

## ITEM 6(a)

**Application Number:** 19/00420/FUL

**Description** Erection of a Class A1 retail foodstore, car parking, access, landscaping and associated engineering works

**At Land** At Wolverton Road, Blakelands, Milton Keynes, MK14 5AA

**For** Lidl UK GmbH

**Statutory Target:** 21.05.2019

**Extension of Time:** Yes – 12.09.2019

**Ward:** Newport Pagnell North and Hanslope

**Parish:** Great Linford Parish Council

**Report Author/Case Officer:** Christopher Walton  
Senior Planning Officer

**Contact Details:** 01908 253435  
christopher.walton@milton-keynes.gov.uk

**Team Manager:** Sarah Hine – Development Management Manager  
sarah.hine@milton-keynes.gov.uk

### 1.0 RECOMMENDATION

1.1 It is recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions set out in this report and completion of a S106 agreement.

### 2.0 INTRODUCTION

#### The Site

2.1 The application site is a 1.13ha area of land located on the northern side of Wolverton Road, Blakelands and forms the eastern part of a larger area of grazing land that lies between Redhouse Park and the M1 overbridge. The eastern side site also includes a private access road off Wolverton Road, and a small section of land associated with CMG Recovery Solutions. A small amount of the junction of this private access road is adopted highway, and the red line site area includes the verge and existing footpath (not a Public Right of Way) on the southern boundary, which is designated as adopted highway.

2.2 The site is bordered to the east by a strip of mature landscaping, beyond which lies the M1 overbridge. To the north, the site is neighboured by existing employment facilities associated with CMG Recovery Solutions, while immediately to the west there is an expanse of additional grazing land which distinguishes the site from the

aforementioned housing estate known as Redhouse Park. To the south, beyond the highway, lies further residential development along Wolverton Road.

- 2.3 The site forms part of a larger area designated as a strategic development site referred to within Plan:MK as 'The Walnuts' and is allocated in Policy SD18. The Parameters Plan accompanying the policy, which covers a total 3.35ha, stipulates that, broadly, the development comprise a mix of retail and/or employment uses toward the eastern side of the site, bordering the M1, with residential development allocated on the western side.
- 2.4 The application site includes a majority of the indicative allocation of retail / employment land, save an area located to the north-east corner. The site also includes a small section of the eastern most portion of land which the Parameters Plan indicates is for housing.

### The Proposal

- 2.5 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a Class A1 retail foodstore with a GIA (gross internal area) of 2,214sqm (gross external area (GEA) of 2,318 sqm), car parking, access, landscaping and associated engineering works. A total of 167 car parking spaces is proposed, along with 36 cycle spaces.
- 2.6 The foodstore would be located within the eastern portion of the site, with the car park located to the west. The use of the existing private access to the site off Wolverton Road, which runs along its eastern boundary, would be discontinued through the implementation of the development, with a new access road serving the store formed toward the south-west corner of the site. The proposed development also includes an extension to the existing redway between the application site and the signalised crossing to the east of Giffard Park roundabout. This connection would upgrade the existing footpath which runs along the southern boundary of the site. This upgrading of the redway is within adopted highway land, and would therefore need separate consent under S278 highway agreement.

### Background

- 2.7 It is noted that a proposal for an A1 food store was submitted in March 2018 (ref: 18/00522/FUL) within the vicinity of the current application site. The proposal concerned the land west to the application site which has since been formally allocated for the purposes of housing as part of the overall strategic development site.
- 2.8 This was determined at the Development Control Committee on 05.07.2018 prior to the formal adoption of Plan:MK in March 2019 which subsequently superseded the Milton Keynes Core Strategy (adopted 2013) and Saved Policies associated with the 2005 Adopted Local Plan. The application was refused by Members, against Officer recommendation for approval, on the following grounds:
1. Failure to accord with the retail hierarchy as set out in the Core Strategy 2013 and would thus be harmful to the vitality and viability of existing town, district and local centres.

2. Contrary to the (then emerging) allocation within Plan:MK for residential use.
3. Conflict between HGV service vehicles and customers which would be detrimental to highway safety.

#### Reason for referral of current application to committee

- 2.9 The application has been referred to committee by the Case Officer who, as per Part A(2) of the 'Limitation on Delegated Authority' set out in the 'Officer Delegation Scheme for Development Management Matters', has deemed the application to be of a controversial nature by virtue of the decision taken by Development Control Committee on 05.07.2018 to refuse application 18/00522/FUL for a foodstore on an adjacent site.

#### Scope of debate/decision

- 2.10 This application proposal is a full planning application and so all matters are to be considered.

### **3.0 RELEVANT POLICIES**

#### **National Policy**

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (NPPF)

Section 2: Achieving Sustainable Development

Section 4: Decision-Making

Section 5: Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes

Section 6: Building a Strong Competitive Economy

Section 9: Promoting Sustainable Transport

Section 12: Achieving Well-Designed Places

Section 14: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Section 15: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

In addition, the National Planning Practice Guidance is also a material consideration

#### **The Development Plan**

- 3.2 Neighbourhood Plan

Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (made 2016)  
"GLNPN" forms part of statutory development plan.

GLPC N9 – Trees, hedgerows and planting

GLPC N11 - New development - accessibility, getting around and biodiversity

GLPC N13 - Proposals for larger scale employment and enterprise

GLPC N14B - Major developments in strategic locations

GLPC N16 - Proposals relating to retail and commercial frontages and signs

### 3.3 Plan:MK (March 2019)

Plan:MK was adopted at Council on 20 March 2019 and now forms part of the statutory development plan for Milton Keynes, and includes the Policies Map that indicates land use in the Borough.

Policy SD18 - The Walnuts, Redhouse Park  
Policy ER10 - Assessing Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Proposals  
Policy CT1 - Sustainable Transport Network  
Policy CT2 - Movement and Access  
Policy CT3 - Walking and Cycling  
Policy CT4 - Crossover on Redways  
Policy CT5 - Public Transport  
Policy CT10 - Parking Provision  
Policy EH7 - Promoting Healthy Communities  
Policy FR1 - Managing Flood Risk  
Policy FR2 - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) and Integrated Flood Risk  
Policy NE2 - Protected Species and Priority Species and Habitats  
Policy NE3 - Biodiversity and Geological Enhancement  
Policy NE6 - Environmental Pollution  
Policy D1 - Designing a High Quality Place  
Policy D2 - Creating a Positive Character  
Policy D3 - Design of Buildings  
Policy D5 - Amenity and Street Scene  
Policy CC1 - Public Art  
Policy SC1 - Sustainable Construction  
Policy SC2 - Community Energy Networks and Large Scale Renewable Energy Schemes

### 3.4 Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance

Milton Keynes Parking Standards (adopted 2016)  
Sustainable Construction (adopted 2007)

### 3.5 Human Rights Act 1998

There may be implications under Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol regarding the right of respect for a person's private and family life and home, and to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. However, these potential issues are in this case amply covered by consideration of the environmental impact of the application under the policies of the development plan and other relevant policy guidance.

## **4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 18/00522/FUL - Land At Wolverton Road, Blakelands, Milton Keynes, MK14 5AA  
Erection of a Class A1 retail foodstore, car parking, access, landscaping and associated engineering works  
Refused 18 July 2018

## 5.0 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

### 5.1 Great Linford Parish Council

#### **Initial comments (received 11.03.2019)**

GLPC agreed to make no objections to the application but agreed that if MKC were minded to approve the application then 9 changes/conditions should be confirmed or included on a decision notice. These changes / conditions referred to issues concerning:

1. Deliveries outside of operating hours to adopt quiet-out-of-hours delivery methodologies
2. External lighting to be altered so as to minimise overspill onto residential areas
3. Providing 3 powered two wheeler [PTW] parking bays
4. Support providing 2 Level 3 fast chargers, providing they are equipped for multi-standard charging sockets.
5. Provision of 24-hours CCTV
6. Consideration given to width of the verge between the adopted highway and redway
7. Proposed opening hours should not be for more than 6 consecutive hours between 10am and 6pm and should be closed on Easter Sunday and Christmas Day.
8. Information on Traffic Survey should be revisited
9. Highway Officer should confirm that the 2017 turning count survey results of October 2017 and November 2018 and the automatic traffic counts and speed surveys of November 2017/December 2018 provide a suitable up-to-date base line for the summary and conclusions in the Transport Assessment.

#### **Additional comments made following a meeting between the Applicant and GLPC on the 18.04.2019 and subsequent amendments to the application (received 31.07.2019)**

At the GLPC meeting on the 31st July 2019; Council confirmed that it has no objections to the applications 19/00420/FUL Land At Wolverton Road Blakelands MK14 5AA.

Council also agreed the wording for the Public Art S 106 contribution as follows:

#### **SECTION 106 CONTRIBUTION FOR PUBLIC ART**

“Public Art Contribution means the sum of Twenty thousand pounds (£20,000.00) Index Linked payable to the Council to be spent in accordance with the Arts and Public Art Strategy specifically on a public art project agreed between MKC public arts team, the Parish Council and residents of Redhouse Park; within the Development or within the immediate vicinity of the Development, in accordance with Policy CC1 of PLAN:MK 2016-2031 (adopted 2019).”

5.2 Cllr George Bowyer – Newport Pagnell North and Hanslope

No comments received. (Councillor Bowyer had not been elected when consultation on this application was undertaken and therefore was not consulted of the proposal; no comments were received from his predecessor).

5.3 Cllr Andrew Geary– Newport Pagnell North and Hanslope (Member of the Development Control Committee)

No comments received.

5.4 Cllr Bill Green – Newport Pagnell North and Hanslope

No comments received.

5.5 MKC Highways

**Initial comments (received 18.03.2019)**

Although the TA does have some issues in the assessment of traffic, these are minor and the conclusion of the TA is accepted.

The proposed frontage Redway needs to be extended further west to meet the Redway at the signal-controlled crossing.

The proposed access junction with Wolverton Road requires a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit prior to consent being granted. Either the applicant should submit the Audit for MKC to review, or the Road Safety Team may be able to carry out the Audit.

The cycle parking provision does not include 12 spaces for staff, these should be shown on revised proposals in a secure, covered location. The provision for EV spaces should be increased from 2 to 3 and the plans should include 3 dedicated PTW spaces, with anchor points.

Changes to the parking provision should be shown on revised plans; however, they could be covered by suitable condition if that were deemed appropriate.

**Additional comments made following submission of additional information / revised plans (received 17.05.2019)**

No objection to the development subject to the provision of the Redway link to the Giffard Park roundabout and the relocation of the customer cycle parking to the western end of the building (i.e. next to the store entrance)- to be covered by condition along with other conditions for the staff cycle parking and the approval of the new junction.

5.6 MKC Flood and Water Management Officer (Lead Local Flood Authority)

**Initial comments (received 17.04.2019)**

Objection to the proposed development of the LIDL store (Blakelands) on Wolverton Road as the proposed method of surface water disposal is via an Anglian Water Services Sewer. Recent flood investigations completed by the LLFA and the current Independent Review into the May 2018 floods has identified that there is no capacity in the sewer network to accommodate any additional run-off volumes. The LLFA note that a stormwater storage system has been incorporated within the development, however this not sufficient given that there is no capacity within Anglian Waters stormwater network to accommodate additional volumes.

The LLFA have identified that properties located below the site and further down on Wolverton Road have flooded 3 times over the past five years, the Flood Risk Assessment developed by SCP dated January 2019 mentions off site risk. However, the Flood Risk Assessment makes no reference to internal property flooding within the immediate vicinity of this site.

**Additional comments made following submission of additional information / revised plans (received 16.07.2019)**

No objection subject to condition to secure drainage strategy. The proposal for the store is acceptable should be constructed in accordance with the agreed rate of 2 l/s and the proposals discussed and agreed with the LLFA.

5.7 MKC Landscape Architect

No objection, subject to the amendments to layout to incorporate a greater land budget of soft landscape and conditions to concerning boundary treatments and a landscape / ecological enhancement scheme.

5.8 MKC Countryside Officer

**Initial comments (received 26.06.2019)**

Requested additional information including a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA); ecological surveys; completed Biological Impact Assessment; biodiversity offset proposal; biodiversity offset site management plan to demonstrate appropriate management of the site

**Additional comments made following submission of additional information / revised plans (17.07.2019)**

Content for permission to be granted in relation to ecology and biodiversity off-setting. In this case a PEA will not be required.

## 5.9 Environmental Health

### **Initial comments (received 09.07.2019)**

“I’m satisfied that this is acceptable based on the report. However is it possible to restrict night time delivery vehicles to those that have white noise reversing alarms only?”

I have no issue with the opening hours of the store.”

### **Additional comments made following submission of additional information / revised plans (received 06.08.2019)**

“Matt and I have looked at the summary and don’t foresee any problems with the scheme based on the low lux levels predicted at nearby properties, also with external lights being turned off when the store is closed. If complaints are received in the future we will undertake a nuisance investigation including visits to check if light from the development is causing a problem.”

## 5.10 Economic Development

Supports job creation as a result of the application. Notes the employment numbers listed as 20 full time equivalent, and elsewhere noted as up to 40 jobs created, indicating that a number of these will be part-time. Would welcome engagement from the applicant to ensure that employment and skills benefits are maximised and encourages the application to engage with the Neighbourhood Employment Programme to support local recruitment.

## 5.11 Development Plans

Site is designated as ‘Shopping and Leisure Proposed’ and adjacent to housing site HS28, and together subject to site specific policy SD18 (The Walnuts, Redhouse Park). The ‘Shopping and Leisure Proposed’ element is also allocated for provision of a new Local Centre under Policy ER14 ‘New Local Centres.’

The proposed development overlaps onto the housing allocation – however this is an indicative parameter plan, and is not a detailed development brief. The proposal does not restrict the west side of the site coming forward for residential use, and provides the access to these areas to facilitate it.

Policy SD18 requires a development brief to be adopted prior to permission being granted. However, planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise, and it is up to the decision maker to determine the material considerations to determine this application without the development brief in place.

The proposed development would allow the wider site principles to be delivered and does not prevent the remainder of the site being development for housing.

Paragraph 6.56 of Plan:MK, “Local centres include new purpose built centres ranging from an individual corner shop, to larger centres containing 15-20 units”. The provision of one retail unit at this location is therefore consistent with Policy ER14.

#### 5.12 Thames Valley Crime Prevention

No comments received.

#### 5.13 Neighbour/ Third Party Representations

Further to the neighbour letters that were issued to adjoining properties, additional letters were sent to parties who contributed towards the consultation process regarding the application for a foodstore on the adjacent site. These additional letters were issued on 5<sup>th</sup> August and any comments that may arise from this additional consultation will be dealt with by way of an updated paper.

Representations have been received from 15 addresses and 1 from an unspecified address on Miles Close.

11 of the representations were made in objection to the proposal, while a further 2 did not explicitly oppose the application but did raise concerns regarding its impact.

The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Impact on local traffic
- Impact on ability for development to come forward on the other half of the site
- Impact on local businesses
- The proposal does not accord with the retail hierarchy (as per the 2013 Core Strategy)
- Proposal exceeds boundary of land designated for retail
- Noise from operation
- Visually overbearing and out of keeping with surrounding development
- Light pollution
- Impact on road safety
- Insufficient landscaping
- Request for more pedestrian safety features
- Overdevelopment
- Proposal does not meet description of a ‘Local Centre’
- A retail impact survey should be required
- Opening hours
- Operational hours
- Flooding
- Impact on surrounding bus stops
- Lack of Public Art proposals
- Vermin control
- HGV movements
- Crime
- Parking
- Air pollution

- Quality/accuracy of information within the application
- Impact on ecology / local wildlife
- Loss of open space
- Location of access

3 of the representations were made in support of the proposal on the grounds that it would be beneficial for the local community and would provide a greater variety of retail outlets in the area.

Other issues were raised within the comments received. These issues are not material to the consideration of the application and can be summarised as follows:

- Impact on domestic cats
- Attraction of homeless people
- Attraction of skip divers
- Criticism of how Lidl develop their sites
- Attraction of local YOBS

## **6.0 MAIN ISSUES**

Principle of Development  
 Parking and Highway Matters  
 Design / Materials  
 Impact on Character and Appearance of the Area  
 Impact on Residential Amenity  
 Ecology and Biodiversity  
 Flood Risk and Drainage  
 Sustainable Construction  
 S106 Contributions

## **7.0 CONSIDERATIONS**

### Principle of development

- 7.1 Policy SD18 of Plan:MK allocates the application site as part of a strategic development site, known as 'The Walnuts'. The site is allocated for a mix of retail and/or employment and residential uses, with the former located predominantly toward the eastern side of the site.
- 7.2 The broad demarcation of these uses across the strategic development site is informed by a Parameters Map which accompanies the Policy. The Policy sets out that prior to the granting of planning permission on the site, a development brief is to be prepared and adopted by MKC. This development brief has not yet been prepared. The Policy also sets out several principles that should inform the basis of the development brief, including the provision of a single access from Wolverton Road, to serve both the residential and retail and/or employment uses and the enhancement of the existing footpath adjacent to the southern boundary of the site to a redway. In this respect the application complies with these parameters.

- 7.3 It is noted that the Council's Planning Policy officers have noted that while the application should be determined in accordance with the development plan and specific policies (in this case, not granting permission before a development brief is adopted) it is up to the decision-maker to determine whether material planning considerations (i.e. the benefits of the scheme) indicate otherwise. Therefore, the fact that the development brief has not been adopted, does not automatically preclude permission being granted for this development, provided the consideration of the planning balance is acceptable.
- 7.4 Further, Policy ER14 (A8) allocates the application site as part of a new local centre for Redhouse Park, which is to be established in accordance with the criteria set out within the abovementioned policy. It is noted, in the supporting text to this Policy, that a local centre can comprise of an individual corner shop, to larger centres containing 15-20 units; and smaller, older centres in the larger settlements incorporated within the city.
- 7.5 Policy ER10 states that proposals for retail development that are outside a defined Town Centre, and which are not on sites that are specifically allocated for such uses, will be subject to an impact assessment as set out by national planning policy. Paragraph 89 of the NPPF reinforces this Policy, while also distinguishing that a retail proposal which does not accord with an up to date plan should be subject to an impact assessment.
- 7.6 The proposed development broadly accords with the Parameters Map accompanying Policy SD18 by virtue of being focused towards the eastern side of the strategic development site. While it is acknowledged that the development would extend into the portion of the site that the Parameters Map indicates would be for residential use, it should be noted that the Map is an indicative representation of the division of uses across the site. It should also be noted that the area of the site which overlaps into the housing allocation consists of the access road, which would be required as access for future housing, and some of the parking spaces.
- 7.7 The application satisfactorily conveys how the residential portion of the site could come forward via subsequent proposals in line with the principles associated with Policy SD18, while also evidencing that the scheme for the retail store would not prejudice this prospective future development. For clarity, the Policy does not stipulate that a single application inclusive of the development of the entire strategic development site is required in order to meet the requirements of the Policy. It is accepted that the concept masterplans submitted by the applicant adequately convey that this proposal would enable further development across the strategic development site in a manner that would meet the aims of Policy SD18.
- 7.8 Crucially, the proposal includes a single access taken off of Wolverton Road to the south which is shown as being able to serve future residential development. This is in addition to a commitment to upgrading the existing footpath, adjacent to the front of the site, to create a continuous redway between Redhouse Park and the M1 Overbridge.

- 7.9 In regard to the site's additional designation as a local centre, as the supporting text to Policy ER10 identifies, new local centres can consist of an individual shop. Furthermore, as the concept masterplans evidence, the proposal would not prejudice additional retail units from being developed in the future within what would be the remaining eastern side of the strategic development site, which could facilitate the increase the total number of retail units.
- 7.10 For these reasons it is considered that the development would, on balance, be acceptable in principle. In light of this, and indeed the site's retail allocation within Plan:MK, the need for a retail impact assessment to be provided to justify the effect of the development on existing town, district and local centres, including Newport Pagnell Town Centre, is not required. Policy ER10 of Plan:MK sets out that retail proposals, which are located on sites allocated for that use, would not need to demonstrate compliance with either the sequential or impact tests. Therefore, it is deemed that the proposal would accord with Policies SD18, ER14 and ER10 of Plan:MK.

#### Parking and Highway Matters

- 7.11 Policies GLPC N11 and GLPC N13 of the GLNPN state that new developments must include appropriate provisions for both the movement of all types of vehicles and links to existing 'redways'. The policies also states that proposals should provide appropriate on-site parking, in accordance with the Milton Keynes Parking Standards SPD (the Standards), and be well connected to existing or proposed local transport routes. Policy GLPC N13 specifically notes that proposals must not adversely impact upon road safety.
- 7.12 Policy CT1 of Plan:MK states that the Council will promote a sustainable pattern of development within Milton Keynes that will promote sustainable modes of transport.
- 7.13 Policy CT2 (A4) seeks to ensure that development is designed to accommodate safe access and adequate vehicle movement, while also ensuring that schemes promote safe and secure pedestrian and cycle routes. Policy CT4 pertains exclusively to crossover on redways and states that any such crossovers should be safety implemented.
- 7.14 Policies CT10 and CT6 highlight the need for development to accord with the Milton Keynes Parking Standards (adopted 2016) in respect of the quantity of parking provision to support development, including Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points, unless mitigating circumstances dictate otherwise.

#### *Parking*

- 7.15 The associated car park is shown to accommodate 167 parking spaces, including 10 disabled spaces, 10 parent and child spaces and 2 fast-charging EV charging points. 24 cycle spaces have also been provided adjacent to the south facing elevation 12 staff cycle parking spaces have been provided internally within the food store.

- 7.16 The quantity and layout of the car and cycle parking spaces are deemed acceptable. Whilst the development would require 166 spaces, as per the Standards, it delivers a total of 167 spaces.
- 7.17 The plans do not provide any spaces for powered two-wheelers (PTW), while three are required by the Standards (when rounding up). However, it is understood that, given the quantity of on-site parking that is being provided, the Highway Officer is content that PTWs can park in the car parking spaces without significant conflict with other vehicles, and this is considered acceptable on balance.
- 7.18 It is noted that the proposal only includes 2 EV charging points, as opposed to the 3 required by the Standards. However, it is recognised that for this type of retail use, with only one store available, members of the public are likely to stay for only a short period, likely to be less than an hour. In this context, a standard EV charging point is unlikely to be as beneficial as a fast-charging point which can deliver accelerated charging over a shorter period of time. It is also recognised that the short 'dwell time' will also ensure a relatively quick turnover of spaces, which will help to limit the overall demand for the spaces served by the charging points. Therefore provision 2 rapid-charging spaces instead of 3 "standard" EV points, is considered acceptable.
- 7.19 The location of the 24 customer cycle spaces was amended to be closer to the western end of the south-facing elevation so as to increase passive surveillance, and the location is therefore considered acceptable.
- 7.20 A summary of the parking requirement, in accordance with the Standards for a 2,318 sqm (GEA) A1 food retail store, is set out below:

	<b>Parking Standards Requirement - Zone 3</b>	<b>Provided</b>
<b>Type</b>	<b>On site spaces</b>	<b>On site spaces</b>
Total car parking spaces	1 per 14 sqm (166 spaces total (165.6))	167 spaces
Accessible spaces	6% of provision (10 spaces (10.0))	10 accessible spaces
Electric vehicle (EV) charging points	2 charging points per 100 spaces + 1 charging point per additional 100 (3 spaces)	2 spaces
<b>Site Total</b>	<b>166 spaces required, including 10 accessible spaces and 3 EV points</b>	<b>167 space provided, including 10 accessible and 2 EV points</b>
Powered two-wheeler (PTW)	1 space per 70 car parking spaces (3 spaces total (2.4))	0 spaces
Cycle Parking - employee	1 per 200 sqm or 1 per 10 FTE staff (12 spaces (11.59 or 2))	12 staff spaces (internal to building)
Cycle parking - visitor	1 per 100sqm (24 spaces (23.18))	24 customer spaces
<b>Site Total</b>	<b>3 PTW spaces + 36 cycle spaces</b>	<b>0 PTW spaces + 36 cycle spaces</b>

### *Access*

- 7.21 The proposal includes vehicular access off Wolverton Road, which would serve both customers and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs).
- 7.22 The Highway Officer has advised that the access had been appropriately designed and that further detail can be assessed via the associated S278 Agreement.
- 7.23 It is observed that access for HGVs within the site would reflect the arrangements proposed within the refused 2018 scheme for a foodstore closer to Redhouse Park (ref: 18/00522/FUL). It is noted that this reason for refusal by the Development Control Committee (DCC) identified conflict of this access with customers and resultant impacts on highway safety. However, the Highway Officer raise no objection to the proposal in this regard. As was the case during the assessment of this previous application, the Highway Officer, although accepting of the fact that the arrangement is not ideal, does not object to the scheme on these grounds and has advised that such a reason for refusal would be unlikely to be successful at appeal. Indeed, it is noted that the supporting 'Safety Audit Technical Note' submitted with the application has expressed that the proposal is consistent with how Lidl operates across the majority of its 750 UK stores with little incident.

### *Traffic*

- 7.24 The application has been supplemented with a Transport Assessment [TA] and a Safety Audit Technical Note, which was revised following the comments from the Highway Officer.
- 7.25 While it is noted that concerns have been raised by third parties regarding the validity of the evidence underpinning the TA, the Highway Officer has commented that the conclusion reached therein, that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the highway network, is accepted.

### *Redway*

- 7.26 It is noted that Great Linford Parish Council have raised concerns regarding the width of the verge associated with the proposed redway extension and the upgrading of the existing footpath to a redway along the southern boundary.
- 7.27 As per the detail associated with the access, the Highway Officer has advised that the precise construction details and layout of the redway should be addressed via the S278 process as the balance between safety and convenience of the redway can only be considered in full when the scheme is audited during the technical highways process. The Planning Officer agrees with this conclusion, as the redway is shown on the site layout, and the provision of the redway, within the adopted highway, will require a S278 agreement to be agreed. However, in order to secure the provision of the redway prior to the occupation of the store, the details and implementation will be required by condition.

### *Bus Stops*

- 7.28 The Parish Council also sought clarity on whether or not the existing bus stop adjacent to the south-east corner of the application site could remain in use following the upgrading of the footpath to a redway.
- 7.29 The Highway Officer has confirmed that, subject to certain modifications to the existing bus stop, it could remain in use and operate safely after the footpath has been upgraded to a redway. It is suggested that these modifications should also be addressed via the S278 Agreement and, given the nature of this matter, this is considered to be appropriate.
- 7.30 For these reasons it is deemed that the proposal would, on balance, be acceptable in regard to parking and other highway matters. Therefore, it is deemed that the proposal would accord with Policies GLPC N11 and N13 of the GLNPN and Policies CT1, CT2, CT3, CT4, CT6 and CT10 of Plan:MK.

### Design and Layout

- 7.31 Policies D1-D3 of Plan:MK state that the design of new development should possess, and be of, good design and be appropriately accessible for all members of the public. In particular, the Policies draw attention to the need for a building's form, massing, rhythm and facade elements to be designed to create character and visual interest, in addition to responding appropriately to the site.
- 7.32 The site is configured with most of the built structures located toward the eastern side of the site, which would be occupied by the main foodstore, ancillary delivery bay and plant. The foodstore is orientated with its pedestrian access facing south-westwards onto the associated car park, with areas of green space located round the periphery. The access road, which would enter from the south-west, would sweep around the western boundary of the site to provide access to the area currently occupied by CMG to the north, in addition to access to the store's car park.
- 7.33 In regard to the design of the foodstore, it is noted that it spans the north-east boundary of the site and possess an angled roof that tilts upwards as it projects towards the car park, reaching a maximum of 7m in height. The building would be formed primarily from white cladding at a lower level which transitions to silver cladding further up the building. A large section of glazing has been included on the southern elevation facing on to Wolverton Road.
- 7.34 It is considered that neither the site layout nor the physical design of the foodstore or ancillary structures would contravene the above policy. The focusing of the buildings towards the eastern side of the site creates a sense of cohesion within the development, while also facilitating easy accessibility from the car park. The building itself creates visual interest through the use of the angled roof and use of glazing, but avoids being overtly elaborate through the use of contemporary yet plain materials.

7.35 For these reasons it is considered that the design of the development would be acceptable. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would accord with Policies D1-D3 of Plan:MK in this regard.

#### Impact on Character and Appearance of the Area

7.36 Policy GLPC N9 of the GLNPN states that new developments must provide for suitable additional tree planting where appropriate.

7.37 Policy GLPC N13 states that new developments of 1000 or more sqm must ensure that they are integrated with and complement existing activity in regard to design mass and scale.

7.38 Policy GLPC N16 of the GLNPN states that new developments and signs must not harm the appearance of the area and public safety.

7.39 Policies D1 and D2 note that development will be required to respond appropriately to the site and surrounding context, respect the continuity of the street frontage and utilise landscape and boundary treatments to integrate with and / or enhance those of the surrounding area. This policy is reinforced throughout Section 12 of the NPPF which also emphasises the need for the development to resonate with its local context.

7.40 Policy D3 states that development proposals for new buildings should contribute to, or enhance, a positive character and should be of an appropriate scale.

7.41 The proposed development would be located immediately to the west of the M1 Overbridge and, although it is acknowledged that it coalesces to a degree with the employment development to the north, the development would be separated from Redhouse Park by the remaining undeveloped paddocks to the west.

7.42 It is noted that the majority of other development within the locality is residential in nature, with employment uses located towards the north. The modern vernacular of the residential development at Redhouse Park contrasts with the traditional character of the properties fronting Wolverton Road to the south, although it is acknowledged that the design of both groups of dwellings is significantly influenced by facing brick and white render.

7.43 While it is recognised that the proposal would result in a void between the development and the properties associated with Redhouse Park, this must be considered alongside the remaining designated land covered by Policy SD18. If developed, this would create a continuous pattern of development from the M1 Overbridge to these aforementioned properties. Given that the application is not required to cover the entire allocation, it will result in a temporary gap along the northern frontage of Wolverton Road. However, the proposal would, through providing a suitable access, help facilitate the development of the rest of the allocation, and its impact in this regard is deemed to be acceptable. Ultimately, the proposed development would comply with the principles set within the Parameters Plan in Policy SD18 of Plan:MK.

- 7.44 The use of glazing on the south facing elevation and the soft landscaping, which was revised following comments from the Landscape Officer to include additional planting and further detail regarding the low level plating adjacent to Wolverton Road, would provide a positive frontage to the proposed redway. It would also further soften its impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposed signage, although indicated on the proposed plans, would be subject to separate advertisement consent.
- 7.45 It is considered that the design of the food store would resonate with the modern vernacular of the properties associated with Redhouse Park to the west. Furthermore, while it is recognised that the modern character of the development would contrast to an extent with the properties fronting Wolverton Road to the south, it is observed that some of these properties possess sections of white render which would resonate with design of the foodstore. Moreover, the height of the store would also broadly match these properties, ensuring that the development would not be unduly overbearing.
- 7.46 For these reasons it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on either the character or appearance of the area. Therefore, it is deemed that the proposal would accord with Policies GLPC N9, N13 and N16 of the GLNPN, Policies D1, D2 and D3 of Plan:MK and the aims and objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF.

#### Impact on Residential Amenity

- 7.47 Policy GLPC N13 of the GLNPN states that new developments providing in excess of 1000 sqm of floor space must protect residential amenity.
- 7.48 Policy NE6 of Plan:MK places emphasis on the need for development to consider pollution from air, noise, vibration or lighting.
- 7.49 Policy D5 requires that all proposals should create and protect a good standard of amenity.
- 7.50 Given the proximity of the development to adjacent residential properties it is considered that the scheme would not give rise to unacceptable levels of visual intrusion, loss of sunlight and daylight or privacy. Further, given the proximity of the site and the surrounding residential properties to the M1 overbridge, it is considered that the development would not contribute towards significant increases in pollution via air or vibration. Also, the site is allocated for development and therefore it is reasonable to expect some degree of change in regard to air pollution derived from additional traffic.
- 7.51 In regard to noise, it is noted that the applicant wishes for there to be no restriction on hours for deliveries. A noise impact assessment has been provided with the application to evidence that unregulated operating hours for deliveries, and other operations, would not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise. One of the contributing factors to this is that the scheme has been designed to take deliveries within a designated internal bay, which would limit the noise associated with this activity during unsociable hours. The Environmental Health Officer has requested

that if deliveries are to be allowed overnight white noise alarms should be used by vehicles accessing the site during night time hours. This will be secured by condition.

- 7.52 Opening hours will be secured by condition for the avoidance of doubt. The condition will include a requirement for opening hours to be controlled to 08:00 to 22:00 Monday to Saturday, and between 10:00-17:00 on Sundays. It is recognised that this appears to contravene the '6 consecutive hour' rule for retail units of this size on Sundays, which is enforced by separate legislation. However, given that the applicant is legally obliged to only be open for 6 continuous hours on a Sunday, it is considered reasonable to afford the applicant flexibility to operate for 6 continuous hours on a Sunday between the hours of 10:00 and 17:00.
- 7.53 The scheme has also been accompanied with a lighting scheme. Following the submission of further information regarding the impact of the lighting associated with the development on surrounding residents, no concerns were raised by Environmental Health who concluded that the lighting would not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity, given that the external lighting would be turned off when the store is closed and the low lux levels predicted at nearby properties. It is however recommended that a condition is included to ensure compliance and maintenance of the submitted lighting scheme.
- 7.54 For these reasons it is considered that the scheme would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. Therefore, it is deemed that the proposal accords with Policy GLPC N13 of the GLNPN and Policies NE6 and D5 of Plan:MK.

#### Ecology and Biodiversity

- 7.55 Policy GLPC N13 states that proposals providing in excess of 1000 sqm of floor space must ensure that they do not have either a direct or indirect impact upon areas of local biodiversity importance.
- 7.56 Policy NE2 of Plan:MK states that, where there is a reasonable likelihood of the presence of statutorily protected species or their habitats, development will not be permitted unless it has been demonstrated that the proposed development will not result in a negative impact upon those species and habitats.
- 7.57 Policy NE3 states that development proposals for non-residential floor space in excess of 1000 sqm will be required to use the Defra Metric or locally approved Biodiversity Impact Assessment Metric to demonstrate any loss or gain of biodiversity. The Policy goes on to specify that compensation to address losses in biodiversity off-site should only be considered if it has been evidenced that this harm cannot be avoided or mitigated- in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy- and that any such compensation secure maintenance for the lifetime of the development.
- 7.58 The site is not identified as a priority habitat site and, given its location and historic use as a paddock, is unlikely to harbour significant ecological value. It is also noted that the site is located in a green risk zone for Great Crested Newts.

- 7.59 While it is acknowledged that the initial comments received from the Ecology Officer identified the need for ecological surveys, following further discussions on this matter it was agreed that in this instance a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal would not be required in light of the existing use of the site.
- 7.60 With regard to Policy NE3, it is understood that, currently, the Council does not possess an adopted locally approved Biodiversity Impact Assessment Metric. It is also understood that, at present, Defra are currently undertaking a consultation process to establish how to convert losses of biodiversity into a monetary sum.
- 7.61 Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that the proposal would result in the loss of biodiversity. The applicant has, in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy, adequately evidenced that this loss cannot be avoided or indeed mitigated for on site. Therefore, in order to address this loss, there is a need for a compensatory sum to be provided to off-set this loss elsewhere. In light of the abovementioned circumstances, a compensatory sum of £41,065.22, derived from the costs that would be associated with the enhancement and management of an equivalent area of land over the lifetime of the development, has been reached. The Ecology Officer has agreed that this figure is representative of the financial input needed to off-set the loss of biodiversity on the site.
- 7.62 For these reasons it is considered that the application would accord with Policy GLPC N13 of the GLNPN and Policies NE2 and NE3 of Plan:MK.

#### Flood Risk and Drainage

- 7.63 Policy GLPC N13 of the GLNPN sets out that new developments of 1000sqm or more should provide suitable and adequate drainage, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS).
- 7.64 Policy FR1 of Plan:MK states that all new development must incorporate a surface water drainage system with acceptable flood control and demonstrate that water supply, foul sewerage and sewage treatment capacity is available or can be made available to serve the development.
- 7.65 Policy FR2 emphasises the need for SUDS to be incorporated into new development. The Policy also states that proposals for development within Critical Drainage Catchments, as identified in the Milton Keynes Surface Water Management Plan, should investigate the potential for the scheme to reduce or mitigate existing risk in the surrounding area.
- 7.66 The site is located within a Critical Drainage Catchment. The application has been supplemented with a Flood Risk Assessment and a detailed drainage strategy inclusive of SUDS, which has been amended following the comments received from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).
- 7.67 It is understood that, initially, the LLFA had concerns regarding the proposed discharge rate which was originally proposed to be 5 l/s. However, following revisions to the drainage strategy, the rate was reduced to 2 l/s in accordance with

the comments received from the LLFA. It is noted that, as a consequence, the scheme will likely improve the existing flooding issues further downstream. In light of this, the LLFA confirmed that they had no objection to the proposal subject to a condition securing the implementation of the drainage strategy prior to occupation of the development

- 7.68 For these reasons it is considered that the development would be acceptable in regard to flood risk and drainage. Therefore, the proposal is deemed to accord with Policy GLPC N13 of the GLNPN and Policies FR1 and FR2 of Plan:MK.

#### Sustainable Construction

- 7.69 Policy GLPC N13 of the GLNPN states that new developments over 1000 or more sqm of new floor space must ensure that they achieve high standards of sustainable and low carbon design.
- 7.70 Policy SC1 of Plan:MK outlines the requirements for development in terms of sustainable construction and includes reference to issues such as water use, materials and waste and energy and climate.
- 7.71 Policy SC2 requires development over 1000 sqm to consider the integration of community energy networks. The Policy states that development will be expected to connect to existing or proposed combined heat and power (CHP), combined cooling, heat and power (CCHP) station or local energy network, unless the heating and/or cooling loads of the scheme do not justify a CHP connection.
- 7.72 The applicant has provided a Sustainability Statement to comply with the requirements of Policies SC1 and SC2.
- 7.73 The Statement indicates that the proposal will include means of ensuring the proposed development is energy efficient through the use of appropriate materials and technologies. It is noted that, through these measures, the development would achieve a 20.57% reduction improvement upon the Building Regulations Approved Document Part L (2013). A carbon off-setting contribution is also included within the S106 Agreement and would serve to enable the residual carbon emissions to be off-set by other local initiatives.
- 7.74 The Statement also includes reference to potential integration into community energy networks but concludes that, due to the relatively low heating demand associated with the development, it would not justify a CHP connection.
- 7.75 For these reasons it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable in regard to its sustainability both in terms of its construction and prospective use. Therefore, it is deemed that the proposal would accord with Policy GLPC N13 of the GLNPN and Policies SC1 and SC2 of Plan:MK.

### S106 Contributions

- 7.76 The applicant has agreed to the S106 Contributions for carbon offsetting and public art. An update on the proposed contribution figure will be included in an update paper.
- 7.77 Policy GLPC N14B of the GLNPN states that development of 1000sqm or more of commercial space should include proposals to provide art in the design of that development, which would be provided on site or in strategic points, such as open spaces or roundabouts.
- 7.78 The application has not been supplemented with conceptual proposals to provide art within the application site, and it is considered unlikely that there would be a enough space on the site to provide on-site art. Nevertheless, the S106 contribution for public art would be spent on art projects within the local area, therefore complying with this policy.
- 7.79 These contributions meet the tests for obligations as outlined at paragraph 204 of the NPPF and are in accordance with CIL Regulations 122 and 123, and are therefore considered appropriate and acceptable contribution to offset the impact of the development. They can be secured by way of S106 agreement if the application is approved.

### Other Matters

#### *Vermin Control;*

- 7.80 It is noted that waste is stored internally within the warehouse, rather than externally. The Planning Statement elaborates on this arrangement and states that waste is returned to the distribution centre on a frequent basis by HGVs that visit the store to drop off deliveries. This is considered an acceptable means of managing waste and would be unlikely to have an impact in terms of amenity or attract vermin.

#### *No. of Jobs;*

- 7.81 With reference to job creation, the applicant has clarified that the store would employ 40 members of staff which comprise a mix of full and part time roles. When broken down, these jobs equate to the provision of 20 full-time equivalent jobs.

#### *Accuracy and Quality of the Application;*

- 7.82 The quantity and accuracy of the application and associated documents are deemed sufficient for a determination to be made on the application. Additional information has been sought through the application process, where necessary, to clarify any issues or concerns.

## 8.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 It is considered, on balance, that the application proposes a policy-compliant scheme which would significantly enhance the fulfilment of one of the allocated strategic development sites in Plan:MK. In addition to the creation of retail floor space, the proposal would also take on the burden of establishing an access to facilitate the development of the remainder of the allocated site, while also upgrading the adjacent footpath to a redway. As is detailed above, it is considered that the scheme, on balance, addresses the refusal reasons associated with the 2018 application, while also delivering additional economic benefits via job creation associated with the store.
- 8.2 Overall, the development would both represent sustainable development while also contributing towards the aims and objectives of Plan:MK.

## 9.0 CONDITIONS

### Expiration

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent the accumulation of planning permissions; to enable the Local Planning Authority to review the suitability of the development in the light of altered circumstances; and to comply with section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

### Access

2. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the new access hereby permitted, between the store access and Wolverton Road, shall not be brought into use until it has been laid out and constructed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.

Reason: To ensure that the development can be accessed safely in accordance with Policy CT2 of Plan:MK and Policy GLPC N11 of Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (2016).

### Closure of Existing Access

3. Following the new access being brought in to use, the existing access will be closed up and the frontage redway/verge reinstated in a manner to be agreed as part of the approval of highway works under s.278 of the Highway Act 1980. The date by which the existing access will be closed up shall accord with the Phasing Plan associated with the approved Construction and Environmental Management Plan required by virtue of Condition 11 of this permission.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not result in a proliferation of accesses onto the public highway which would be of detriment to its safe and convenient use by vehicles and pedestrians, in accordance with Policy CT2 of Plan:MK.

#### Redway Details

4. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted details of the proposed redway shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The redway shall be fully constructed and laid out prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason; To ensure that public walking and cycling access is appropriate and safe in accordance with CT2 and CT3 of Plan:MK (2019) and Policy GLPC N11 of Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (2016)..

#### Implementation of Cycle Parking

5. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the cycle parking area shown on the approved drawings shall be constructed, surfaced and permanently marked out. The cycle parking area so provided shall be maintained as a permanent ancillary to the development and shall be used for no other purpose thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of adequate cycle parking in accordance with Policy CT3 and CT10 of Plan:MK (2019) and Policies GLPC N11 of Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (2016).

#### Implementation of Parking

6. Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the car parking area shown on the approved drawings shall be constructed, surfaced and permanently marked out. The car parking area so provided shall be maintained as a permanent ancillary to the development and shall be used for no other purpose thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate provision of car parking associated with the development in accordance with Policy CT10 of Plan:MK and Policies GLPC N11 and N13 of Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (2016).

#### Opening Hours

7. The opening hours of the premises shall be restricted to within the hours of 08:00 - 22:00 Monday to Saturday and 10:00 - 17:00 on Sundays.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the amenity of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy NE6 of Plan:MK.

#### White Noise Alarms

8. Between the hours of 22:00 and 08:00 all vehicles required to use reversing alarms at the site shall use white noise reversing alarms.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the amenity of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy NE6 of Plan:MK and Policy GLPC N13 of Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (2016)..

#### Landscaping Scheme

9. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, the development shall not be occupied until full details of soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in

writing by the local planning authority. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans at a minimum scale of 1:300 with schedules of plants noting species, supply sizes and proposed densities; and a tree planting details drawing. The planting plan shall include use of native species for biodiversity; show existing trees / hedgerows to be retained; existing and proposed finished levels; access road junction visibility splays; position of lights. The location of boundary treatment shall have been designed in conjunction with the landscape proposals to ensure that any required acoustic barriers are well screened behind planting where necessary.

All soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and before the development is first brought into use or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of two years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub, or any tree and shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed, dies, becomes severely damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees and shrubs of equivalent size, species and quantity

Reason: To protect significant trees and hedgerows, safeguarding the character of the area and preserving habitat and to minimise the effect of development on the area in accordance with Policies NE4 and NE5 and Policy D1 of Plan:MK and Policies GLPC N9 and N13 of Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (2016).

#### Boundary Treatments

10. Notwithstanding the approved details, the development shall not be occupied until details of the proposed boundary treatments including location outside of the root protection areas of existing trees / hedges to be retained have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The location of boundary treatment shall have been designed in conjunction with the landscape proposals to ensure that any required acoustic barriers are well screened behind planting where necessary. The approved details shall be erected before the development is first brought into use and thereafter retained in that form.

Reason: To provide adequate privacy, to protect the external character and appearance of the area and to minimise the effect of development on the area in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of Plan:MK (2019).

#### Drainage Strategy

11. The drainage strategy hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and specifications contained within the SCP FRA and ODS report (ref: AP/17509/FRA V2.2) prior to the occupation of the building. If a revised programme is required, the drainage strategy will be carried out in accordance with revised details that are first to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Reason: To ensure satisfactory and sustainable foul and surface water drainage to prevent the increased risk of contamination and flooding on or off site in accordance with Policies FR1 and FR2 of Plan:MK (2019) and Policy GLPC N13 of Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (2016)..

### Construction Management Plan

12. No development, including any works of demolition, shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include site procedures to be adopted during the course of construction including:

- Routes for construction traffic
- Method of prevention of mud being carried onto the highway
- Location of site compound
- Loading and unloading of plant and materials
- The erection and maintenance of security fencing/hoardings and lighting
- Proposed temporary traffic restrictions
- Parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors

The CEMP shall also include a Phasing Plan inclusive of the timescales associated with the closure of the existing access and reinstatement of the redway/verge. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved CEMP, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

To ensure there are adequate mitigation measures in place, in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and in order to protect the amenities of existing and future residents in accordance with Policies CT2 of Plan:MK and Policy GLPC N13 of Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (2016)..

### Sustainable Construction

13. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Sustainability and Energy Statement received on the 10th July 2019.

Reason: To ensure that renewable energy is generated on site in accordance with Policy SC1 of Plan:MK (2019).

14. Lighting Scheme

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Proposed Lighting Layout, DWG01 rev 1 dated: 27/02/19 received: 13 March 2019. No other external lighting shall be implemented at the site.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers in accordance with policy D5 of Plan: MK and Policy GLPC N13 of Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North (2016)..









## **A1.0 FULL CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS**

### **A1.1 Great Linford Parish Council**

#### **Initial comments (11.03.2019)**

##### **CONSIDERATIONS**

1. The relocation of the proposed store to the east meets the requirements of the land use allocation in Policy SD21 of the submission version of Plan: MK
2. Access will support the comprehensive development of the wider site, whether that comprises the expansion and reorganisation of the existing CMG business, or the development of other uses, including housing, in accordance with the objectives of Plan: MK in relation to Site SD21.
3. Core Strategy Policy CS4 states:  
'...Applications for retail and other main town centre uses outside of existing centres will only be permitted if they satisfy NPPF sequential and impact tests.'  
The Officer's report for the previous application concluded:  
"Taking into account the applicants' qualitative assessment and quantitative data and assessment provided by Carter Jonas in the Milton Keynes Retail Capacity & Leisure Study 2018, it is considered that the proposals would not harm the vitality and viability of any Town, District or Local centre. This is due to a combination of factors, including:
  - The lack of direct competition between a limited assortment discount food store and the smaller and generally more specialised stores in Newport Pagnell and surrounding local centres which cater for day to day and 'top up' shopping needs as opposed to 'main food' shopping.
  - Newport Pagnell Town Centre is considered to be a healthy and viable centre which is performing well with convenience floor space comprising a relatively small percentage of its overall retail composition
  - Based on the centres identified as being affected generally catering for day to day as opposed to main shopping needs, a large proportion of residents in these areas are already likely to travel further afield for their weekly shopping needs.
4. A total of 167 customer parking spaces will provided including: 10 spaces designed to mobility standard, 10 allocated for parent and child and 2 EV charging points.
5. 24 Cycle spaces are provided, close to the front of the store entrance.
6. A dedicated servicing/deliveries bay is located along the store's northern boundary. There will be up to two dedicated deliveries per day, and up to three per day at peak periods of the year (Christmas and Easter). All deliveries will be undertaken by 16.5m articulated HGVs.
7. The store opening times will be 07:00 to 23:00 7 days a week and Bank Holidays.
8. A Redway will be constructed along Wolverton Road from Redhouse Park to the M1 Motorway Bridge.
9. The two bus stops close to the M1 Motorway Bridge are to be removed.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Council makes no objections to the Application.
2. If MKC are minded to approve the application then the following changes/conditions should be confirmed or included in a decision notice:
  - I. Deliveries outside operating hours to adopt Quiet Out-of-hours Delivery methodologies.
  - II. External lighting to be directional programmable LED flood lighting, tuned to minimise overspill onto residential areas, and to be turned off, or to be dimmed outside store opening/operating hours.
  - III. To provide 3 Powered Two Wheeler parking bays, with anchor points within 50 metres of the store to dissuade use of car parking bays by motorcyclists.
  - IV. GLPC would support having only two Level 3 fast chargers; provided they are equipped for multi standard charging sockets to charge any CCS, CHAdeMO EV or AC vehicle.
  - V. The closeness of the site to the motorway services makes it attractive for drug wholesaling therefore onsite prominent 24-hour CCTV surveillance of the car park is required. Consultation with TVP should be considered.
  - VI. The width of the verge; between the adopted highway and redway, along Wolverton Road, to be a minimum of 2.0m wide; or is acceptable for pedestrian safety to the MKC Highways Officer.
  - VII. The total gross internal floor space is 2,214 square metres. The Sunday Trading Act 1994; restricts the opening hours of shops over 280 square metres on Sundays, for 6 consecutive hours between 10am and 6pm and they must close on Easter Sunday and Christmas Day.
  - VIII. The information in the Traffic Survey should be revisited as it includes the refused, at appeal, development at Linford lakes but not the Danescroft proposed application 18/03002/FUL Site South of Little Linford Lane Redhouse Park.
  - IX. The MKC Highways Officer should confirm that the 2017 turning count survey results of October 2017 and November 2018; and the automatic traffic counts and speed surveys of November/December 2018 provide a suitable up-to-date base line for the summary and conclusions in the Transport Assessment.

## NOTE

GLPC wish to be notified in advance should this application be recommended for approval without the changes or conditions requested by GLPC and that it be called in for consideration by DCC or DCP so that GLPC may make representations to DCC or DCP about the application.

**Additional comments made following a meeting between the Applicant and GLPC on the 18.04.2019 and subsequent amendments to the application (received 31.07.2019)**

At the GLPC meeting on the 31st July 2019; Council confirmed that it has no objections to the applications 19/00420/FUL Land At Wolverton Road Blakelands MK14 5AA.

Council also agreed the wording for the Public Art S 106 contribution as follows:

#### SECTION 106 CONTRIBUTION FOR PUBLIC ART

“Public Art Contribution means the sum of Twenty thousand pounds (£20,000.00,) Index Linked payable to the Council to be spent in accordance with the Arts and Public Art Strategy specifically on a public art project agreed between MKC public arts team, the Parish Council and residents of Redhouse Park; within the Development or within the immediate vicinity of the Development, in accordance with Policy CC1 of PLAN:MK 2016-2031 (adopted 2019).”

#### A1.2 Cllr George Bowyer – Newport Pagnell North and Hanslope

No comments received. (Councillor Bowyer was not elected when consultation on this application was undertaken; no comments were received from his predecessor).

#### A1.3 Cllr Andrew Geary – Newport Pagnell North and Hanslope

No comments received.

#### A1.4 Cllr Bill Green – Newport Pagnell North and Hanslope

No comments received.

#### A1.5 MKC Highways

##### **Initial Comments (received 18.03.2019)**

This is a full application for the erection of a 2,318m<sup>2</sup> GFA foodstore at Wolverton Road, Northern Expansion Area. The proposals include a new access to the store and the existing CMG operation. The application is supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) and a Design & Access Statement (DAS).

The transport aspects of the proposals have been discussed in the pre-application discussions (17/02803/PRELAR) for the previous application (18/00522/FUL) and at a meeting on 9th May 2018.

Several key issues were raised previously, both in the pre-app and the consultation responses:

- The access junction with Wolverton Road
- Provision of a Redway on Wolverton Road
- Cycle parking provision
- HGV access through the car park

Having reviewed the submitted documentation, it is clear that these issues have still not been adequately addressed and therefore some remain a concern.

## Junction with Wolverton Road

TA Appendix 6 provides a detailed plan of the proposed junction and the layout does appear to be acceptable in principle. The complexity of the junction and associated pedestrian movements mean that a Stage 1 Safety Audit is required prior to planning consent being issued.

The plan in Appendix 6 should be submitted for Stage 1 Road Safety Audit prior to the application being determined.

## Provision of a Redway on Wolverton Road

The proposals do now clearly show a Redway across the Wolverton Road frontage of the site. This is welcomed; however, the Redway needs to be extended further west to connect with the existing Redway at the signal-controlled crossing just east of Giffard Park Roundabout.

This item can be covered by condition and will form part of the Section 278 works for the Redway and the new junction.

## Parking Provision

The proposed provision and the Council's requirements are set out in the table below.

Parking Type	Requirement	Proposal
Cycle	36	24
PTW	3	0
Car	166	167
Disabled	10*	10*
EV	3*	2*
Parent / Child	n/a	10*

The overall car parking provision is broadly in line with the Council's standards; however, the provision of 10 "Parent & Child" spaces is not required by the standards and does reduce the parking available to general customers.

Despite this being clearly raised in the highway response to the previous application, the EV provision is still 1 space short and there is no noticeable provision of any PTW spaces (which should have anchor points).

The table also shows that the cycle parking provision is 12 spaces short of the required standard. Looking at the TA it appears that the provision is based on the 1:100m<sup>2</sup> requirement for casual/visitor spaces, but no provision for staff parking has been made.

The TA states that staff cycle parking can be accommodated internally, but no details are provided and this cannot therefore be guaranteed. Specific staff provision should be made and shown on the submitted plans.

The location of the cycle parking is also less than ideal, tucked away towards the back of the site in a location which will receive almost no surveillance. Whilst it is located beneath the building canopy, it would still be insecure.

#### HGV access

The mixing of HGVs and members of the public in car parks such as this should be avoided where possible. It would be relatively simple to reconfigure access to provide a separate HGV route; however, I am aware that despite safety concerns, LIDL refuse to do this.

The swept path track plot of HGV delivery vehicles entering and leaving the site and accessing the delivery bay are included in the TA. Notwithstanding the comments about separating HGVs, the track plots do show that access through the car park is physically possible.

#### Transport Assessment

The Transport Assessment submitted by SCP is an updated version of the TA submitted for the previous application. It describes the current and future highway conditions in the vicinity of the site. The scope and methodology of the TA have been accepted previously. However, there remain some detailed points within the TA that are of note.

The assumption about pass-by trips remains high (i.e. those cars that are already passing the site that will use the new store). SCP has assumed 50% for this, which seems high and the 30% assumed for the Brooklands LIDL TA seems more appropriate.

However, with regard to the impact on junction testing, the difference is minimal; around 24 vehicles at the Giffard Park Roundabout and 10 at the Little Linford Lane junction. This is also offset by the fact that the TA includes traffic from the potential development on the adjoining land.

Although the analysis of the Little Linford Lane junction shows significant queuing in the weekday peak hours, the impact from the LIDL store is very small in the am peak (which is the worse of the two peaks) and is less than 5% in the pm peak. The testing shows that the impact of the LIDL and adjoining potential development only raises the highest RFC from 1.17 to 1.20, which shows how small the impact is (2.6%).

Given the minimal impact, it is not reasonable to seek a contribution to improving the Little Linford Lane junction and an objection based on the impact would certainly not be justified.

In other respects, the TA is broadly acceptable and, although it is not right to say that the TA is accepted fully, the conclusion of the TA that the impact of the proposal on the network is not significant is accepted.

## Summary

Although the TA does have some issues in the assessment of traffic, these are minor and the conclusion of the TA is accepted.

The proposed frontage Redway needs to be extended further west to meet the Redway at the signal-controlled crossing.

The proposed access junction with Wolverton Road requires a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit prior to consent being granted. Either the applicant should submit the Audit for MKC to review, or the Road Safety Team may be able to carry out the Audit.

The cycle parking provision does not include 12 spaces for staff, these should be shown on revised proposals in a secure, covered location. The provision for EV spaces should be increased from 2 to 3 and the plans should include 3 dedicated PTW spaces, with anchor points.

Changes to the parking provision should be shown on revised plans; however, they could be covered by suitable condition if that were deemed appropriate.

## **Additional comments made following submission of additional information / revised plans (received 17.05.2019)**

Subsequent to the previous Highway Observations, a Technical Note to address the comments raised has been submitted by SCP.

Several issues were raised previously:

- The access junction with Wolverton Road
- Provision of a Redway on Wolverton Road
- Cycle parking provision
- HGV access

The Technical Note has been reviewed and a response to each of the points is given below:

### Access Junction

A Stage 1 Safety Audit has now been carried out. The Audit identified 3 potential issues with the junction design and these have subsequently been addressed in a Designer's Response. The Audit, Designer's Response and therefore the junction design, are accepted.

## Redway Provision

The Technical Note does not accept the need for a Redway connected to the one further west at the signal-controlled crossing just east of Giffard Park Roundabout. The reason cited is to avoid conflict with a bus stop. An acceptable design for Redways passing bus stops has been achieved in other locations and this is not an acceptable reason to leave a gap in cycle provision at this location.

The connected Redway remains a requirement of the scheme.

## Cycle Parking

The Technical Note comments that the cycle parking is located to the front of the building; however, it is clear that although the cycle parking is on the Wolverton Road aspect of the building, this is not the “front” in operational terms. The building faces the car park and the cycle parking is on a location where it has little passive surveillance from other shopper and is remote from the entrance.

At the very least, this cycle parking should be relocated to the western end of this façade.

A plan has been provided to show 12 staff cycle parking spaces within the building. The provision of these can now be conditioned and therefore the spaces are accepted.

## HGV access

The Technical Note and Safety Audit have both looked at aspects of the HGV servicing of the site. SCP and LIDL are of the view that as this takes place on most of the company’s 750 stores without problems, it is acceptable here.

The mixing of manoeuvring HGVs with members of the public is never desirable and could easily be designed out of the scheme. However, it is a private site and it is clear LIDL will not change the proposals. Consequently, despite still having concerns about this aspect, no objection will be raised.

## Other matters

It is understood that the non-provision of PTW spaces was agreed at a meeting between MKC and the applicants on 9th May 2018.

The TA was found to be broadly acceptable and, although it is not right to say that the TA is accepted fully, the conclusion of the TA that the impact of the proposal on the network is not significant has been accepted.

The Parish Council has raised some issues regarding the provision of the Redway and the retention / relocation / removal of bus stops. These are matters that will be addressed during the detailed design and approval of the highway works and will form part of the Section 278. As a result, they do not need to be resolved at this stage.

## Summary

Although the TA does have some issues in the assessment of traffic, these are minor and the conclusion of the TA is accepted.

The proposed frontage Redway needs to be extended further west to meet the Redway at the signal-controlled crossing.

The proposed junction arrangement is accepted (subject to detailed design and approval).

Cycle parking for customers should be relocated to the western end of the building's Wolverton Road façade. Cycle parking for staff within the building is accepted.

Should planning permission be granted, the following conditions would be appropriate:

1. Details of the proposed junction between the store access and Wolverton Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Reason: To ensure the provision of safe and convenient access to and from the proposed development and to minimise the impact on users of the existing highway.

2. The staff cycle parking indicated on Drg. SK12 at Appendix 4 of the SCP Technical Note dated 26 April 2019, shall be provided prior to the opening of the store. The staff cycle parking shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure adequate staff cycle parking provision.

3. Notwithstanding the provision of cycle parking indicated on the Site Layout Plan, the customer cycle parking shall be provided at the western end of the building's Wolverton Road façade, adjacent to the customer entrance.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory provision of safe, secure and convenient cycle parking for the proposal.

4. The proposed highway works associated with the new store and new road junction shall include a continuous Redway connection to the signal-controlled crossing at Giffard Park Roundabout.

Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate cycle links to the site by connecting to existing cycle infrastructure and for the avoidance of doubt.

#### A1.6 MKC Flood and Water Management Officer (Lead Local Flood Authority)

##### **Initial comments (received 17.04.2019)**

The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) object to the proposed development of the LIDL store on Wolverton Road within Blakelands. The proposed method of surface water disposal is to an Anglian Water Services Sewer. Recent flood investigations completed by the LLFA and the current Independent Review into the May 2018 floods has identified that there is no capacity in Anglian Waters Surface Water Sewer to accommodate any additional run-off volumes.

##### **Additional comments made following submission of additional information / revised plans (16.07.2019)**

The proposal for the store is acceptable should be constructed in accordance with the agreed rate of 2 l/s and the proposals discussed and agreed with the LLFA. I have added a bit more detail condition if your happy with the additional wording.

I haven't seen any proposals for the access road and the storage area underneath the road should be based on the same principles as the store.

#### A1.7 MKC Landscape Architect

Landscape considerations:-

1. A large soft landscape island is included within the car parking area which is a positive addition. However more of the larger 'islands' within the car parking areas should be soft landscaped and be capable of supporting trees with sufficient soil volume the break up the expanse of hard surfacing, provide shade for cars and pedestrians, reduce runoff, absorb CO2, purify air, and generally provide a 'greener' more attractive appearance to the store. This will also be of future benefit in regards potential housing development west of this site.
2. The areas for soft landscape are indicated generally. However more tree planting at 10metre intervals where soft landscape is proposed and along the Wolverton Road frontage would soften the appearance of the large area of hard surfacing which is the car park and in part mitigate the loss of greenspace along Wolverton Road.
3. To discourage people short-cutting across planting from the cycleway proposed along Wolverton Road a suitable timer boundary detail will be needed in front of the soft landscape. If consent is recommended then planning approval should be subject to a boundary treatment condition.
4. Properties along Wolverton Road opposite the site particularly but not necessarily exclusively dwellings 214 to 222 Wolverton Road will need their loss of residential amenity outlook and potentially light spill and noise nuisance mitigated by the addition of substantial screening in the form of trees and native hedgerow along the Wolverton Road site boundary.
5. Existing hedgerow and trees (recorded on the existing site plan included with the application and shown in select photos in the DAS) along the frontage of Wolverton Road were removed before this application submission. A minimum of 15 semi-mature trees (specified as 18-20cm girth 4.25-6m height to conform to British Standard BS 3936) within a greater total of tree planting and 100m of native

hedgerow should be required towards achieving net gains for biodiversity and can be secured through a bespoke landscape scheme condition to approve the details of a landscape and ecology enhancement scheme. The existing trees are also recorded on the GIS database records of aerial photographs and Google Earth Streetview.

6. I can't see any response so far from environmental health but if they have concerns relating to noise impact from mechanical plant and deliveries and recommend acoustic fencing, this would raise the question from me as to how any acoustic barriers would be screened to minimise potential harm to visual amenity and local character. Particularly as there is little space already for planting of useful width as screening. Any barrier and compound fencing will need careful consideration before the boundary treatment details are submitted and should be designed in conjunction with the landscape proposals to ensure that any acoustic barriers are well screened behind planting.

7. All new development exceeding a gross floor-space in excess of 1000sqm in the case of non-residential development is required by policy NE3 to incorporate proposals to enhance biodiversity to compensate for impacts on the immediate area and the site characteristics, including use of native species in the landscape scheme.

8. The site plan includes a re-profiled ditch along Wolverton Road; I would expect the landscape scheme to include the ditch area with good amenity benefit and biodiversity enhancement measures alongside the ditch including wildlife hedgerow.

Policy NE3 will apply therefore the specialist advice of an ecologist (Countryside Officer) is recommended. They are likely to require a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and proposals for providing a net gain in site biodiversity. They usually also advise that the development proposals should be subject to the DEFRA Impact Assessment Biodiversity Calculator methodology to inform avoidance, mitigation and compensation actions that will ensure compliance with the NPPF and NE3. In accordance with the provision of the relevant Chapter of the National Planning Policy Framework, recommendations for biodiversity enhancement measures in terms of planting that is beneficial to wildlife should feed into the landscaping scheme of proposed works to maximise the ecological value of the site. Other enhancements may also be necessary.

No objection, subject to the amendments to layout to incorporate a greater land budget of soft landscape and the following bespoke conditions:

1. (Boundary treatment) Notwithstanding the approved details, no development shall take place above slab level until details of the proposed boundary treatments including location outside of the root protection areas of existing trees / hedges to be retained have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The location of boundary treatment shall have been designed in conjunction with the landscape proposals to ensure that any required acoustic barriers are well screened behind planting where necessary. The approved details shall be erected before the development is first brought into use and thereafter retained in that form.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over the external character and appearance of the development in accordance with Saved Policy D2 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011.

2. (Landscape and ecological enhancement scheme) Notwithstanding the approved drawings, no development shall take place above slab level until full details of soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans at a minimum scale of 1:300 with schedules of plants noting species, supply sizes and proposed densities; and a tree planting details drawing. The planting plan shall include use of native species for biodiversity; show existing trees / hedgerows to be retained; existing and proposed finished levels; access road junction visibility splays; position of lights. The location of boundary treatment shall have been designed in conjunction with the landscape proposals to ensure that any required acoustic barriers are well screened behind planting where necessary. All soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and before the development is first brought into use or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of two years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub, or any tree and shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed, dies, becomes severely damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees and shrubs of equivalent size, species and quantity.

Reason: To protect the appearance and character of the area and to minimise the effect of development on the area in accordance with Saved Policy D2 and NE3 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011.

#### A1.8 MKC Countryside Officer

##### **Initial comments (received 26.06.2019)**

Any application for development must provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have a detrimental effect on flora, fauna or habitats on or nearby the application site.

The developer must submit a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the site in order for all material facts to be taken into consideration. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal should include a desk study based on data obtained from the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Records Centre and other relevant bodies. The results of this survey will inform whether there is a need for additional Phase II species surveys that should be undertaken prior to determination.

All ecological surveys should be undertaken at the appropriate time of year by suitably qualified ecologists. Any Phase II species surveys should ideally be undertaken in the current season but if older, should be less than 2 years old at the commencement of the development.

A partial BIA has been submitted, demonstrating a 2.58 loss in biodiversity unit as a result of the development. The existing site plan submitted in support of the proposal shows an area of mature hedgerow/trees along the frontage of Wolverton

Road. This is borne out by a number of photographs included in the DAS and GIS imagery. However, the hedgerow/trees have recently been removed from the site and have not been included in the BIA.

The mitigation hierarchy is crucial to ensure there is no overall negative impact on biodiversity and the BIA is a process of identifying, quantifying and evaluating the potential effects of development-related or other proposed actions on habitats, species and ecosystems.

All development proposals must consider the mitigation hierarchy in order to avoid, minimise, rehabilitate/restore on the site and if residual adverse impacts remain, in the last resort, compensate off-site for harm caused to ecosystem services as a result of development.

1. Avoid harm – e.g. by siting in an alternative location.
2. Minimise harm – reduce the impacts of development by designing the development to cause the least harm.
3. Rehabilitate/restore – measures taken on-site to improve ecosystems degraded or destroyed by the development. This would be achieved by providing at least the same amount of ecological functions on the site to compensate for those lost to development.
4. Off-site compensation – measures taken to compensate for any residual adverse impacts after implementation of the previous three steps of the mitigation hierarchy.

Off-site compensation is not an acceptable option until all earlier steps in the mitigation hierarchy have been thoroughly investigated. Any off-site biodiversity offsets provided as compensation and appropriate management of the compensation site in perpetuity will be fully funded by the developer, who will be required to enter into an appropriate legal agreement.

Any loss in biodiversity units that cannot be fully mitigated on site must be fully compensated for by the provision of biodiversity offsetting on an alternative site. The offset must be provided and its ongoing management adequately funded by the developer in order to maintain its biodiversity value for as long as the site remains developed.

The developer must therefore provide and fully fund a biodiversity offset by provision of an offset site, a management plan (which must be submitted to the LPA for approval) and ongoing management of the site in an appropriate manner to provide the required amount of biodiversity units in perpetuity. Alternatives to this may be via a third party organisation such as the Environment Bank or an appropriately funded S106 agreement.

The developer has used the Warwickshire matrix and I have completed a calculation using the same matrix and the declared areas of habitat provided by the partial BIA. My calculation is in accord with the declared biodiversity loss but the calculated sum is significantly higher than the sum the developer suggests they believe would be appropriate as a S106 contribution. However, the developer appears to be under the misapprehension that a biodiversity offsetting consultation

document that was issued by DEFRA last year has been adopted. There is insufficient clarity in the cited document relating to exactly how the scale of unit costs mentioned in the consultation document are arrived by and exactly what these costs cover. The consultation document states that the proposed tariff rate per biodiversity unit is based on “existing costings for habitat creation and estimates for administrative costs”. However – it is not clear whether the suggested costs include set-up (legal) costs, writing and updating management plans, ongoing maintenance cost (including inflation) into the long-term, periodic condition monitoring or local cost differences which together could increase the unit tariff significantly. As this document was merely a draft for consultation, it carries no weight and cannot be used to support a planning application.

**Additional comments made following submission of additional information / revised plans (received 17.07.2019)**

Content for permission to be granted in relation to ecology and biodiversity off-setting. In this case a PEA will not be required.

A1.9 Environmental Health

**Initial comments (received 09.07.2019)**

I'm satisfied that this is acceptable based on the report. However is it possible to restrict night time delivery vehicles to those that have white noise reversing alarms only?

I have no issue with the opening hours of the store.

**Additional comments made following submission of additional information / revised plans (received 06.08.2019)**

Matt and I have looked at the summary and don't foresee any problems with the scheme based on the low lux levels predicted at nearby properties, also with external lights being turned off when the store is closed. If complaints are received in the future we will undertake a nuisance investigation including visits to check if light from the development is causing a problem.

A1.10 Economic Development

*Fit with Economic Development Strategy*

One of the outcomes sought from the Economic Development Strategy 2017-2027 is ensuring more residents having satisfying jobs. Through this proposal, a number of job opportunities will be created. The Economic Development Strategy also highlights the strengths associated with the diversity of sectors within Milton Keynes, with retail and wholesale recognised as the largest sector by employee numbers.

*Employment creation*

Opportunities for job creation within Milton Keynes are welcomed. Whilst unemployment is generally low in the area, there remain pockets of deprivation,

and it is important that a variety of opportunities are available for residents in these areas.

The re-development will create employment within retail. The sector has traditionally offered opportunities for part-time and flexible working, which can be particularly beneficial for individuals juggling employment with care responsibilities, study commitments etc. Retail can also be a good first step into employment for those with lower skills levels and for those who may not have worked before or who have not worked for some time.

There would appear however, to be some discrepancy between the job figures cited in the application form and those in the supporting planning statement, with the former suggesting 20 FTE jobs would be created and the latter suggesting up to 40 jobs. This could be a result of many of the jobs being part-time, but clarity on this figure is required.

#### *Wider Economic Impact*

Generally, being in employment has a positive impact on an individual's income levels. If an element of this income is spent on goods and services locally, this generates positive multiplier effects across the wider local economy.

This development will offer access to a greater variety of goods and services, well-suited for local residents with a range of incomes and purchasing powers.

In addition, in the refurbishment phase possibilities may arise for local businesses to benefit from supply chain opportunities and local procurement.

#### *Recommendation*

The Economy and Culture Team would welcome engagement with Lidl to ensure that the employment and skills benefits are maximised. For example, we would hope to see efforts to utilise local labour and local procurement within the refurbishment phase. And once complete, we would hope to see engagement with the Neighbourhood Employment Programme to support local recruitment.

### A1.11 Development Plans

The proposal is for a Class A1 retail food store on a site that is designated in Plan:MK as 'Shopping and Leisure Proposed'. The site is also adjacent to proposed Plan:MK Housing site HS28 and, together they are subject of a site specific Policy (Plan:MK Policy SD18 "The Walnuts, Redhouse Park"). Furthermore, the 'Shopping and Leisure' element of the site is allocated for the provision of a new Local Centre under Plan:MK Policy ER14 "New Local Centres" Criterion A.8., as per the policy set out in SD18.

The relevant Plan:MK policies for considering this application are outlined with further consideration below:

#### *SD18 "The Walnuts, Redhouse Park"*

Policy SD18 Criterion C.1 supports the development of retail and/or employment use on the eastern portion of the wider site, within which the majority of this

proposed development is sited. The proposed development would overlap onto the side of the site illustrated in the accompanying parameters plan to Policy SD18 for residential use. The parameters plan in policy SD18 is however an indicative plan illustrating the principles of development set out in the policy, it is not a detailed development brief for the site which would show precisely where different land uses would go. Furthermore, the proposed development does not restrict the remainder of the wider site coming forward for residential or other uses in line with Policy SD18 and, it delivers access to all other parts of the wider site, which will assist in enabling the future delivery of the remainder of the site.

Policy SD18 Criterion C refers to a development brief, which adheres to the principles outlined in Policy SD18, being prepared and adopted by MKC, prior to planning permission being granted. A development brief for the site has not been prepared or adopted by MKC. This does not however mean that planning applications for development on this site are expected to cover the entire site. Planning applications should be determined according to the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise; the decision maker should therefore consider what material considerations/reasons there are for granting this application without a development brief in place.

Whilst a development brief has not been produced, the proposed development appears to adhere to the principles outlined in Policy SD18 that relate to the retail/employment element of the site. The proposed development also enables a number of the wider site principles to be delivered and does not prevent the remainder of the site from being developed in line with all the principles outlined in Policy SD18. For example, the proposed development delivers access to the wider site, in line with Policy SD18, which will enable the future delivery of the entire site, as and when it comes forward. Furthermore, the Design & Access Statement and Planning Statement, submitted as part of this application, also outline a number of concept masterplans which satisfactorily illustrate how the proposed development can assist in enabling the future development of the wider site in a manner which adheres to the principles set out in Criteria C of Policy SD18, whilst also delivering a retail unit which accords with Policy SD18.

#### *ER14 "New Local Centres"*

Policy ER14 Criterion A.8 allocates this site for the provision of a new Local Centre. As per paragraph 6.56 of Plan:MK, "Local centres include new purpose built centres ranging from an individual corner shop, to larger centres containing 15-20 units". The provision of one retail unit at this location is therefore consistent with Policy ER14. Furthermore, land to the north of the proposed development could in the future still come forward for the provision of further retail or employment uses, of a scale in keeping with a Local Centre, in line with Policy SD18.

#### A1.12 Thames Valley Crime Prevention

Consultation issued on 5th August. Any comments to be addressed by way of an update paper.

### A1.13 Neighbour/ Third Party Representations

Further to the neighbour letters that were issued to adjoining properties, additional letters were sent to parties who contributed towards the consultation process regarding the application for a foodstore on the adjacent site. These additional letters were issued on 5th August and any comments that may arise from this additional consultation will be dealt with by way of an updated paper.

Representations have been received from 15 addresses and 1 from an unspecified address on Miles Close.

11 of the representations were made in objection to the proposal, while a further 2 did not explicitly oppose the application but did raise concerns regarding its impact.

The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Impact on local traffic
- Impact on ability for development to come forward on the other half of the site
- Impact on local businesses
- The proposal does not accord with the retail hierarchy (as per the 2013 Core Strategy)
- Proposal exceeds boundary of land designated for retail
- Noise from operation
- Visually overbearing and out of keeping with surrounding development
- Light pollution
- Impact on road safety
- Insufficient landscaping
- Request for more pedestrian safety features
- Overdevelopment
- Proposal does not meet description of a 'Local Centre'
- A retail impact survey should be required
- Opening hours
- Operational hours
- Flooding
- Impact on surrounding bus stops
- Lack of Public Art proposals
- Vermin control
- HGV movements
- Crime
- Parking
- Air pollution
- Quality/accuracy of information within the application
- Impact on ecology / local wildlife
- Loss of open space
- Location of access

3 of the representations were made in support of the proposal on the grounds that it would be beneficial for the local community and would provide a greater variety of retail outlets in the area.

Other issues were raised within the comments received. These issues are not material to the consideration of the application and can be summarised as follows:

- Impact on domestic cats
- Development likely to attract homeless people
- Development likely to attract skip divers
- Criticism of how Lidl develop their sites
- Development likely to attract local YOBS