to the submitted soft landscape plan as it proposes approximately 60% less open green space then the approved soft landscape plan. The amended plan appears to have increased not reduced the amount of hard standing suggesting the proposal is over developed and therefore recommend the applicant considers reducing the number of dwellings in order to achieve a comparable quantum of green space as illustrated on the scheme approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO.

9. With respect to landscaping of the site RPC object to the submitted soft landscape plan as overall the soft landscape features fall far short of the design approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. As such RPC suggest the applicant re-visit the overall layout of houses first to reduce the quantum of hard standing and or houses or house sizes to allow for 50% more green open spaces as per the approved design under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
10. With respect to the layout of the development RPC object to submitted proposed site plan as it fails to align with the design principals and features of the approved proposed site plan under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
11. With respect to the layout of the development RPC object to submitted proposed site plan as it is a highway dominated design where ease of refuse and emergency vehicle movements continue to dictate the character of the road layout which remains at odds with the organic gentler pedestrian lead layout approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
12. With respect to the layout of the development RPC object to submitted proposed site plan as it fails to provide the perimeter footpath proposed on the proposed site plan under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
13. With respect to the layout of the development RPC object to submitted proposed site plan as it utilises house sizes significantly larger than those proposed under application ref: 21/00014/MAO as evident by the total site coverage of 14,807 sqft now proposed and the 12,632 sqft approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This increase further erodes the space remaining for soft landscaping areas. RPC note the site coverage has not been reduced through the amended plans. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
14. With respect to the layout of the development RPC object to submitted proposed site plan as the proposed gardens both front and back along the southern boundary of the site are significantly less than those indicated on the approved site plan under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. It is also worth noting the amended plans have removed the front gardens. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans. This is another example of how the proposals now before the LPA illustrate an over developed site hence RPC suggest the applicant consider reducing the number of dwellings.
15. With respect to the layout of the development RPC object to submitted proposed site plan as generally front and rear gardens are significantly smaller than those indicated on the approved proposed site plan under application ref: 21/00014/MAO.
16. With respect to the layout of the development RPC note the play area has been increased; RPC request this play area is designed to meet the requirements of the primary school children down to align with the age profile of pupils attending the neighbouring Roxton Academy COE School.
17. With respect to the layout of the development RPC object to submitted proposed site plan as it fails to provide the perimeter pedestrian routes as those indicated on the approved proposed site plan under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.

18. With respect to the layout of the development RPC object to submitted proposed site plan as plots 15 & 27 protrude into the view corridor of St Mary Magdalen Church identified through the Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment submitted under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. RPC note how the amended plan has increased this protrusion; it appears this is the result of increasing gardens when reducing the number of dwellings would be a better way of achieving a policy compliant layout.
19. With respect to the scale of the development RPC object to the scale as the total site coverage of 14,807 sqft now proposed is greater than the 12,632 sqft approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
20. With respect to access roads with the site RPC object to the submitted proposed site plan as it is a highway dominated design where ease of refuse and emergency vehicle movements have dictated a rigid road layout at odds with the organic gentler pedestrian lead layout approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
21. With respect to access roads with the site RPC object to the submitted proposed site plan as it proposes the use of tarmac to private parking areas contrary to sustainability drainage principals. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
22. Overall, RPC object to the proposals submitted to discharge reserved matter 3 as they represent a significant departure from the high design standards set out under the approved scheme application ref: 21/00014/MAO. Such failings are synonymous with the worse characterises of mass housing developments which typically build anonymous designs lacking any connection to the local environment or sense of place. At its core the problem with these proposals is there is too much hard standing be that building, parking or road; the simple solution would be to significantly reduce the quantum of development.

Reserved Matter 10 of the Decision Notice dated 8<sup>th</sup> Sept 2021 ref: 21/00014/MAO states:

*The submission of reserved matters for layout shall include full details of a scheme for car and cycle parking with access thereto in accordance with Bedford Borough Council's Parking Standards for Sustainable Communities: Design and Good Practice 2014 has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented and made available for use before the development is occupied and the car and cycle parking areas shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.*

23. RPC object to the quantum of private parking as it exceeds the standards set out in Bedford Borough Council's Parking Standards for Sustainable Communities; Design and Good Practice 2014 resulting in a development which is over parked and having an excessive amount of hard standing/garages to the detriment of green space. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.

Reserved Matter 12 of the Decision Notice dated 8<sup>th</sup> Sept 2021 ref: 21/00014/MAO states:

*Notwithstanding details of access shown within the site, the submission of reserved matters for layout shall include details of the site's internal roads, footways/paths and*

*cycleways which shall be designed in accordance with national and local design standards and best practice. No dwelling shall be occupied until the roads and footways/paths which provide access to the building have been laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved plans.*

- 24. RPC object to the submitted layout of internal roads, footpaths & cycle paths as it fails to make connections with the existing pedestrian network. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
- 25. RPC object to the submitted layout of internal roads, footpaths & cycle paths as it fails to provide any recreational route around the site as approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
- 26. RPC object to the submitted layout of internal roads, footpaths & cycle paths as it fails to provide any cycle routes within the development. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
- 27. RPC object to the submitted layout of internal roads, footpaths & cycle paths due to its rigid straight format. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
- 28. RPC object to the submitted layout of internal roads, footpaths & cycle paths as it does not align with the organic fluid design as approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.

Reserved Matter 15 of the Decision Notice dated 8<sup>th</sup> Sept 2021 ref: 21/00014/MAO states:

*The submission of reserved matters for appearance and layout shall include a scheme demonstrating the provision of a minimum of 5% of all market housing and 7% of affordable housing which meet Category 3 requirements in accordance with the Building Regulations 2010, Volume 1 (accessible and adaptable dwellings) or such replacement document or policy which exists at the time of the development commencing. The submitted details shall specifically indicate which dwellings are to be built to these standards and the relevant dwellings shall be built and retained in accordance with the approved details.*

- 29. RPC object to the submitted distribution of social housing properties as it fails to encourage social integration by virtue of the fact the layout clusters social housing in one main area of the development. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.

Reserved Matter 20 of the Decision Notice dated 8<sup>th</sup> Sept 2021 ref: 21/00014/MAO states:

*As part of the submission of reserved matters for landscaping, a sustainable landscaping scheme and maintenance plan must be submitted which includes details for the protection of trees close to the development site in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations.*

30. RPC object to the submitted landscaping proposals due to the felling/clearing of existing trees and hedgerows on all boundaries of the site. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
31. RPC object to the submitted landscaping proposals as it indicates a shortfall in the number of trees when compared to the soft landscape approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
32. RPC object to the submitted landscaping proposals as it fails to recognise the existing local feature use of golden privet hedging to the external frontage of properties. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
33. RPC object to the submitted landscaping proposals as it fails to offer the comparable variety of fruit bearing trees and shrubs as proposed in the approved soft landscape plan. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.
34. RPC object to the submitted landscaping proposals as it proposes approximately 50% less open green space than the approved soft landscape plan. This situation has not been addressed with the amended plans.

Overall, the details submitted to discharge the reserved matters 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 & 20 fall short of policy and/or significantly depart from the proposals approved under application ref: 21/00014/MAO therefore RPC request this application ref: **21/03333/MAR** be refused permission.

**RPC strongly recommend the applicant reviews the details approved under application ref 21/00014/MAO and amend their proposals to align both in detail and spirit with these approved details. We repeat the simple solution would be to significantly reduce the quantum of development thus reducing the number of dwellings, their size, their need for parking, the extent of roads in favour of green space in this rural location.**

In the event the application is approved RPC demand a series of conditions are applied to any consent of reserved matters to include:

- i. Construction traffic should be always controlled with suitable banks person(s).
- ii. Construction traffic should be limited to avoid school drop off and pick up times during term time.
- iii. The contractor to instigate a structure means of communication with both Roxton School and St Mary's Magdalen Church.
- iv. Construction works should be limited to the hours of 08:00 to 17:00 Monday to Fridays and 09:00 to 13:00 on Saturday with no works been undertaken on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- v. The proposed temporary construction access route should be returned to the condition it was prior to the commencement of development before the completion of the sale of the last dwelling.
- vi. In the interest of social cohesion RPC suggest rather than providing a play area within the application site that the whole community of Roxton would be better served if the developer were to install the play equipment on Roxton Playing Field. Details of which can be agreed with RPC.

In addition to the above RPC wish to express our disappointment that the applicant has not engaged with RPC; we have several questions (listed below) to which we would welcome a written response to:

- a) The Pumping Station. Where will it pump to? Already when it rains the sewerage works overflow to the ditches down School Lane and Ford Lane.
- b) Since the water table is high and the site low lying and with the high density housing with only soakaways mentioned, flooding would seem inevitable. This could be both on site and School Lane.
- c) Are the constructors signing the Considerate Constructors Scheme to make sure the site is kept secure and clean. Can beepers be silenced.
- d) Could a No Access to Site for Construction traffic be erected at the North end of High Street North.

**Cllr Justin Griffiths**

Chair of Roxton Parish Council