

**Item No. 17****SCHEDULE C**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/10/01171/FULL</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>6 The Old Dairy, Beadlow, Shefford, SG17 5PL</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Erection of extension to stable building under construction, for storage with associated hardstanding.(Revised application CB/09/07032/FULL)</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Campton/Chicksands</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Shefford</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllr Lewis Birt &amp; Cllr Tony Brown</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Abel Bunu</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>01 April 2010</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>27 May 2010</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Miss F Webb</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	<b>Anthony Planning Services</b>
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	<b>The applicant is employed by the Council</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Full Application - Refused</b>

**Site Location:**

The application site lies to the rear of 6 The Old Dairy, a barn that was converted to residential use with the benefit of planning permission and forms part of a barn complex formerly belonging to Speedsdairy Farm, Beadlow. To the south east of the barn complex are residential gardens with paddock areas beyond, of which the application site is part. The site is outside the Settlement Envelope on the eastern outskirts of Clophill village within the Parish of Campton and Chicksands. Speedsdairy Farmhouse and Units 2 and 3 are Grade II Listed Buildings. Units 1, 6 and 7 are curtilage listed.

**The Application:**

Seeks permission for the erection of a side extension to a stable building which is currently being constructed. The proposed extension would measure approximately 5.1 metres deep, 6.9 metres wide and 5.3 metres high and would be to the north west of the stable building.

**RELEVANT POLICIES:****National Policies (PPG & PPS)**

PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas  
PPG15 - Planning and the Historic Environment

**Regional Spatial Strategy****East of England Plan (May 2008)**

ENV6 - The Historic Environment  
ENV7 - Quality in the Built Environment

## **Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy (March 2005)**

### **Bedfordshire Structure Plan 2011**

None saved.

### **Mid Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009**

DM 4 - Development Within and Beyond Settlement Envelopes

DM 18 - Equestrian Development

CS16 - Landscape and Woodland

### **Planning History**

CB/09/07032/FULL	Withdrawn. Erection of outbuilding for storage with hardstanding and ancillary works.
MB/09/00560/FULL	Permission granted to increase the roof pitch of the approved stables from 40 to 45 degrees.
MB/08/00455/FULL	Permission granted for erection of stable along with ancillary works.
MB/07/01794/FULL	Permission granted for the erection of stable along with ancillary works. Door to existing car port. Change of use of land from agricultural to residential garden and paddock. Retention of access track.
MB/04/00135/LB	Listed Building Consent for alterations and extensions to existing barns and farm buildings to form 7 dwellings and erection of 6 bay car port; demolition of modern extensions and Dutch barns and hardstandings.
MB/04/00134/FULL	Permission granted for alterations and extensions to existing barns and farm buildings to form 7 dwellings; erection of 6 bay carport; change of use of land to form 6 paddocks and change of use of agricultural land to garden land.

### **Representations: (Parish & Neighbours)**

Clophill Parish Council	No comment. This site is located in the Campton parish. Would not normally comment unless the proposed development would be detrimental to the countryside visible from Clophill or impact of traffic generated would be considered unacceptable. Neither is the case with this application.
Neighbours - 1, 2, 3 & 4 The Old Dairy and Speeds Farmhouse	Objection: 1. The proposed outbuilding is excessive and unnecessary in view of the recent permission granted for a stable building. Even when considering the original application, reference, MB/07/01794, the case officer expressed concerns about the size of the building then.

2. The approved stable building is bigger than 3 of the residential dwellings at the Old Dairy.
3. It is difficult to justify the need for additional space based on machinery to maintain the land.
4. Concerned that the increasingly sprawling nature of the development is not being adequately controlled. Original permission has already been amended more than once. If approved, the current extension together with previous amendments, would have a cumulative effect of trebling the original floor area.
5. Concerned about the objectivity of comments from internal consultees.
6. Previous comments and recommendations from an external Conservation Officer regarding application reference MB/08/00455/FULL are material.
7. Applicant has neither a horse nor a wood-burning stove.
8. The proposed development would set an unacceptable precedent.
9. Resultant overdevelopment of the site would be detrimental to the setting of the residential barns. The extension would bring the building about 13 metres closer to the residential dwellings. This distance was also of concern in the original application.
10. Permitted development rights of the barns were removed to protect the rural countryside.
11. The resultant building would be visible from public vantage points.
12. The approved stable building and the current proposal resemble residential dwellings. The future intention of the applicant is unclear.
13. If permission is granted, appropriate conditions should be attached.

### **Consultations/Publicity responses**

Public Protection-North	No comment.
Conservation Officer	No objections. Design is acceptable and would not adversely affect the setting of the Listed Buildings or the wider context of this group of buildings.
Internal Drainage Board	No objection.

### **Determining Issues**

The main considerations of the application are:

1. Whether or not the proposal is acceptable development in the countryside in principle.
2. Visual impact on the character and appearance of the open countryside and the setting of a Grade II Listed Building.

3. Impact on residential amenity.
4. Other material planning considerations.
5. Conclusion.

## Considerations

### 1. **Whether or not the proposed extension is acceptable in principle**

The principal guidance for assessing applications for development in the countryside is contained in national Policy Statement 7, 'Sustainable Development In Rural Areas' which states that,

*New building development in the open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled; the Government's overall aim is to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and so it may be enjoyed by all. ....All development in rural areas should be well designed and inclusive, in keeping and scale with its location, and sensitive to the character of the countryside and local distinctiveness.*

Policy DM 18 of the Mid Beds Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009 is also relevant. The policy acknowledges the fact that there continues to be considerable pressure for equestrian related development within Mid Bedfordshire and as such, states at paragraph 14.6.1, that it is therefore particularly important to consider the context of the proposed development in the flat landscapes towards the eastern side of the district where even small buildings will be prominent against the skyline. Policy CS16, 'Landscape and Woodland', emphasises the importance of the countryside outside settlements and the need for the Council to protect it for its own sake and safeguarding it from the increasing pressures of development.

This in effect amounts to a general presumption against development outside the residential curtilage in the countryside areas. This is further emphasised by Policy DM 4 of the Mid Beds Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009 which states in part that, '**--- Beyond Settlement Envelopes, limited extensions to gardens will be permitted provided they do not harm the character of the area. They must be suitably landscaped or screened from the surrounding countryside and buildings may not be erected on the extended garden area.**'

The current proposed extension to the approved stable block would result in a building which goes beyond the scope of what can reasonably be considered modest development in the countryside. The overall size of the extended stable block would in fact rival the size of the host dwelling and as such, would not reflect the subordinate relationship expected of an ancillary building. Clearly, the countryside policies seek to encourage low key structures that are appropriate to the rural context but the proposed extension would result in a building that does not fall into this category.

**2. Visual impact on the character and appearance of the open countryside and the setting of the Grade II Listed Building**

In design terms, the proposed extension would be in keeping with the traditional form of typical farm buildings and as such would not detract from the appearance of the Listed Building.

For the reasons discussed above and below at 4, the proposed development is considered to have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the open countryside in this locality.

**3. Residential amenity**

With regards impact on residential amenity, it is considered that the resultant building would still maintain an adequate separation distance from the residential dwellings such that no harm would be caused to the amenities of the occupiers of these properties.

**4. Other material planning considerations**

The previous planning permissions granted for the erection of a stable block and ancillary works, reference, **MB/07/01794/FULL**, **MB/08/00455/FULL** and the subsequent amendment, reference, **MB/09/00560** are material planning considerations. The original approved structure incorporated two stables, tack room and tractor store and a lean - to log store to the northern end. A freestanding manure store was also included to the south of the stable block. Subsequent amendments to the scheme resulted in the addition of two open bays to the northern end to serve as a manure and log store and an increase in the height of the structure.

The Applicant has sought to justify the proposed development as follows:

1. The extension is required solely for the storage of equipment required for the maintenance of the land.
2. The equipment is currently stored in a rented yard about 6 miles away from the site.
3. Keeping the equipment on-site would be more convenient and secure and thus comply with the Applicant's home insurance policy.
4. A schedule of the equipment has been attached as Appendix A to the Design and Access Statement and comprises the following:
  - Water bowser
  - Metal cage trailer
  - Mini digger
  - Metal trailer
  - Sprayer boom for tractor
  - Mini tractor
  - Hedgerow flail
  - Ride on tractor mower.
5. The outbuilding would supplement the recently approved stable block.
6. The design of the outbuilding and the choice of materials is considered to be in keeping with the character of the area.
7. The siting of the outbuilding would respect and retain the existing hedgerow along the southern and western boundaries.
8. Additional landscaping is proposed.
9. The outbuilding would not be visually intrusive.
10. The building would not be harmful to residential amenity.

The applicant's submission is noted. It is however considered that the scale of storage contemplated in this application is disproportionate to the level of activity and size of the plot. The proposed development is therefore not justified by a reasonable need to sustain the equestrian use of the plot.

**5. Conclusion**

In view of the previous permissions granted, it is considered that the need for the extension is not established and therefore the principle of the proposed development in the countryside is not acceptable. Furthermore, having regard to the size and overall scale of the development, it is considered that, whilst the proposed development would be acceptable in design terms and would not adversely affect residential amenity, this is not considered adequate mitigation to outweigh the cumulative harm to the character and appearance of the open countryside. Notwithstanding that each case should be treated on its own merits, given that there are properties in a similar position to the application property, granting permission to the current proposal would set a precedent that would make it difficult for the local planning authority to resist future applications of a similar nature resulting in further harm to the character and appearance of the open countryside. The proliferation of buildings of a size and scale as the one proposed, would have an overall harmful effect on the character and appearance of the countryside.

**Reasons for Refusing**

The proposed development would not accord with national and local plan policies which seek to protect the countryside for its own sake and would set a precedent that would result in the proliferation of buildings harmful to the character and appearance of the open countryside.

**Recommendation**

That Planning Permission be **REFUSED** for the following:

- 1 The proposed extension would result in a building that would not, by reason of its overall scale and size, reflect the level of restraint appropriate in the open rural countryside and no special justification has been established to permit the development. The proposal is therefore contrary to national advice contained in Planning Policy Statement 7, 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas', Planning Policy Statement 1, 'Delivering Sustainable Development' and policies DM18 and CS16 of the Mid Beds Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2009.
- 2 If permitted, the proposal would create a precedent whereby it would be difficult for the Local Planning Authority to resist similar proposals to the further detriment of the locality

**DECISION**

.....  
.....