

26th February 2020

Application Number: 19/01818/OUT

Description: Outline application including access for the development of the site for employment uses, comprising of warehousing and distribution (Use Class B8) floorspace (including mezzanine floors) with ancillary B1a office space, general industrial (Use Class B2) floorspace (including mezzanine floors) with ancillary B1a office space, a small standalone office (Use Class B1) and small café (Use Class A3) to serve the development; car and HGV parking areas, with earthworks, drainage and attenuation features and other associated infrastructure, a new primary access off Brickhill Street, alterations to Brickhill Street and provision of Grid Road reserve to Brickhill Street with appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be determined as reserved matters

AT Land At Brickhill Street, South Caldecotte, Milton Keynes, MK17 9FE

FOR HB (South Caldecotte) Limited

Statutory Target: 03.03.2020

Extension of Time: N/A

Ward: Danesborough and Walton

Parish: Bow Brickhill Parish Council

Report Author/Case Officer: David Buckley, Senior Planning Officer

Contact Details: david.buckley@milton-keynes.gov.uk

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

1.0 Introduction

This updates the reason for refusal which was delegated by Committee Members to Officers at 6th February Development Control Committee (DCC).

2.0 Late Submission Documents

2.1 It was reported in the additional papers to the February 6th 2020 Development Control Committee (DCC) that an update letter had been sent by the applicant on Monday 3rd February. This sought to address the recommended reasons for refusal in relation to Archaeology, Ecology and Transport and requested that DCC Members defer making a decision until 02 April 2020 DCC for those issues to be resolved.

2.2 It was reported by officers at the DCC meeting that the Ecology and Transport submissions did not raise substantive new material and as a result it was not recommended that a decision be deferred. As there had not been an opportunity to consult the Council's Archaeologist on the new submission, the following recommendation was made in relation to archaeology:

It is recommended that power to refuse planning permission for the reason stated below is delegated to officers, subject to consultation on the additional archaeological material with the Council's Archaeological Officer confirming that no new substantive issues have been raised:

3) The proposal, by reason of the total loss of non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, failure to ensure that consideration is given to the historic environment in informing the site layout and the quantum of development and failure to demonstrate that the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm, taking into account the assets significance and importance, would be unacceptable contrary to NPPF policy 197 and Plan: MK policies HE1 (F), SD1 (A19) and SD14 (C9).

2.3 The Council's Archaeologist has now reviewed the late submission of 3rd February and in a formal consultation response dated 14th February 2020 has confirmed that no new substantive material has been submitted and his view on the proposal is unchanged.

2.4 It is noted that the Council Archaeologist consultation response of 21st January 2020, while it was produced in full in the annexe and reflected in the recommendation of the DCC report, was not explicitly mentioned in the Archaeology section of the DCC report and had not been published on the public access website at the time of 6th February 2020 DCC.

2.5 The response of 21st January 2020 maintains the objection to the proposal. It does, however, revise the comments of 7th January 2020, in terms of defining the archaeological assets as being of 'possible' national significance rather than 'probable' national significance and associated policy references are also revised.

2.6 The Council Archaeologist consultation responses of 21st January and 14th February 2020 were uploaded to the public access website and the applicant was notified on Monday 17th February. This provided the applicant an opportunity to provide any additional comment by the end of 21st February 2020.

2.7 On 21st February 2020, the applicant submitted a response containing the following documents:

- A covering letter containing a further explanatory response from the applicant's Archaeologist, Dr Mike Dawson, following the Council Archaeologist consultation response dated 21st January 2020.
- An updated Archaeological Trenching Report. It was requested by the applicant that the previous Trenching Report be substituted with this version.
- The covering letter reiterates the point that the archaeology is of local or at most regional significance and therefore should not form a reason for withholding planning permission.

2.8 A final consultation response to address these supplementary documents was received from the Council's Archaeologist on 25th February 2020. In summary this states that having reviewed the updated version of the Archaeological Trial Trench Report, the remains of the roman street are of at least regional significance. The consultation response disagrees with the contention in the covering letter that there is no evidence of substantial structural remains and also states that his conclusions do not stand or fall on evidence for the presence or absence of such structural remains. The response concludes by stating that the new submission documents do not necessitate the recommended reason for refusal to be revised.

2.9 Therefore officers recommend that the scheme is refused as per the resolution of the Development Control Committee of 6th February 2020.