

**Item No. 7****SCHEDULE B**

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/11/03091/RM</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>Land And Buildings North Of, Taylors Road, Stotfold</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Reserved Matters: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment for B1/B2 employment and C3 residential to include affordable housing, car parking, service roads, landscaping, children's playspace and access (pursuant to outline planning permission MB/07/01762/OUT dated 23 December 2008)</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Stotfold</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Stotfold &amp; Langford</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllrs Clarke, Saunders &amp; Saunders</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Hannah Pattinson</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>12 September 2011</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>12 December 2011</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Taylor Wimpey North Thames, Prime Estates &amp; Bedsand Ltd</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	<b>PPML Consulting Ltd</b>
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	<b>Called in by Cllr B Saunders in view of planning objections raised by Stotfold Town Council.</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Reserved Matters - Granted</b>

**Site Location:**

This site lies at the edge of the settlement of Stotfold to the north and east, with open countryside to the east and west of the site. The south, southwest of the site is primarily residential in character, except for the adjoining business premises (i.e. Beta Engineering which forms part of the original outline application site). A public footpath runs to and from the north of the site (i.e. Taylors Road) along adjoining business premises to the west of the Motorola site and continues via the residential properties at Silver Birch Avenue. There is also a right of way across the site to the agricultural open land to the south.

It is acknowledged through public consultation responses that the site is to the south of Taylors Road, however it is considered that the location is a little misleading in the way it has been worded (this is the same as for the outline planning permission) but should be interpreted as the site is north of Stotfold and off Taylors Road.

**The Application:**

This is a reserved matters application: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment for B1/B2 employment and C3 residential (139 dwellings) to include affordable housing, car parking, service roads, landscaping, children's playspace

and access (pursuant to outline planning permission MB/07/01762/OUT dated 23 December 2008).

## **RELEVANT POLICIES:**

### **PPS:**

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS3 Housing  
PPS6 Town Centres and Retail Development  
PPS7 Rural Areas  
PPS9 Biodiversity & Geological Conservation  
PPG13 Transport  
PPG16 Archaeology & Planning  
PPG17 Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation  
PPS22 Renewable Energy  
PPS23 Planning & Pollution Control  
PPG24 Planning & Noise  
PPS25 Planning & Flood Risk

### **Policy + SPG:**

Core Strategy & Development Management  
Policies 2009

Policies CS5, CS6, CS7, CS14,  
CS16, CS17, CS18, DM1,  
DM3, DM4, DM10, DM13,  
DM14, DM15 & DM16.

Technical Guidance:

A Guide for Development in Central Bedfordshire 2010.

### **Relevant Planning History**

MB/07/01762/OUT Outline: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment for B1/B2 employment and C3 residential to include affordable housing, car parking, service roads, landscaping, children's playspace and access - granted 23 December 2008.

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

Stotfold Town Council

Object on the following grounds:

- 1) This application is inaccurate in that it applies to land to the South of Taylors Road, not to the North as stated.
- 2) It is an overdevelopment of the site within the context of CBC Design Supplement 1 [4.09 – 6.01 – 7.00].

This is suggested as an 'urban fringe' development whereas, in reality, it looks over and is overlooked by open farmland and the recognised 'Conservation Area' of Astwick.

Any permitted development should be in keeping with the setting and be closer to a rate of 30 dwellings per hectare "the conventional density for most suburban developments" as defined in the Design Supplement under section 6.01.

3) The proposal is out of keeping with the general character of the setting, immediately surrounding residential areas and core of Stotfold itself.

The "Design and Access Statement" claims in various places to have taken inspiration from the various housing styles within Stotfold BUT then states that the development should "have its own reflective design to reflect the surrounding areas but not to reproduce them." "The best features of local housing have been replicated through the development but a balance has been reached to ensure this is not an 'anywhere' development and has its own character whilst sitting well within its surroundings."

Under 6.6.3 it states, "The best design features have been reinterpreted on the proposed house types. A layout and elevational treatment steer has been taken from the new development at Land South of Stotfold."

The Land South of Stotfold is an unfinished, high-density development, already displaying severe signs of vehicular access and parking problems due to narrow road widths and inadequate parking provision for "real life" conditions. It fronts on to the main town by-pass and the situation cannot be compared in any way with the proposals in Taylors Road.

4) Undesirably narrow roads / lack of on-road parking provision / garages of inadequate size to encourage their use for vehicles / storage.

The developer is proposing, on narrow width roads "limited on-street parking across the development to ensure the development is not vehicular dominated.....with a limited number of parking courts primarily for the flats and commercial units." It later says there will be "minimal on-street parking."

CBC Design Supplement 1, under section 6.07, gives clear guidance that suitable accommodation for vehicles SHOULD be designed into the scheme and that garage provision should be of suitable size to facilitate both access and storage.

On-road parking is convenient for residents arriving with children, shopping, elderly passengers etc or for their visitors & tradesmen on a temporary basis. It acts as a natural "traffic calming" measure.

Roads must be of a suitable width, and their layout be such that large vehicles (such as refuse collection and

emergency vehicles) can safely pass by and turn (CBC DS1, section 6.11).

5) Play area / Amenity land proposals are unacceptable

The application suggests under 6.16.1 "A contribution will also be made under a supplementary S106 agreement towards the local play space at Stotfold Green.

The Riverside Recreation Ground is as equally accessible from this site the option of where S106 monies are spent should remain with Stotfold Town Council.

Further:

6) Under 6.16.2

Proposal to sign over amenity land and play areas to residents or contractor without first being offered for adoption to the Local Authority (with commuted sums) is not acceptable.

It is proposed that; "all of the amenity space will either be conveyed to the adjacent private households or be maintained by a management company."

The outline permission granted, under items 16 & 17, requires that; "Before any development is commenced on the site details of the layout and design of play areas on the site, including the equipment, furniture, surfacing and boundary treatment to be installed, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority."

"Prior to commencement of development, a detailed scheme for the future maintenance and management of any play, amenity, sporting facilities and landscape areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. .... The scheme should include a plan indicating any play, amenity areas or landscape works that are to be proposed for adoption and details of any commuted sums to be paid to any authority or organisation taking over responsibility for its maintenance."

This practice has already caused problems and concern on other recent developments such as; Fairfield, Queen Street, Waters End/Heron Way; it should not be encouraged to continue.

The Council's Recreation Grounds, Public Lands and Lighting Committee has previously requested that the developers move the play area site away from its proposed location as it is felt not to be a safe area as it is directly adjacent to the high use vehicular access to the site. It is suggested that the play area is repositioned, to swap with plots 31 and 30 so that it is further back into the site.

7) Single access road to residential & employment areas is undesirable.

The original site layout (Prime Estates Ltd application, as approved in outline form) had separate entrances to "employment site" and "residential development", both directly accessed from Taylors Road, with the employment area to the NE of the site.

It is now proposed to relocate the employment area to the SW of the site and have access to it through the residential area on a "shared" road through to Taylors Road.

This will increase total traffic movements through the residential area, bringing commercial traffic into the area with the additional safety and noise implications this carried. It would be preferred that distinct access for the two areas off Taylors Road were provided.

8) Local infrastructure is inadequate to cope with this additional loading.

Traffic movements generated from this site will be intolerable in an already congested area, with all initially leaving on to the very narrow Taylors Road, the majority then turning into narrow, congested and poor visibility Astwick Road to the "difficult" 'Crown Corner' and past the "play area" of Stotfold Green into again heavily used and congested Regent Street on to Hitchin Road before reaching the by-pass.

It should be noted that, as recently as 2001, Planning Permission was refused for the land immediately to the NE of this site (For Chilfen Joinery Ltd, on land owned by Mr D Chellew) for a workforce of only 35 people and occasional commercial vehicle, as Beds CC Highways Department considered (item 2 of their refusal) "The highway network leading to the site is of insufficient standard to safely accommodate the traffic that the proposal may generate."

School places provision – The schools in Stotfold are already in an "oversubscribed" situation creating hardships for parents and teaching staff alike. There are additional residential developments in the pipeline in/around Stotfold, as well as the ongoing Fairfield and Land South of Stotfold developments.

The system is already on overload and cannot cope with more development until this basic need is address beforehand.

9) It is in conflict with the adopted 'Stotfold Town Plan'

The Town Plan clearly indicates that local residents want no more large-scale developments in/around the town due to the already heavily overloaded infrastructure.

The Town Plan also embraces the 'Quiet Lanes' Initiative, strongly endorsed for the roads to the North & East of the

town including Taylors Road, Astwick Road and Malthouse Lane, where possible to be used alongside the 'Green Infrastructure' plan (Taylors Road is a major road crossing point at the appropriate time of the year and, due to its remoteness supports a myriad of other wildlife in the hedges, fields and ditches along its length).

10) Misleading statement concerning sustainability / easy access to public transport

At 6.4.1 they state "The site is within close proximity to local bus stops with regular services to Letchworth, Hitchin, Luton, Shefford, Baldock and Stevenage.

The only close proximity bus stop to the site is at Stotfold Green – The service could not fairly be described as "regular", more "occasional", and most of the destinations listed cannot be reached directly from that stop (or others in Stotfold) at all!

11) Non compliance with outline planning permission requirements

Approval of Planning Permission (Outline) was sent by Gary Alderson of MBDC on 23 December 2008.

Condition 11 begins;

"Before development is commenced a detailed layout plan..... The details shall incorporate the following;"

There is then a list of works /provisions 'off site' that the developers should be agreeing to carry out as a condition of being granted full permission.

These do not seem to be included or covered in the planning application received?

Neighbours

12 letters of objection and 3 letters of comment raising the following issues:

1. A continued mechanical buzzing noise morning to evening, Monday to Friday and frequent weekends from the adjacent commercial premises.
2. Poor air quality from the extractions from the industrial processes.
3. The detriment to the value of our home because of the close proximity to the factory.
4. The unpleasant view at the rear of our home of a factory that has seen better days.
5. Not want to use our garden during the day time because of the above mentioned.
6. Impact on highways.
7. Commuting of occupiers.
8. Lack of School places.
9. Other more suitable sites.

- 10. Design of the houses.
- 11. Impact on footpaths.
- 12. Impact upon Toads.

### Consultations/Publicity responses

EA	No comment.
Disability Discrimination Officer	No issues for DDA.
Tree and Landscape Officer	<p>Landscape proposals are acceptable although it does not appear that much planting has been proposed to screen the remaining Industrial Units to the south from the new development. A fair amount of new hedging is proposed that appears to consist of one species. Why not include a better mix of native hedging plants for better variety and improved biodiversity. Hedging plants to be protected from rabbit damage using spiral rabbit guards.</p> <p>Management Plan is acceptable.</p>
IDB	<p>This site is within the Internal drainage Board's district. The ditch fronting the site is subject to the Board's Byelaw which states that no development shall take place within 7m of bank top of the ditch without the prior consent of the Board. This includes fencing, landscaping and other structures. The proposed layout shows development over the ditch which contravenes the Byelaw. For the development to proceed the ditch would need to be culverted although the layout plan does not appear to take account of the land required for this to take place.</p> <p>An <b>objection</b> is therefore raised to the grant of planning permission.</p> <p>I note that an FRA dated November 2006 Rev C was submitted to the Planning Authority in 2007. The FRA describes the drainage ditch running along the western boundary of the site as 1.4m deep and culverted at each site entrance. Existing on site infiltration drainage is described as discharging surface water from the existing impermeable areas on the site to the ditch. Because the ditch extends upstream beyond the development site, properties upstream of the site are likely to drain to the ditch, albeit the extent of the upstream catchment has not been identified in the FRA. The FRA recommends, however, that the ditch be maintained to ensure free flow of water during a storm event which implies that culverting of the ditch should be subject to certain caveats.</p>

In order for the **objection** to be removed the applicant would need to show that the proposed culvert is sufficiently large to ensure that the upstream catchment is not at flood risk during an extreme flood event and that there is no increase in water level in the culvert above that which would have occurred in the ditch had it not been culverted. This is necessary to ensure that the possibility of upstream drains surcharging as a result of raised water levels due to the development is unlikely to occur. Please note that because the ditch extends beyond the development site, there may be other landowners with the right of drainage to the ditch which must not be adversely impacted by the development.

Culverting of the section of ditch fronting the development site would leave a short section of ditch between the development site and upstream property which is difficult to maintain and will be at risk of blockage. Following the presumption that ditches should not be culverted due to the potential loss of storage during extreme rainfall events and the loss of habitat for wildlife, in order for culverting to be acceptable the applicant would need to show that:

- culverting of the entire length of ditch upstream of the southern boundary of the development site is feasible and possible.
- there will be no adverse impacts on storage as a result of culverting.
- the loss of wildlife habitat by culverting is mitigated elsewhere on the site.
- An easement is provided along the line of the culvert which is free from development, fencing, landscaping or other structures.
- The extent of the existing ditch be included within the redline of the development site.

I would recommend that the application is withdrawn until the investigation and assessment has been carried out and a Drainage Strategy produced for the development which acknowledges any third party drainage issues.

Finally, if the ditch is to be culverted, the Board's consent will be subject to a Legal Agreement between the Board, the applicant and any other landowners affected by the proposals. The Agreement must be completed prior to the culverting works commencing. I would suggest that the applicant contact the Internal drainage Board in order to provide the necessary undertaking for drafting the agreement so that development is not unduly delayed.

Subsequent to this a further email was received on the 1 November stating the following:



The FRA is accepted and includes a drainage strategy for the site. It shows that the ditch fronting the site is to be piped to form part of the on-site surface water sewerage system which will be offered to AWS Ltd for adoption as a public sewer. The IDB will not object to this proposal. The objection to the planning application is therefore withdrawn on conditions that:

- The surface water drainage is designed and constructed to the parameters set out in the FRA. Reason: In order to provide satisfactory drainage for the development.
- An Environmental Assessment is carried out to show that the loss of the ditch does not impact adversely on wildlife habitat or that this loss, if necessary, can be mitigated elsewhere on the site. Reason: To ensure no adverse impact on wildlife by the culverting of an open ditch.

I would suggest that the applicant's solicitor contact the Internal Drainage Board's solicitor in order to provide the necessary undertaking for drafting the agreement for culverting of the ditch so that development is not unduly delayed.

#### Highways

With reference to your consultation of 13 September on the above application, I would make the following comments.

There are no details within the submission describing how Condition 11 is to be dealt with. As long as this condition remains to be complied with, the details can be agreed at a later date.

Similarly Condition 9 should remain in place to ensure that the landscaping proposals do not compromise the requirement for visibility splays.

#### Public Protection

No objection subject to a relevant condition.

### **Determining Issues**

The main considerations of the application are:

1. The Principle
2. Impact upon the Character and Appearance of the Area
3. Impact upon Neighbouring Amenity
4. Other Considerations

### **Considerations**

#### **1. The Principle**

The principle of development has been established by the granting of outline planning permission for re development of the site (planning ref:

MB/07/01762/OUT dated 23 December 2008).

The proposal is to provide 840 sq m of B1 office space adjacent to the existing commercial uses which are to be retained. Beyond the B1 Office space it is proposed to provide 139 dwellings. This development breakdown ensures that 3.22 Hectares of the site shall be developed for C3 residential and the remaining 0.88 Hectares (including the existing industrial premises to be retained) shall be B1/B2 business or general industry.

The above breakdown is in accordance with the developable areas designated as part of the outline planning permission for this site. However, it is acknowledged that as the existing commercial buildings adjacent to Silverbirch Avenue are remaining and therefore the layout of the site has altered. In this application the proposal is to provide the required B1/B2 adjacent to the existing commercial property and the residential beyond this.

The proposal has been considered in relation to the Environment Impact Regulations and it is not considered that it would trigger the need to an Environmental Impact Assessment.

In summary, provided that the proposal is in accordance with Design in Central Bedfordshire: A Guide for Development. and in accordance with the outline planning permission the principle of development is agreed.

## **2. Impact upon the Character and Appearance of the Area**

The proposal has been designed to have as minimal impact as possible upon the Character and Appearance of the Area with a buffer strip being provided as discussed at outline stage to all edges of the site not adjacent to the existing commercial premises. This shall ensure that the development will assimilate as much as possible with the surrounding open countryside.

The site is currently vacant and in poor condition with mounds of soil, demolition rubbish and scrub land. This proposal would ensure that the land is tidied up.

The design of the proposed dwellings has taken into consideration local vernacular architecture and has provided a mix of house types and tenure mix in accordance with principles contained within the adopted Design in Central Bedfordshire: A Guide for Development. In addition the affordable housing provision has been clustered into two separate areas with market housing in between to ensure that it is integrated with the remainder of the development.

As such the proposed development is considered to be appropriate in scale and design to its setting and has been designed to positively create a sense of place. The design of the buildings has taken cues from local vernacular architecture to ensure that the development shall be locally distinctive.

The provision of car parking spaces and garages have been designed in accordance with Design in Central Bedfordshire: A Guide for Development.

In summary, as the principle of development has already been set and as the development has been designed in accordance with the principles provided in the adopted Design in Central Bedfordshire: A Guide for Development it is

considered that the impact upon the character and appearance of the area is acceptable.

### **3. Impact upon Neighbouring Amenity**

There are nearby residential properties, however, the design of the proposal would not impact upon existing residential amenity. Concerns have been raised in relation to traffic implications, however, the outline planning permission has planning conditions attached to it to ensure that highway improvements are provided as necessary.

The proposal has been designed to ensure that each unit has sufficient amenity space. In addition the principles within the adopted Design in Central Bedfordshire: A Guide for Development have been implemented to ensure that privacy is retained for future occupiers. It is acknowledged that some of the rear gardens are slightly small however, the properties in question either have a more generous front garden or side garden as well so in this instance this is considered to be acceptable.

It is understood that the Council have received noise complaints from existing residents in respect of the existing commercial users which is not part of this reserved matters application. Therefore during pre application discussions the applicant has been asked to provide additional information in respect of a Noise Survey and Air Quality and Odour Assessment. Public Protection during the consultation. To date formal comments have not been received from Public Protection. This will be updated on the late sheet.

In summary, as the proposal has been designed in accordance with the adopted Design in Central Bedfordshire: A Guide for Development it is considered that the impact upon both existing and future neighbouring amenity is acceptable.

### **4. Other Considerations**

Highways have not objected to this proposal as there are suitably worded conditions included on the outline planning permission which shall ensure a satisfactory scheme.

The IDB originally objected to the application but subsequently removed the objection provided that two suitably worded conditions are attached to any planning permission.

Public Protection have raised no objection to the scheme subject to a relevant condition ensuring that the scheme is constructed in accordance with the RSK acoustic report submitted as part of this reserved matters application.

Please note that this application requires a Deed of Variation pursuant to the original S106 Agreement to be entered into securing a play equipment contribution in accordance with discussions with the Council's Play Officer. As such until the Deed of Variation is completed the Reserved Matters consent should not be approved.

### **Conclusion**

The proposal has been designed within the parameters of the outline planning permission and in accordance with the principles of the adopted Design in Central

Bedfordshire: A Guide for Development. As such the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

## **Recommendation**

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation outlined above and subject to the following conditions:

- 1 No development shall commence until details of materials to be used for the external finishes of the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance therewith.**

**Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the completed development by ensuring that the development hereby permitted is finished externally with materials to match/complement the existing building(s) and the visual amenities of the locality.**

- 2 No development shall commence until a scheme has been submitted for written approval by the Local Planning Authority indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme before each dwelling hereby permitted is occupied.**

**Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the completed development and the visual amenities of the locality.**

- 3 The surface water drainage is designed and constructed to the parameters set out in the Flood Risk Assessment.**

**Reason: In order to provide satisfactory drainage for the development.**

- 4 No development shall commence until an ecology review of the site has been undertaken, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to show any potential impact upon wildlife habitat or that this loss, if necessary, and provide suitable mitigation measures. The recommendations and mitigation measures of the report shall be wholly implemented prior to the culverting of the ditch.**

**Reason To ensure no adverse impact on wildlife by the culverting of an open ditch.**

- 5 The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the RSK acoustic report ref 440344-02 dated November 2011. Any alterations from the RSK acoustic report ref 440344-02 dated November 2011 shall only be undertaken with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority and thereafter shall be maintained in perpetuity in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To protect the amenity of occupiers of the residential dwellings.**

6 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers [500701-01 Rev B; TWNT-17769-12; TWNT 17769-05; TWNT 17769-11 Sheet 1; TWNT 17769-13 Sheet 4; TWNT 17769-11 Sheet 4; TWNT 17769-11 Sheet 6; CBC001; TWNT 17769-11 Sheet 2; TWNT 17769-13 Sheet 1; TWNT 17769-13 Sheet 2; TWNT 17769-13 Sheet 3; 500701-COM 1-02; 500701 - COM1-03; 500701- COM 1-01; 500701 - COM 2-02; 500701 - COM2-03; 500701 - COM2 - 01; 500701 COM3-02; 500701 - COM3 - 03; 500701 COM3 - 01; 500701-COM 4-02; 500701-COM4-03; 500701 - COM4 - 01; 500701 - COM 5-02; 500701 - COM 5 - 03; 500701-COM 5-01; 500701-SS-01; 500701-FB1-02; 500701 - FB1-03; 500701 - FB1 -04; 500701 - FB1-05; 500701 - FB1-01; 500701-FB1 - 06; 500701 - FB1-07; 500701 - FB2-02; ; 500701 - FB2 -03; 500701 - FB2-04; 500701 - FB2-05; 500701 - FB2-01; 500701 - FB2-06; 500701-FB2-07; 500701 - FB3-02; 500701-FB3-03; 500701-FB3-04;500701-FB3-05; 500701-FB3-01; 500701-FB3-06; 500701-FB3-07; 500701-GAR-01; 500701-GAR-02; 500701-A-03; 500701-A-04; 500701-A-01; 500701-A-02; 500701-AA02; 500701-AA03; 500701-AA01; ; 500701-AB-03; 500701-AB-04; 500701-AB-01; 500701-AB-02; 500701-AC1-02; 500701-AC1-01; 500701-AC2-02; 500701-AC2-01; 500701-AC2-03; 500701-AD-03; 500701-AD-04; 500701-AD-01; 500701-AD-02; 500701-AE-02; 500701-AE-01; 500701-AF02; 500701-AF03; 500701-AF01; 500701-AG-03; 500701-AG-04; 500701-AG-01; 500701-AG-02; 500701-B-03; 500701-B-04; 500701 - B-01; 500701 - B-02; 500701 - C-02; 500701 - C-01; 500701 - D-02; 500701 - D-01; 500701 - D-04; 500701-D-03; 500701-E-03; 500701-E-01; 500701-E-02; 500701-F-03; 500701-F-04; 500701-F-01; 500701-F-02; 500701-G-03; 500701-G-01; 500701-G-02; 500701-H-03; 500701-H-04; 500701-H-01; 500701-H-05; 500701-H-02; 500701-H-06; 500701-H-08; 500701-H-07; 500701-J-04; 500701-J-01; 500701-J-03; 500701-J-02; 500701-J-06; 500701-J-05; 500701-K-03; 500701-K-04; 500701-K-01; 500701-K-02; 500701-L-02; 500701-L-01; 500701-L-04; 500701-L-03; 500701-M-02; 500701-M-01; 500701-N-02 Rev A; 500701-N-01; 500701-P-02; 500701-P-04; 500701-P-01; 500701-P-03; 500701-R-03; 500701-R-05; 500701-R-04; 500701-R-06; 500701-R-01; 500701-R-02 ].

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

### **Reasons for Granting**

The proposal is in accordance with the parameters provided by the outline planning permission. The proposed development would not result in a detrimental impact upon the character or appearance of the area or upon existing or future neighbouring amenity. In addition the proposal is in accordance with the principles of the adopted Design in Central Bedfordshire: A Guide for Developers; Policies CS5, CS6, CS7, CS14, CS16, CS17, CS18, DM1, DM3, DM4, DM10, DM13, DM14, DM15 & DM16 of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies and PPS1 & PPS3.

## DECISION

.....

.....