

HOUGHTON REGIS TOWN COUNCIL

Planning Committee

**Minutes of the meeting held on
Monday 3rd August 2026 at 7.00pm**

Present: Councillors: D Jones Chairman
E Billington
E Cooper
Y Farrell
S King
C Slough

Officers: Louise Senior Head of Democratic Services
Amanda Samuels Administration Officer

Public: 12 (3 virtual)

Apologies: Councillors: J Carroll

13659 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies were received from Councillor Carroll.

13660 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Members of the public attending the meeting agreed to their questions being addressed under the relevant agenda item.

13661 SPECIFIC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

13662 MINUTES

To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on the 13th July 2026.

Resolved: To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 13th July 2026 and for these to be signed by the Chairman.

13663 PLANNING MATTERS

Members were advised that there were no planning matters for consideration.

Noted:

[CB/26/01886/LDCP](#)
[\(click for more details\)](#)

Lawful Development Certificate Proposed: A mobile home, with roof light, for ancillary use to the main dwelling house
7 Douglas Crescent, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5AS

CB/26/02060/DOC (click for more details)	Discharge of Condition 21 against planning permission ref. CB/25/03234/RM Land to the North and East of Houghton Regis, Sundon Road, Houghton Regis
CB/26/02178/GPDE (click for more details)	Prior Notification of Householder Extension. Single storey rear extension, 3.5m beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height of 3.5m and 2.6m to the eaves 11 Woodlands Avenue, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5LJ
CB/26/02274/NMA (click for more details)	Non-material amendment to planning permission CB/23/03551/RM Amendment sought: Revised boundary treatments. Bury Spinney, Thorn Road, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 6JQ
CB/26/02159/DOC (click for more details)	Discharge of Conditions 20 against planning permission ref. CB/25/03234/RM Parcels 7 & 8 in Area 4 at Linmere, Houghton Regis North, Dunstable
CB/26/02156/DOC (click for more details)	Discharge of Conditions 14 against planning permission ref. CB/25/03234/RM Parcel 7 & 8 Linmere, Houghton Regis North, Sundon Road, Houghton Regis

Permissions / Approvals / Consents

None received.

Refusals:

None received.

Withdrawals:

None received.

13664 PLANNING APPLICATIONS – DELEGATED AUTHORITY

Members were advised that there were no planning applications which had been determined using delegated authority to report at this meeting.

13665 [CB/26/00932/FULL](#) - LAND ADJ VANE COTTAGE, PARK ROAD NORTH, HOUGHTON REGIS

Members were advised that notification had been received from Central Bedfordshire Council regarding CB/26/00932/FULL.

Central Bedfordshire Council had received the amendments below in respect of the application of the above property.

Amendments to dwelling types (now detached), landscaping and parking areas following consultee responses from Tree Officer, Ecologist and Landscape Officer. Application was

now supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Statement as requested by the Sustainable Drainage Officer.

An extension to the deadline of 30th July had been granted to allow submission of the Planning Committee's comments.

Members remained unaware of the results of the enforcement order regarding the unauthorised felling of trees, or whether the case continued to be pursued. HRTC had requested further information at their meeting on 11th May 2026 (Minute 13534) but had not received a response. It was thought that this information should be made available prior to a decision being made.

Members had received correspondence from members of the public: one had withdrawn their previous comments and now supported the application; the other, from residents of a neighbouring property, was in support of the revised application. The communication in support of the application was read out to Members. Members were minded, however, to repeat their strong objection made on 11th May and highlighted the illegal tree felling.

While the issue of inadequate internal spaces had been addressed, Members noted the plans showed an increase from 3-bedroom to 4-bedroom properties; therefore, extra parking spaces would be required.

While Members remained strongly opposed to the plan, preference for design option 3 was expressed in the event of approval from CBC.

Members enquired whether it was possible to make a Freedom of Information Request regarding the progression of prosecution, the Head of Democratic Services confirmed they would seek further information on this matter.

Members agreed to re-submit their earlier objections as below:

Houghton Regis Town Council strongly objected to this application on the following grounds:

- *The land was in a conservation area and formed part of the historic curtilage of a listed building*
- *Development would be inappropriate and detrimentally impact the historic character, setting and significance of a heritage asset*
- *The placement of two houses on this site constituted overdevelopment and would be visually obtrusive.*
- *The proposed houses appeared to have small internal spaces for the proposed properties.*

Members highlighted that the original application stated two x three-bedroom properties, the revised application now stated two x four-bedroom properties, as such would require an additional parking space.

Resolved: **To note the amendments and consider any comments for submission to Central Bedfordshire Council.**

13666 CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE LOCAL PLAN REVIEW - SUBMITTED SITES CONSULTATION

Members were advised that Central Bedfordshire Council was consulting on sites submitted through its previous Call for Sites exercise as part of the preparation of the emerging Local Plan.

Members were invited to consider the submitted sites and whether the Town Council wished to submit comments in response to the consultation.

Members had been provided with a report which provided further information, and a location map showed the submitted sites.

The Chair suggested that comments from members of the public were taken at this time. Compatibility of the proposals with those of the Local Plan would be examined and these factors would be incorporated into HRTC's response.

A member of the public responded to the submitted sites with reference to the Neighbourhood Plan, outlining the detrimental impact to each of the following:

Section: Site 135341 French's Avenue to Maidenbower

Full Representation: This site is adjacent Maidenbower Ancient Monument and its development will negatively affect the cultural value of this hill-top site. Buildings will obstruct the wide views to the east, north, west and south-west which are special features of the character of the town as stated in the Neighbourhood Plan. (7.10 and 7.11, and 12.19, 13.4, 13.5, 13.6 and 13.7 as shown on the Policies map Annexe 1.) Protected Natural Features are in Policy BNF1. Development will also endanger the wildlife at Maidenbower which traverse the site to access Sewell Quarry and Nature Reserve, and Suncote Pits for foraging

Section: Site 136530 Sewell Lane land in Barley Brow CWS

Full Representation: Sewell is a Conservation area, and this site is wooded and part of the Barley Brow CWS. It rises steeply and also has an historic roadway running through it, paved in parts, used to bypass the chalk cutting in wet weather, and as such is unsuitable for building on as well as being an important part of the whole area for wildlife. Sewell Lane is narrow, single lane, the single entrance/exit awkward with poor visibility, and not capable of being widened, therefore the road cannot cope with more traffic from more dwellings.

Section: Site 136564 Adjacent Chalkpit CWS and SSSI

Full Representation: My objection is because this site is adjacent to, and could be within the boundaries of, Houghton Regis Chalkpit County Wildlife Site and SSSI. The site is steeply sloping, occupied by residential properties, surrounded by good wildlife habitat, and accessed only by a steep narrow lane from the A5 at Chalk Hill. It is totally unsuitable for large trucks to manoeuvre, and join the traffic on the A5. The whole area is criss-

crossed by the tracks of wildlife foraging and denning, and the trees are a haven for birds, being contiguous with the Sewage Farm which also supports wildlife.

Section: Site 136597 Land North of Sewell to A505

Full Representation: This site is on the north-facing escarpment which is drained by many chalk streams running into Ouzel Brook. Risk of flooding is therefore high (Flood Zone 2). Access would be very difficult as the level of the roads around is higher than the land, and Sewell Lane not suitable for access, being single lane. Putting employment next to a Conservation Area is incongruous and would be damaging to the value of the Hamlet of Sewell, due to noise, traffic, and disruption of agricultural views north.

Section: Site 136641 Dog Kennel Down eastern arm

Full Representation: This site has twice been refused planning permission for employment use for a variety of strong reasons. It is a County Wildlife Site, part of Dog Kennel Down and supports wildlife when allowed to develop naturally. To quote from the Neighbourhood Plan Green Spaces Designation: "The site, including its eastern section, is important for chalk meadow flowers, pyramidal orchids in particular. The site contributes considerably to the biodiversity of South Bedfordshire." This site should be managed for nature and recreation, a break from the rest of the industrial sites around it where people can connect with nature.

Representatives from the Friends of Windsor Drive voiced concern that Windsor Drive (WD), while not one of the submitted sites, had been the subject of some discussion within CBC. It was felt that there was a need for transparency regarding the future objectives for Windsor Drive.

It was also stated that the CBC website was confusing with no obvious means of response.

The Friends of Windsor Drive put the following questions to the Planning Committee:

1. Do the FoWDCOS [Friends of Windsor Drive Community Open Space] still have the support of HRTC in keeping WD as an Open Space for the Community. Will you stand with us and work with us against any attempt to develop this land?
2. CBC have renewed their interest in developing WD, not necessarily through the call for sites process at this stage, meaning, for example, they could move to sell WD. Should that happen, the Asset of Community Value status would mean a community bid could take place. Would HRTC be interested in supporting such a bid?
3. We first became aware of CBCs renewed interest in WD on the 11 June, were HRTC approached by CBC about their renewed interest before that date. If so what was your response?

4. At this stage there is no mention of WD on the call for sites survey, it may be added during the next stage. Are you aware of any plans CBC may have to progress their renewed interest in WD?
5. The residents are confused by the current surveys, finding them difficult to navigate. Have HRTC considered a social media post clarify what residents are being asked to comment on pertaining to HR.

Members of the public believed the proposals would overwhelm Sewell, which had a cluster of listed buildings and was a local beauty spot for nearby communities to visit.

There was general concern that yet more green space within Houghton Regis would be lost and that an already inadequate infrastructure would be tested even further.

The Chair reviewed the following submitted sites:

- Section: Site 135302 Windy Willows – had previous approval for housing
- Section: Site 135341 Top of French's Avenue – Green Belt land and potential impact on Maidenbower site
- Section: Site 136350 Bretheren Church Site – this had been included in the 2021 Local Plan for 25 units but had been reviewed and rejected on this occasion
- Section: Site 136550 Sewell Land – Green Belt land. Appeared to have been filtered out
- Section: Site 136564 Grendall Lane - this was formerly the proposed cemetery site and local dwellings would be impacted. Appeared to have been filtered out
- Section: Site 136596 Part of Linnere – a residential area but was now suggested for employment use. There was uncertainty as to whether this was for a local centre and school
- Section: Site 136597 Corner of Leighton Buzzard bypass and the A5 - proposed for employment use. Green Belt land containing springs and a tributary to the river Ouzel. Would also be detrimental to the views from the conservation area
- Section: Site 136641 Land between Foster Avenue and the Arenson Centre – a designated Green Open Space under the Local Plan. Planning permission previously refused twice

In regard of the final site, 136641, which had been cleared, the Head of Democratic Services confirmed that the Head of Environmental and Community Services was conducting further investigation.

Cllr Billington had composed a Freedom of Information Request which was read out to the Committee. Members were in agreement that this should be submitted and members of the public requested that clarity on Windsor Drive was also sought.

- Resolved:**
- 1. Note the current Submitted Sites Consultation being undertaken by Central Bedfordshire Council.**
 - 2. Consider whether the Town Council wishes to submit comments on any of the submitted sites.**
 - 3. Consider whether any submitted sites appear more or less consistent with the objectives and policies of the Houghton Regis Neighbourhood Plan.**

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 8.31

Dated this 24th day of August 2026

Chairman

DRAFT