

**Item No. 13****SCHEDULE A**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/11/00087/OUT</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>Skylarks, Great North Road, Stotfold, Hitchin, SG5 4BL</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Outline: Erection of building and associated works to house the Saunders Collection of steam engines, fairground rides, mechanical organs and associated memorabilia (All matters reserved except access and layout)</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Stotfold</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Stotfold &amp; Arlesey</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllrs Dalgarno, Saunders, Street, Turner</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Lisa Newlands</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>08 February 2011</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>10 May 2011</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Mr Saunders</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	<b>DLP Planning Ltd</b>
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	<b>Application made by a Central Bedfordshire Ward Councillor</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Outline Application - Refused</b>

**Site Location:**

The application site is located outside any defined settlement envelope, on land not in agricultural use, which the supporting information states is within the extended curtilage of the residential property known as 'Skylarks', Great North Road, Stotfold.

The site lies to the east of the settlement of Stotfold and comprises approximately 2 hectares of land formerly Skylarks Nursery lying to the south of the newly refurbished A1 north BP service station, it has an independent and sub standard access direct to/from the A1. To the east of the site is a residential bungalow 'Skylarks' which is occupied by the applicant and originally comprising an agricultural workers dwelling associated with the operation of the nursery, a substantial glasshouse development of approximately 16,000sqm, stand immediately west of the site and is adjoined by a smaller residential bungalow. This dwelling and glasshouse development form Dingleman's Nursery - an active horticultural business. The agricultural occupancy restriction has been removed from 'Skylarks' and the associated land.

To the south of the site is 'Wrayfields', separated by a rectangular parcel of agricultural land. Wrayfields is a single carriageway road connecting the A1 with Stotfold. Along Wrayfields is Wrayfields Farm which comprises a small two storey dwelling that fronts the road.

The sites boundaries to the north, south and east are largely demarked by mature hedgerows. The site is predominantly flat with a public footpath alongside the

southern boundary, connecting Stotfold via Wrayfields with Caldecote approximately 1km east of the A1.

### **The Application:**

Outline planning permission is sought for the erection of building and associated works to house the Saunders Collection of steam engines, fairground rides, mechanical organs and associated memorabilia (all matters reserved except access and layout).

An operational statement submitted as a supporting document with the application expands on the need for the proposed building and how the building would function.

### Need

The collection referred to within the application is currently stored in a number of locations around Stotfold and Arlesey, much of this storage is considered by the applicant to be wholly unsuitable and it is at potential risk of damage from the weather, fire and vandalism.

To ensure the safe preservation of the collection in the longer term the applicant considers that the only option would be to erect a building that would enable the whole collection to be housed within one secure location.

The collection is now made up of a number of steam driven locomotives, showmans' engines, fairground organs, fairground gallopers and yachts. In addition to this, the Turner Collection of fairground equipment and musical organs was acquired in 2004.

### Function

The proposal comprises a building of 3691sqm measuring 78.8m x 45.7m. The building is sited approximately 18m from the western boundary of the site and has an eaves height of 7.81m (9.38m to the raised organ loft) and a maximum height of 13.6m.

It is proposed that the development will be primarily used as storage for the Collection with some public access, and restricted use of the organs for public entertainment. The following uses have been outline within the supporting operational statement:

<b>Use</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Educational visits Visits by enthusiast groups and societies	Maximum twice a week during school terms only
Open Days	Maximum eight weekends per annum between March and October.
Afternoon Tea Dances	Maximum 3 per week (4 per week in November/ December) Total limited to 100 per annum.

The operational statement also states that there would be a maximum of 300 persons, plus staff at any one time. In addition to this the opening hours would be

restricted to Educational Visits 10.30am - 3.30pm; Open Days 10.30am - 7pm; Tea Dances 12noon - 7.30pm.

## **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

### **National Policies (PPG & PPS)**

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth  
PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment  
PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas  
PPG13: Transport  
Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism

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

Policy SS1: Achieving sustainable development  
Policy SS8: Land in the urban fringe  
Policy E6: Tourism  
Policy C1: Cultural Development  
Policy C2: Provision and Location of Strategic Leisure, Sport, Recreation, Arts or Tourism Facilities  
Policy T1: Regional Transport Strategy Objectives and Outcomes  
Policy T2: Changing Travel Behaviour  
Policy T3: Managing Traffic Demand  
Policy T9: Walking, Cycling and other Non-Motorised Transport  
Policy ENG1: Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Energy Performance

### **Bedfordshire Structure Plan**

N/a

### **Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North)**

Policy CS1: Development Strategy  
Policy CS3: Healthy and Sustainable Communities  
Policy CS4: Linking Communities - Accessibility and Transport  
Policy CS9: Providing jobs  
Policy CS11: Rural Economy and Tourism  
Policy CS14: High Quality Development  
Policy CS15: Heritage  
Policy CS16: Landscape and Woodland  
Policy CS18: Biodiversity and Geological conservation  
Policy DM2: Sustainable Construction of New Buildings  
Policy DM3: High Quality Development  
Policy DM4: Development Within and Beyond Settlement Envelopes  
Policy DM9: Providing a range of transport  
Policy DM12: Horticultural and Redundant Agricultural Sites  
Policy DM13: Heritage in Development  
Policy DM14: Landscape and Woodland  
Policy DM15: Biodiversity

## Supplementary Planning Guidance

Design in Central Bedfordshire: A guide for development

### Planning History

75/0174/FA	Full: Agricultural Dwelling. Approved 17/04/1975
75/0174A/FA	Full: Enclosure of swimming pool. Approved 01/09/1977
88/01328/FA	Full: Remove agricultural occupancy condition (3) from planning permission 75/0174. Refused. 13/12/1988
92/01238/FA	Full: Retention of stable building (retrospective). Approved 13/11/1992
06/00190/LDC	Lawful Development Certificate: Occupation of dwelling without compliance with the agricultural occupancy condition attached to planning permission MB/75/174 dated 17/04/75. Approved 26/05/2006

### Representations: (Parish & Neighbours)

Parish/Town Council	<p>The Town Council fully supports the application and feels the provision of a steam museum will be of great benefit to the residents and town of Stotfold. The closure of the current access from the A1(M) is welcomed. We also concur with and echo the sentiments as laid out on pages 2/3 of Dynamic Development Solutions' letter in the application supporting papers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The site has good road connections</li><li>• Good rail access.</li><li>• Stotfold as a community is keen to see this collection housed on the site identified.</li><li>• Employment opportunities for local people</li></ul>
Neighbours	<p>24 letters of support have been received raising the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The collection is a great asset to the town;</li><li>• The site has direct access onto the A1 - therefore avoiding increasing traffic within the town;</li><li>• It is relatively close to Stotfold Mill - another local visitor attraction;</li><li>• The building fits well into the site and is screened by trees;</li><li>• The museum will help preserve the collection for everyone to enjoy;</li><li>• Would create a new holiday destination bringing public focus and awareness to the area;</li><li>• It will not harm local amenity;</li><li>• It will not harm the countryside;</li></ul> <p>5 letters of objection have been received raising the</p>

following concerns:

- The quiet lanes used for recreation need to be safeguarded;
- Excess traffic and noise;
- Noise and light pollution
- Concerns regarding the capacity of the local road network are still valid;
- Serious safety hazard;
- Vehicle access and increased traffic within Stotfold.

## Consultations/Publicity responses

### Public Protection

I am concerned that noise and smoke/fumes from the steam engines, fairground rides and mechanical organs may be detrimental to the residential amenity of neighbouring residential properties particularly the nursery bungalow "The Conifers" and properties at Wrayfields.

Although the noise environment is mentioned in section 4 of the Environmental Policy Statement the applicant has not provided details of the noise levels from the operation of steam engines, fairground rides and musical organs within the proposed building. There is also no information on the noise levels from activities external to the building from the operation of vehicles and the steaming of engines. The proposed new access will also potentially increase traffic flow and therefore traffic noise past the nursery bungalow "The conifers" . The Environmental Policy Statement has suggested that the siting and orientation of the proposed building will contain noise to the East and North of the site but this has not been supported with a noise assessment.

I have previously investigated complaints of noise from tuning the mechanical organ and smoke from steam engines at other premises within Stotfold and am therefore aware that these matters may be detrimental to amenity.

I would therefore like to object to the application because the applicant has provided insufficient information to demonstrate that noise will not be detrimental to residential amenity at neighbouring residential property.

Ramblers Association

No objection provided FP1 remains unaffected

Highways Agency

No objection subject to conditions

Highways

No objection

Tree and Landscape  
Officer

No objection

Environment Agency

No objection subject to conditions

Ecology

I have read through the baseline ecological statement, tree survey and made a site visit. The site has a number of apple trees identified in the tree survey, under BAP

habitat criteria these would constitute an orchard as there are more than 5 trees. Most of these are over shadowed by a large leylandii hedge and are recommended for removal in the tree survey. However, tree numbers 8659 and 8865 are of a good size, support a good lichen community and as such provide a valuable resource for biodiversity in a dwindling habitat type. Tree 8677 is recommended for retention so I would hope that these three trees could be kept and added to with replacement planting closeby but not impacted on by the tall hedgerow to provide continued orchard habitat.

The ecological statement recommends a reptile survey be undertaken in the spring and due to the nature of scrub, piles of building materials, compost and manure heaps the results of this would be needed to inform any necessary mitigation measures prior to any site clearance and FULL planning permission being granted. Conditions would also be needed to ensure that no clearance of scrub, trees or hedgerows is undertaken during the bird nesting season March - August inc.

## **Determining Issues**

The main considerations of the application are;

1. The Principle of Development
2. Character and Appearance of the Surrounding area
3. Highway Implications
4. Neighbouring Amenity
5. Other Issues

## **Considerations**

### **1. The Principle of Development**

The site is located outside any defined settlement envelope in a location which in planning policy terms is considered as falling within protected open countryside where restrictive planning policies apply, which seek to prevent new commercial and residential development in order to protect the open countryside for its own sake.

Planning Policy Statement 7, Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, states that sustainable development is the core principle in underpinning land use planning. It also states that new buildings in the open countryside should be strictly controlled, and preference should be given for developing brownfield land, in preference to greenfield sites. Parallel to this tourism and leisure activities are seen as being vital to many rural communities and such uses can help to sustain rural businesses and provide additional employment. PPS 7 also advises that any proposals for large-scale tourism and leisure developments in rural areas should be subject to close assessment to weigh-up their advantages and disadvantages to the locality in terms of sustainable development objectives. In particular, the policy in PPG13 should be followed in such cases

where high volumes of traffic may be generated.

The objectives of PPG13, Transport, are to promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight, promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling, and by reducing the need to travel, especially by car. To meet these objectives, Local Planning Authorities are advised in rural areas to locate most development for housing, shopping, jobs, leisure and services in local service centres which are designated in development plans to act as focal points.

Government Guidance on new tourism-related development is contained in the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism, this replaced PPG21. The advice in this document is that planners and developers should work together to ensure that new tourism developments are as sustainable as possible in transport terms, and maximise access by sustainable modes of transport. It is acknowledged in this document that given the wide variety of developments that are inherent in the tourism industry there are some developments that are car dependent. Further advice is given in that in cases where the proposed development is not sustainable it will be necessary to weigh up the other benefits of a tourism proposal against any disadvantages arising from its location.

Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North) states that the Council will seek to support the rural economy and promote tourism by *supporting proposals for tourist or leisure developments in settlements or in the countryside including new tourist accommodation which provides opportunities for rural diversification and are well located to support local services, businesses and other tourist attractions.*

Policy DM12 of the same document relates to Horticultural and Redundant Agricultural Sites. The application site was part of the former 'Skylarks' Nursery and could be classed as a redundant horticultural/ agricultural site. This policy states that proposals for commercial development on these sites will be considered favourably if they are considered acceptable in terms of

- scale, layout and design in relating to their setting;
- Assimilation into the rural setting and impact on the surrounding countryside;
- relationship with the road network and neighbouring rural settlements;
- potential impact on the existing local retail facilities;
- provision of suitable vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements.

Given that planning policy seeks to strictly control new development in the countryside, it is considered reasonable for the Council to consider whether the applicant has undertaken a sequential test to establish if there are other sites available which could accommodate the proposal, and are located within the Settlement Envelope or are better sited in relation to urban areas. A sequential assessment was submitted in support of the application. The operational statement states that the requirements of any site are as follows:

- The primary requirement is for a location close to Stotfold - due to highly specialised retained and volunteer skills base;
- An accessible location, adjoining a principal route - for large low loader vehicles for moving the collection to and from external events;
- minimal impact on residential amenity;

- site of sufficient size to accommodate a building large enough to house the collection;
- An outdoor area, to allow a number of the larger steam equipment to be safely brought into steam and for loading and offloading the collection.

The sequential assessment has therefore taken into account all potentially vacant, underused or available employment land within a catchment of the site defined by an acceptable distance for travel to and from the proposed facility by the volunteer workforce. To this end a 20 mile radius has been assumed. Key settlements of Bedford, Luton and Welwyn Garden City have also been taken into account. Of 76 sites that were originally identified, 30 were discounted at the second stage because they were too small or had poor accessibility for heavy vehicles. 46 sites were then assessed at Stage 3. Of these sites 36 were considered to be unviable/ unsuitable/ or unavailable, with 4 being discounted due to accessibility reasons and a further 5 being discounted for other reasons, for instance contrary to local policy.

In considering the principle of development, it is necessary to outline the potential benefits of the proposal to the local economy, and at same time understand the negative aspects of the development. The applicant has stated that the proposal would generate a level of local part-time employment, although this would be casual and estimated to be a maximum of 35. There may also be benefits in terms of linked trips to other visitor attractions within the area such as Stotfold Mill.

Turning to the negative impacts of the proposal, it would result in a large commercial development in the countryside when there is a duty on local planning authorities to protect such areas. The site has no real access to public transport, although the applicant has made reference to the provision of a shuttle bus service from nearby railway stations. This lack of public transport accessibility is of significant concern as the application states that the site could hold a maximum of 300 people. It has been stated in the Transport Assessment that all visits will be pre booked and that all visitors are to arrive by coach/minibus, with a shuttle bus service offered from Arlesey Station on a pre-booked basis. This raises concerns in terms of how visitors who do not come by coach/minibus will visit the site, will it lead to additional parking at Arlesey Railway Station or on-street parking within Stotfold. This will result in a large number of coach/minibus vehicle movements, with the additional staff/ volunteer car trips.

Given its location there is no potential for visitors to use public transport, other than rail services with a pre-booked shuttle link to the site, this is clearly contrary to government advice regarding the location of uses which generate significant amounts of traffic. There is also no essential reason why this building needs to be located in the countryside.

Planning permission was sought for a similar scheme on land at Wrayfields, Stotfold in 2004. Wrayfields as noted previously is within close proximity just south of the application site. The access sought for this site was also from the A1 although a different arrangement to that currently proposed. The application in 2004 was made by the same applicant as the application now under consideration and sought permission for the erection of building to house The Saunders Steam and Mechanical Organ Collection (all matters reserved except



means of access). This application has been submitted for same proposal, however, there have been a number of minor changes. It is therefore considered that the concerns raised in the previous application are still relevant.

The previous application stated that the intention of the application was to fulfil the following purposes - providing a controlled storage environment for the historic collection; the provision of a substantial new tourist attraction; and the creation of a facility of educational value. The applicant exhibits his collection of steam engines at fairs, shows and rallies not only in England but widely across Europe. The intention was to continue holding 'tea dances' established by Turners Merry-go-round former owners of some of the collection, and they would be held in the afternoons and evenings at the site. When not in use for formal events, the building could be made available to schools for organised visits. There is also a possibility that the building could be hired for corporate entertainment, or by clubs with an interest in the social or engineering value of the collection.

The application was called in by the Secretary of State, at which point a Planning Inspector refused the application. The Secretary of State agreed with the conclusions of the Planning Inspector. In the report, the Inspector concluded that the site was outside the settlement envelope and therefore would not meet the broad policy thrust of PPS7 to restrain new development in the countryside, and as such 'would result in the establishment of sporadic commercial development...which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the rural area'. In terms of PPS7, the Inspector concludes that the proposal would not meet one of the key objectives of PPS7, to promote more sustainable patterns of development, it would fail to focus development in or next to towns or villages, fail to prevent urban sprawl along the A1 and would not discourage the development of greenfield land.

In this appeal the applicant emphasised the need to locate the collection within Stotfold, given the link with the local community and that the collection would continue to be maintained at the applicant's premises in Arlesey Road, Stotfold. The Inspector acknowledged the benefits for the applicant of the collection being within Stotfold, however, the nature of the collection and the proposed use of the site, serving a national customer base, do not justify a location at Stotfold.

The proposal has been revised and an element of evening entertainment previously proposed has not been included, although it is still proposed to hold 'tea dances' in the afternoon/ evening that could have a maximum attendance of 300 people.

It is considered that many of the conclusions drawn by both the Inspector and Secretary of State are pertinent to this application, given the close proximity of the site and that there has been no significant modification to the proposal that would justify a recommendation against the previous ruling of the Secretary of State. The report by the Secretary of State and the Planning Inspector in regard to the previous application at 'Wrayfields' has been appended to this report for your information.

It is accepted that the proposal would bring some economic benefits to the area and would also provide a tourist attraction for the District. In addition to this and more importantly it would provide a suitable home for a nationally important

collection.

Having weighed very carefully the benefits and the negative impacts of the proposal, it is considered that the development would be contrary to planning policy and government advice, would give rise to development in the countryside and result in significant traffic generation in a location which has no access to public transport. The principle of the proposal is therefore not acceptable.

## **2. Character and Appearance of the Surrounding area**

The site is to some extent masked in the open countryside by the local topography and the site boundaries to the north, south and east are largely demarked by mature hedgerows.

Short distance views of the site from the public highway land are limited, none are available from the southbound approach along the A1 or from immediately east of the site due to extensive mature tree screening. This is evident from the information given in the supporting Design and Access Statement.

It is acknowledged that there would be some screening to the site, however, during winter months this would be reduced and there would be greater views in to the site from the surrounding area, and in particular the footpath that bounds the site and is frequently used by residents in Stotfold.

It is considered that given the size and scale of the proposed building that it would become a dominant feature within this landscape, although seen in conjunction with the existing glasshouses nearby, it would constitute a noticeable and alien feature in an otherwise largely open rural landscape.

This application is in outline form, with only access and layout to be considered at this stage. Matters of design and landscaping would need to be considered at the subsequent reserved matters stage if the proposal was otherwise considered to be acceptable.

## **3. Highway Implications**

The access to the site is from the A1, through an access arrangement agreed with the BP Service Station. The Highways Agency have raised no objection to the application and have recommended two conditions in relation an approved Travel Plan and the closure of the existing access arrangement.

The applicant has stated that all visits to the site will be by coach/ mini bus or shuttle from Arlesey Railway Station. There are concerns over this arrangement and how it can be restricted. In addition to this, how families would visit the site on open days, if they are not arriving by rail. This has raised concern that there may be an increase of parking within Arlesey and potentially Stotfold, as people park there and use the pre-booked shuttle service.

It is considered that the location is generally unsuitable in sustainability terms for a facility likely to attract a significant number of visitors, given the absence of public transport passing by the site and its remoteness from local population centres. PPG13 seeks to promote accessibility to leisure facilities by means of other transport than the private car and paragraph 41 seeks to locate trip

intensive uses in locations best served by public transport. Whilst the shuttle service is welcomed and the encouragement of visitors to the site in groups by coach/ mini bus is acknowledged, it is difficult to see how this would work and could be restricted. It is foreseen that there will inevitably be visitors arriving by car. In addition to this, if visitors are not allowed to park on site, they will be encouraged to park in Arlesey/ Stotfold and use the proposed shuttle service.

#### **4. Neighbouring Amenity**

There are a limited number of dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the application site, in particular the bungalow at Dingleman's Nursery.

The applicant has stated in the Design and Access statement supporting the application that the orientation of the building is such that any external noise generated in connection with the use of the building and in particular vehicular movements will be contained to the north and east of the structure and therefore shielded from the nearest residential properties in Wrayfields and Silver Birch Avenue. In addition to this the bungalow at Dingleman's Nursery is approximately 165m north of the proposed building and is located at the entrance to the commercial nursery. The orientation of the dwelling will minimise any impact of the proposed development.

No supporting information has been submitted with the application in terms of noise or fumes from the development. In particular, there is to be an outside area for display and operation of some of the steam machines. No information has been given in terms of how noise/ fumes will be minimised from these open areas. It is therefore considered that there is insufficient information within the application to assess the impact of noise and fumes on the residential properties within the vicinity of the proposal. It is considered that on this basis the application would be contrary to Policy DM3 and should be refused permission accordingly.

#### **5. Other Issues**

##### Flood Risk

The application site does not lie within the indicative flood plain but nonetheless the introduction of new buildings and significant hard surfacing areas in this rural location could have an impact on the surface run-off rates into local watercourses. In addition to this the site is located on a Principal aquifer. A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application and the Environment Agency have raised no objection subject to conditions. The IDB have been consulted on the application, but to date have not commented. Should they comment on the application prior to committee, their comments will be given on the late sheet.

##### Biodiversity

The site has a number of apple trees identified in the tree survey, under BAP habitat criteria these would constitute an orchard as there are more than 5 trees. Most of these are over shadowed by a large leylandii hedge and are recommended for removal in the tree survey. However, tree numbers 8659 and

8865 are of a good size, to support a good lichen community and as such provide a valuable resource for biodiversity in a dwindling habitat type. Tree 8677 is recommended for retention so it is hoped that these three trees could be kept and added to with replacement planting closeby but not impacted on by the tall hedgerow to provide continued orchard habitat.

The ecological statement recommends a reptile survey be undertaken in the spring and due to the nature of scrub, piles of building materials, compost and manure heaps the results of this would be needed to inform any necessary mitigation measures prior to any site clearance and FULL planning permission being granted. Should planning permission be granted conditions would also be needed to ensure that no clearance of scrub, trees or hedgerows is undertaken during the bird nesting season March - August inc.

## **6. Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing appraisal, the proposed development would represent a substantial tourist attraction within the open countryside, this would be contrary to local policy and national planning guidance. It is not considered that the potential benefits of the proposal would outweigh the objection to the principle of development.

In addition to this insufficient information has been given in terms of noise and fumes resulting from the proposal to assess the impact on the residential properties within the vicinity. It is therefore contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North).

## **Recommendation**

That Planning Permission be refused

- 1 The application site is in an unsustainable location, outside of any defined settlement envelope, with no access to public transport. The proposal would therefore be contrary to local and national planning policies which seek to restrict new development in the countryside; as such the proposal is contrary to national planning policies PPS1, PPS7 and PPG13. In addition to this it is contrary to Policy CS4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North).
- 2 The proposed development, by nature of its location outside any defined Settlement Envelope, would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of this rural area where restrictive Planning Policies apply; as such the proposal is contrary to PPS7 and Policy DM3 and DM4 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North).
- 3 No technical information has been submitted in relation to noise and fumes from the proposed development to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of properties within the vicinity. Therefore the proposal fails to demonstrate that there

would be no detrimental impact on the residential amenities of properties within the vicinity and is therefore contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies for Central Bedfordshire (North).

**DECISION**

.....  
.....