



MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN THE COMMUNITY ROOM, GREENACRE CENTRE, VALERIAN WAY, STOTFOLD, SG5 4HG ON WEDNESDAY 4 JUNE 2025 AT 19:00

Present:

Cllr L Anderson (Chair), Cllr S Buck, Cllr S Dhaliwal, Cllr J Headington, Cllr L Miller, Cllr J Smith (ex officio)

Apologies:

Cllr J Bendell, Cllr M Cooper (Vice Chair), Cllr J Hyde, Cllr B Woods.

Also Present:

Cllr N Venneear – Non-Committee Member
Emma Payne – Town Clerk
Sian v d Merwe – Democratic Services Manager
2 members of the public – 1 in person and 1 online

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs Bendell, Cooper, Hyde and Woods.

Decision: It was **RESOLVED** to accept the apologies for absence from Cllrs Bendell, Cooper, Hyde and Woods.

2. DISCLOSURES OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

3. PUBLIC SECTION (MAX. 15 MINUTES)

The member of the public in attendance addressed the Committee and pointed out that neither the developers nor Central Bedfordshire Council appear to have provided details related to the testing proposals on water and sewage supplies for CB/24/03066/OUT and CB/24/03068/OUT. He noted that the following concerns are all still relevant: new builds will aggravate flooding instances at number 19, the current medical infrastructure at Larksfield Surgery cannot cope with its current patient load and promises were made to the buyers of the properties already in situ that the land would only be used for business use.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on **21 May 2025** were reviewed. Members resolved that the minutes were a correct record.

Decision: Members **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on **21 May 2025** were a correct record.

5. CLERK'S REPORT, CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AND MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES, FOR INFORMATION

Nothing to discuss.



6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

6.1 CB/24/03066/OUT - Land North of A507 Angelica Avenue, Stotfold

Stotfold Town Council's Planning Committee **OBJECT** to this application's most recent consultation on the following grounds:

Overall, whilst the Town Council notes the attempt to partially address concerns, the new layout is less appealing. The Town Council welcomes the reduction in units to 28 and appreciates that this is an outline application so the final layout can be updated but we are looking to ensure that indicative layouts will be able to work at outline stage to help inform the Reserved Matters layout. Additional comments are as follows:

- The cycle route has been replaced by a pedestrian route and the Town Council requests cycle access be retained as shown in the DAS.
- Even though the latest proposal has reduced the proposed number of houses to 28, this still brings the total of units on the estate over the 650 units permitted in the original application - which would therefore put significant further pressure on roads and there is already insufficient parking.
- Despite the noise rebuttal by the Applicant's Surveyor, there remain significant noise concerns associated with houses adjacent to the A507. In the noise rebuttal letter reference is made to the buildings of the development themselves used to provide noise screening, and that residents will have access to the nearby public amenity space on Sorrel Drive and near Prince Charles Avenue (Stotfold Mill Meadows) where much lower noise levels would be expected. This is surely not acceptable to expect someone to have to seek peace and quiet away at such a distance from their own home?
- Stotfold Town Council has run a public consultation on a Wheeled Facility at the Greenacre Centre and previously requested that this be added to the Constraints Plan – however, the applicant has still failed to show this in the DAS.
- The Town Council supports CBC's MANOP Older People Team request that the applicant consider the Council's evidenced need for 23% of planned housing growth to be suitable for older people when designing this scheme.
- All S106 funding needs to be ringfenced for Stotfold only and the Town Council should be consulted on where that funding should be allocated.
- The Town Council echoes Ivel Drainage Board's concerns over balancing ponds which will be likely to flood, thereby adding additional pressure on the Pix catchment. The latest response from the Applicant has not addressed Ivel Drainage Board's concerns.
- The Town Council seeks to underline that additional pressure on already overextended local infrastructure - including medical facilities, local and public transport needs, electricity supply and telecommunications – all of which have not been addressed.
- The Town Council has safety concerns over entry to the site via Tansy Avenue, which could conflict with the exit from the A507 roundabout - improved visibility is required. The new layout has addressed this resulting in a cross-roads with Willowherb Way. The Town Council would like to know if Central Bedfordshire Council's Highways division are supportive of this proposal?
- Failure to demonstrate 10% biodiversity net gain - despite the DAS incorrectly referring to a 0.08 habitat unit loss, the updated EclA claims a loss of 0.43 habitat units, equating to 18.66%. Nowhere near a gain, let alone 10%.

The Town Council has requested, on two separate occasions, that it would welcome working in consultation with the Developer and designer on a suitable design. To date,



there has been no approach to the Town Council to meet to discuss any of the concerns raised.

6.2 CB/24/03068/OUT – Land North of A507 Speedwell Way, Stotfold

Members considered a response to the re-consultation request received from Central Bedfordshire Council on 29 May 2025.

Stotfold Town Council's Planning Committee **OBJECT** to this application's most recent consultation on the following grounds:

- Even though the latest proposal has kept the proposed number of houses at 30 units, this still brings the total of units on the estate over the 650 units permitted in the original application - which would therefore put significant further pressure on roads and there is already insufficient parking.
- There has been no attempt made to reduce the number of units, to increase the green space or reduce the ecological losses. Additionally, this still represents overdevelopment of the estate – 650 units were permitted; this proposal will take the number of units over the original permit – therefore putting significant further pressure on roads and there is already insufficient parking.
- The Town Council still has significant noise concerns associated with houses adjacent to the A507. The Applicant's Surveyor sent a noise rebuttal where reference is made to future investigation of whether worthwhile benefit is offered by a noise barrier along the site boundary with the A507 but also localised fencing and other elements of the layout design if appropriate. The Town Council would be concerned over the scale of such fencing and its impact on character of the area.
- STC appreciates that this is an outline application but we need to be sure that indicative layouts will be able to work at outline to help inform the Reserved Matters layout.
- The Town Council supports CBC's MANOP Older People Team request that the applicant consider the Council's evidenced need for 23% of planned housing growth to be suitable for older people when designing this scheme.
- All S106 funding needs to be ringfenced for Stotfold only and the Town Council should be consulted on where that funding should be allocated.
- The Town Council echoes IDB concerns over balancing ponds which will be likely to flood adding additional pressure on the Pix catchment. The latest response from the Applicant has not addressed Ivel Drainage Board's concerns.
- The Town Council seeks to underline that additional pressure on already overextended local infrastructure - including medical facilities, local and public transport needs, electricity supply and telecommunications – all of which have not been addressed.
- Failure to demonstrate 10% biodiversity net gain. The Town Council notes that the latest designs have increased from 47% loss of biodiversity to 59.96% loss of biodiversity, which is an extensive loss. This could be reduced by retaining more open space on site.
- Parking concerns – people will want to park in front of their houses so provision should be made. No additional parking spaces have been provided in this latest design, rather they have been reallocated around the development, with the units on Speedwell Way now all having 3 on plot spaces shown per unit.
- Should the application be approved by CBC, the Town Council requests that double yellow lines be added to the Speedwell Way junction to prevent cars from parking on that junction and to facilitate access to the road by waste vehicles and emergency vehicles.



The Town Council has requested, on two separate occasions, that it would welcome working in consultation with the Developer and designer on a suitable design. To date, there has been no approach to the Town Council to meet to discuss any of the concerns raised.

7. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES, RELEVANT TO THIS COMMITTEE ONLY

There were none.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To be confirmed.

The meeting ended at 19:19.

SIGNED BY CHAIRMAN:

MINUTES APPROVED (date):