

Item No. 13

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/15/00275/OUT
LOCATION	Prebendal Farm, Grove Road, Slip End, Luton, LU1 4BZ
PROPOSAL	Outline Development: Redevelopment of land previously used as a farm yard to residential use for 8 detached houses (market) and 4 semi detached houses (social use).
PARISH	Slip End
WARD	Caddington
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Collins & Stay
CASE OFFICER	Nicola Darcy
DATE REGISTERED	02 February 2015
EXPIRY DATE	04 May 2015
APPLICANT	Brickhill Properties GP Ltd
AGENT	BHD Ltd
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Called-in by Cllr Richard Stay for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting housing need locally• Provides enabling support for the aggregated farm operation & allows investment in new machinery & protects jobs• Site firmly supported for housing through substantive consultation for the local Neighbourhood Plan• Proposed S106 provides enabling resources to complete large section of Heritage Greenway• Site is edge of village & would have no adverse impact on the Green Belt

RECOMMENDED DECISION **Application recommended for refusal**

Summary of Recommendation

The planning application is recommended for refusal as the site lies within the South Bedfordshire Green Belt, where permission will not be granted except in very special circumstances for development for purposes other than those uses listed in paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework. No very special circumstances have been established in this case to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The harm would comprise harm by reason of inappropriateness, harm by reason of impact on openness, harm to the character and appearance of the area and encroachment into open countryside. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policy 36 of the Development Strategy in Central Bedfordshire, revised pre-submission version June 2014. Additionally, the limited facilities within Slip End are likely to result in additional journeys by private car to other locations to access health, retail and leisure opportunities. The proposal is not considered to be sustainable development and therefore is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policy SD1 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and policies 1 and 24 of the Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire, revised pre-submission version June 2014.

Site Location:

The site lies 160m to the north west of the village centre, fronting onto Grove Road which runs a north westerly direction from the village to Woodside. The site has a common boundary with Prebendal Drive.

The site was originally Prebendal Farm and its associated yard and was in active agricultural use five years ago when farming operations were amalgamated with Woodside Farm. All that remains of the original farm is the farmhouse itself which has been recently refurbished and now rented out as a residential use. An L-Shaped block fronting Grove Road, was granted permission in 1993 for change of use from a redundant barn to the sale of pet foods and is currently leased by small retailers. A small housing development lies to the south east of the site with open fields to the north of the site. There is no significant landscaping denoting the boundaries of the site and there is a corrugated roofed, open barn building within the application site.

The Application:

The application seeks outline planning permission for the residential development of the site of 12 dwellings. The existing dwellinghouse and converted retail unit and parking area would be retained on the Grove Road frontage and are outside of the application site.

The application is for all matters reserved except for access. The development would be served by 1 main vehicle access point off Grove Road.

The application was accompanied by:

- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Layout Plan
- Location Plan
- Transport statement
- Ecological Survey
- Phase 1 Geoenvironmental Desk Study

RELEVANT POLICIES:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012)

- Section 4: Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- Section 7: Requiring good design
- Section 8: Promoting healthy communities
- Section 9: Protecting Green Belt land
- Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review Policies

- Policy BE8 Design Considerations
- Policy T10 Controlling Parking in New Developments
- Policy H4 Providing Affordable Housing
- Policy H3 Meeting Local Housing Needs

The NPPF advises of the weight to be attached to existing local plans for plans adopted prior to the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, as in the case of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review, due weight can be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the

framework. It is considered that Policies BE8 and H3 are broadly consistent with the Framework and carry significant weight. Policies T10 and H4 carry less weight but are considered relevant to this proposal

Emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire 2014

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Policy 2: Growth Strategy
Policy 3: Green Belt
Policy 19: Planning Obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy
Policy 22: Leisure and open space provision
Policy 23 : Public Rights of Way
Policy 24: Accessibility and Connectivity
Policy 25: Capacity of the Network
Policy 27: Car Parking
Policy 28: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
Policy 29: Housing Provision
Policy 30: Housing Mix
Policy 32: Lifetime Homes
Policy 34: Affordable Housing
Policy 36: Development in the Green Belt
Policy 43: High Quality Development
Policy 44: Protection from Environmental Pollution
Policy 50: Development in the Countryside
Policy 56: Green Infrastructure
Policy 57: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Policy 58: Landscape
Policy 59: Woodlands, Trees and Hedgerows

The draft Development Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State on the 24th October 2014. After initial hearing sessions in 2015 the Inspector concluded that the Council had not complied with the Duty to Cooperate. The Council has launched a judicial review against the Inspectors findings and has not withdrawn the Development Strategy. The first phase of the legal challenge took place at a hearing on 16th June 2015. This was to consider whether the court would grant the Council leave to have a Judicial Review application heard in the High Court. The Judge did not support the Council's case. On the 22nd June 2015 the Council lodged an appeal against his judgement. The status of the Development Strategy currently remains as a submitted plan that has not been withdrawn. Its policies are consistent with the NPPF. Its preparation is based on substantial evidence gathered over a number of years. It is therefore regarded by the Council as a sustainable strategy which was fit for submission to the Secretary of State. Accordingly it is considered that the emerging policies carry weight in this assessment.

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Other Documents

Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (March 2014)

Relevant Planning History:

CB/14/03582/PAPC - Pre-App Charging Fee Advice Released (24/10/14)

Representations:

(Consultations/Publicity/Neighbour responses)

Parish Council

The Parish Council supports the application for the following reasons:

- The site is being promoted for redevelopment in the Slip End and Caddington Neighbourhood Plan and although the site is in the Green Belt, the Parish Council would not resist redevelopment of this site.
- The site is an eyesore and contributes nothing to the Green Belt and has little ecological value.
- By supporting the application, it fulfils the role of the Neighbourhood Plan, allowing small sites to contribute to the housing deficit.
- The landowners (Messrs Brown) are supporting and cooperating with the Heritage Greenway Trust, agreeing several footpath diversions to allow delivery of the proposed Heritage Footpath Scheme.

Under the circumstances, the Parish Council believe that the proposed development should be approved.

Highways DM

No objection

Ecology

- No objections
- Further provision could be made and recommends that integral bird boxes are included in the development at a ratio of 1 per unit.
- The ecological survey notes that the site should be reassessed for badger activity prior to works commencing and also makes the recommendation that scrub and bramble should be close cut to prevent any reptile or amphibian interest in the site.

Tree and Landscape
Officer
Housing Development
Officer

Requests Tree Survey

I do not support this application of 12 units at Prebendal Farm. This site being in the Green Belt will be of contentious issue and will require very special circumstances for the development to be able to take place. Whilst this application does provide for 30% affordable housing, in my view if any development were to take place it should be treated as a rural exception site and an application be made along those lines. The supporting documentation indicates that there is an identified affordable housing need which was identified and evidenced through the Housing Needs Survey undertaken within the parish. A rural exception site at Prebendal Farm would go some way to meeting the identified affordable housing need within the Parish. An exception site would also ensure that the affordable housing would be provided for local people with a local connection to the Parish with the affordable housing remaining as affordable in perpetuity. An exception site would provide an appropriate tenure mix providing a range of affordable rent and intermediate tenures to meet the identified local needs.

If Members are minded to approve this application then

we would seek an affordable housing requirement of 30% which equates to the provision of 4 affordable units. Further to this, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has a tenure split requirement from sites meeting the affordable housing threshold as being 63% affordable rent and 37% intermediate tenure. This would make a requirement of 3 units of affordable rent and 1 unit of intermediate tenure from the proposed development.

The supporting documentation for the application states that the affordable housing will be provided to local people of Slip End. As this is an application for a general housing development and not for a rural exception site then the housing can not be designated as being allocated for local people with a local connection. The allocation will have to adhere to the allocations policy and will be let through the Choice Based Lettings (CBL) system the Council operates. If the applicant wants the housing to be for local people then an application should be made as an exception site where the housing will be affordable in perpetuity for local people with a local connection. This would also help to meet the identified affordable housing need within the Parish. Allocation of housing for a rural exception site will adhere to the Rural Exception Sites Local Lettings Policy.

Environment Agency The site is located above a secondary Aquifer and is considered to be of high sensitivity which could present potential pollutant/contaminant linkages to controlled waters. The EA recommends several conditions.

Land Contamination No objection subject to conditions relating to the Officer submission of pre-commencement site surveys.

Archaeology The proposed development site lies within an area that has produced evidence of prehistoric activity and under the terms of the NPPF this is a heritage asset with archaeological interest. However, the archaeological potential of this area is considered to be low. Consequently, there are no objections on archaeological grounds.

Integrated Transport Requests highway improvements to connect the Delivery development with the bus stop opposite.

Other Representations:

Neighbours 1 objection letter relating to the limited space between the new development and the existing houses in Prebendal Drive and to the Green Belt status of the land.

Determining Issues

- 1. Green Belt & Principle of the development**
- 2. Harm to the Green Belt**

3. **Very special circumstances**
4. **Impact on Biodiversity and Landscape**
5. **Amenity**
6. **Highways, Sustainable Transport and Parking**
7. **Affordable Housing**
8. **Legal Agreement**
9. **Sustainable Development**
10. **Other Issues**

Considerations

1. Green Belt and Principle of the Development

- 1.1 The site is within the Green Belt and is not one of the types of development listed in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF. The proposal therefore conflicts with the policy set out in section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the reasons for including land within the Green Belt set out in paragraph 88. Policy 36 of the Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire, revised pre-submission version June 2014, reflects the approach of national policy in relation to the Green Belt.
- 1.2 As the proposal is not listed in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF it is inappropriate development. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
- 1.3 The proposal is therefore by definition harmful to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness. Very special circumstances will therefore need to be demonstrated to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriateness and any other harm which would arise as a result of the development.
- 1.4 The application site is also outside of any settlement and is for the purposes of planning in the open countryside. The NPPF sets out that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Development Strategy policy 50 sets out that *"outside the defined settlement boundaries new development will only be supported if it satisfies the appropriate policies and the following criteria where applicable:*
 - *where development would represent the most sympathetic, viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or*
 - *where development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting."*
- 1.5 The proposal does not represent enabling development in relation to a heritage asset, nor does it involve the re-use of buildings.
- 1.6 The principle of the development is therefore unacceptable due to its location within the Green Belt and open countryside subject to the consideration of very special circumstances considered below.

2. Harm to the Green Belt

- 2.1 The application suggests the VSCs should outweigh the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is not the test that the NPPF applies, the NPPF requires that VSCs clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm. In order to consider whether the VSCs outweigh the potential harm, that harm

first needs to be identified.

2.2 The proposal would cause harm by reason of inappropriateness, it would also cause harm by reason of loss of openness, harm to the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt by failing to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The level of harm caused by each of these is considered in more detail below.

2.3 Harm by reason of inappropriateness

The application site is within the Green Belt and constitutes inappropriate development. The harm by reason of inappropriateness should be given significant weight.

2.4 Harm to openness

The NPPF highlights the openness of the Green Belt as its most important attribute and the development of the site would result in the loss of openness. Openness is the absence of development and it is considered that although the application site is adjacent to existing development the proposal would have an adverse impact on the openness of the land within the Green Belt.

2.5 It is accepted that a limited amount of development would result in limited harm; however the proposal comprises a development of 12 dwellings and associated road, landscaping etc which would cause significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

2.6 Significant weight should be given to the harm to openness which would result from the development.

2.7 Harm to the character and appearance of the area

The boundaries of the site are formed by sporadic hedgerows of varying maturity, density and health. There are clear views into and across the site. If housing was erected on the land it would be clearly visible above the existing landscaping.

2.8 There would also be an adverse impact on the character of the landscape as the site is currently an open yard with only one open sided building in the centre of the site. The proposal would significantly alter the open character to one of built development.

2.9 Encroachment

One of the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The application would clearly fail to comply with this purpose as it would represent encroachment into the countryside contrary to Green Belt policy.

2.10 Conclusion on harm

It is considered that the potential harm which would result from the development would be significant and the applicant must demonstrate very special circumstances to clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt.

3. Very Special Circumstances

3.1 The application sets out that there are a number of reasons to approve the application, although these matters have not been referred to as 'very special circumstances'. The reasons are set out below.

3.2 The site has been considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and is supported by them as an appropriate site to come forward through the plan.

The consideration of this site among other sites in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for Caddington and Slip End has zero weight as a material consideration at present, particularly given that, the plan has yet to be submitted to Central Bedfordshire Council. The Development Strategy is not yet adopted and the site is within the Green Belt where development cannot be allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan alone.

3.3 The correct approach to contributing to housing stock by providing housing in villages would be to use the "Call for Sites" process to seek to encourage the Local Planning Authority to release the land from the Green Belt and allocate it for residential development. The NPPF is clear that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. There is no mechanism to review the Green Belt boundary through a planning application which is effectively what this application is seeking to do.

3.4 The site has been 'previously developed.'

The site comprises an open yard with a single, dilapidated, corrugated roofed, open sided barn which is not considered to be of substantial construction. No evidence has been put forward to suggest that there were permanent buildings on the site.

3.5 The site will generate significant Planning Obligations money and would provide contributions to the Heritage Greenway.

The proposal for a heritage greenway would comprise a route from the southern tip of Slip End to the northern tip of Caddington, which will include the upgrade of existing footpaths to encourage sustainable methods of transport such as walking, cycling and horse riding.

3.6 The Caddington & Slip End Neighbourhood Plan is at a stage of preparation where no weight can be given to the aspirations that can be found within it. The proposed Heritage Greenway is also a significant distance from the application site and any planning contributions arising from this application would not meet the CIL tests as the Greenway is not directly related to the development. Therefore the level of weight that can be given to the public benefit that would result from the provision of contributions for the Heritage Greenway is negligible.

3.7 The Council do not currently have a five year housing land supply

Although the Council at the time of writing, cannot demonstrate an up to date 5 year housing land supply, this small scale site in the Green Belt does not accord with paragraphs 49 and 14 of the NPPF where "the adverse impacts of this development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the framework as a whole."

3.8 The proposal would cause harm by reason of inappropriateness, it would also cause harm by reason of loss of openness, harm to the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt by failing to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The level of harm caused by each of these is considered in more detail below.

3.9 Overall it is not considered that the very special circumstances set out above clearly outweigh the harm identified to the Green Belt. The proposal therefore

would be contrary to the NPPF and policy 36 of the Development Strategy.

4. Impact on Biodiversity & Landscape

4.1 Biodiversity

Development Strategy policies 56 and 57 require a net gain in terms of green infrastructure provision and biodiversity and geodiversity. The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 requires the Council in exercising its functions, to have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

4.2 The Ecology Officer has recommended that bird boxes be provided at one box per dwelling which is considered to be in accordance with the relevant policies and conditions could secure a scheme. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policies 56 & 57 of the Development Strategy.

4.3 Landscaping

South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review policy BE8 requires that the proposal takes full account of the need for landscaping and takes into account existing trees and vegetation. Development Strategy policies 43 and 59 seek to ensure that developments incorporate high levels of landscaping and retain existing trees.

4.4 The Tree and Landscape Officer has requested an arboricultural assessment, however, there are no longer any trees on the site. As the application is in outline format there are no detailed landscaping plans, conditions could however be used to secure a landscaping scheme. The proposals are therefore considered to comply with policy BE8 of the Local Plan and policies 43 & 59 of the Development Strategy.

5. Amenity

5.1 South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review policy BE8 and Development Strategy policy 43 require that new development is of high quality and is appropriate in scale and design to its setting as well as contributing positively to creating a sense of place and respecting local distinctiveness in addition the policies require a high quality development in terms of design, layout and provision of open space.

5.2 Illustrative layout

The illustrative layout is only for information in this outline application but does represent one potential approach to the development of the site. The Design Guide sets out internal and external space standards and also a recommended back to back distance. The illustrative layout has been assessed against these standards.

5.3 No typical housetype plan has been submitted with the application. Therefore, the internal space standard cannot be assessed.

5.4 External Space Standards

The Design Guide requires that the minimum depth for rear gardens should be 10m to ensure both that suitable levels of privacy are maintained and that reasonable sized gardens are created. For a 2 bed dwelling a minimum area of 50m² (based on a 5m width) with a depth of 10m should be provided as rear garden, for a dwelling with 3 or more bedrooms a minimum of 60m² with a depth of 12m. Where dwellings have awkward shaped plots side gardens could be taken into account.

- 5.5 Many of the dwellings shown on the layout plan do have gardens large enough to comply with the guidance set out in the Design Guide, those which show an under provision could be amended to meet the criteria.
- 5.6 Residential Amenity - Existing residents
South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review policy BE8 and Development Strategy policy 43 state that new development ensures general and residential amenity is not adversely affected
- 5.7 The relationship between the existing dwellings in Prebendal Drive and the proposed dwellings is very close. As the site layout is for illustrative purposes only, this matter could be addressed within the Reserved Matters application.
- 5.8 The Design Guide includes a back to back distance of 21m which should be achieved between dwellings to ensure privacy is maintained. The proposed dwellings have no 'back to back' relationship conflicts, there are front to front and front to side relationships to consider and subject to the placing of fenestration, based on the illustrative plan it is considered that adequate separation distances can be achieved to protect the residential amenity of existing residents.
- 5.9 Existing residents would experience a change in circumstances if the proposed development was built, with increased activity adjacent to their properties and/or gardens. Whilst this level of activity may not be welcomed it is not considered that it is a reason to refuse the application.
- 6. Highways, Sustainable transport and parking**
- 6.1 Development Strategy policy 25 sets out that planning permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated that development will not endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.
- 6.2 The application is in outline with all matters reserved apart from access. The submitted plans show the main point of access would be taken from Grove Road.
- 6.3 The Highways Development Control Officer has confirmed that he has no objection to the use of the existing access.
- 6.4 Parking
Development Strategy policy 27 requires that appropriate levels of parking in line with those set out in appendix 8, which are the same as those in the Design Guide are provided.
- 6.5 It is proposed that all parking is on plot either adjacent to the private garden or within private garaging. The level of parking would be in accordance with the parking standards.
- 6.6 Integrated Transport Delivery
The Principal Highways Officer considers that improvements should be made in order to connect the development to the bus stop opposite, proposed works would involve the provision of a courtesy crossing by way of the installation of tactile paving and footpath improvements and the upgrade of the existing bus stop. These improvements would be in line with Policy 24 of the Development Strategy and could be delivered via a planning obligations contribution, discussed in detail at section 8 of this report.

7. Affordable Housing

- 7.1 The application description details that four of the twelve dwellings would be offered as 'social housing.' This would equate to a 30% affordable housing provision. The supporting planning statement states that these four dwellings would be specifically for local people and families that live in the village already and who need their own independent accommodation but cannot afford to buy a house. The Parish Council have stated that they support the application on this basis. However, the Housing Development Officer has objected to the application as he considered the site should be treated as a rural exception site which would ensure that the affordable housing would be provided for local people with a local connection to the Parish with the affordable housing remaining as affordable in perpetuity. An exception site would also provide an appropriate tenure mix providing a range of affordable rent and intermediate tenures to meet the identified local needs. As this is an application for a general housing development and not for a rural exception site, the housing cannot be allocated for local people with a local connection. The allocation would have to adhere to the allocations policy and would be let through the Choice Based Lettings (CBL) system the Council operates.
- 7.2 If the applicant wants the housing to be for local people then an application should be made as an exception site where the housing will be affordable in perpetuity for local people with a local connection. This would also help to meet the identified affordable housing need within the Parish. Allocation of housing for a rural exception site would adhere to the Rural Exception Sites Local Lettings Policy.
- 7.3 If Members were minded to approve this application then we would seek an affordable housing requirement of 30% which equates to the provision of 4 affordable units. Further to this, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has a tenure split requirement from sites meeting the affordable housing threshold as being 63% affordable rent and 37% intermediate tenure. This would make a requirement of 3 units of affordable rent and 1 unit of intermediate tenure from the proposed development.

8. Legal agreement

- 8.1 The Planning Obligation Strategies that have previously been used to inform the collection and negotiation of contributions can no longer be applied. From 6 April 2015 only site specific planning obligations can be negotiated until the adoption of the Central Bedfordshire Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which is expected towards the end of 2015.
- 8.2 Spending Officers from Leisure, Education and Sustainable Transport have requested the following contributions:
- 8.3 £21,052 Leisure contribution which would support improvements at the Crawley Road site.
£8,295.84 Slip End Pre-School.
£50,885.45 for improvements to Manshead School.
£10,000 for improvements to the highway to connect the proposed development to the bus stop opposite.
- 8.4 The spending requests must be assessed in line with CIL tests set out in Regulation 122(2) of the CIL Regulation 2010 (as amended) which ensure that the requested obligation is; necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and is fairly and reasonably

related in scale and kind to the development. All of the above requests appear to meet the criteria in order for the Council to request such payments, however, no detailed negotiations on the agreement have taken place due to the in principle objection to the development.

9. Sustainable Development

9.1 The NPPF sets out at paragraph 9 that:

"pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life, including (but not limited to):

- making it easier for jobs to be created in cities, towns and villages;*
- moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature;*
- replacing poor design with better design;*
- improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure; and*
- widening the choice of high quality homes."*

9.2 The traditional view of sustainability being in relation to reducing journeys by private car should also be considered. The limited facilities within Slip End are likely to result in additional journeys by private car to other locations to access health, retail and leisure opportunities.

9.3 Overall it is not considered that the proposal represents sustainable development and would be contrary to national policy in the NPPF and local policies in the South Bedfordshire Local Plan and the Development Strategy.

10. Other Issues

10.1 It is not considered that the application raises any issues under the Human Rights Act.

10.2 It is not considered that the application raises any issues under the Equality Act.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

RECOMMENDED REASONS

- 1 The site lies within the South Bedfordshire Green Belt, where permission will not be granted except in very special circumstances for development for purposes other than those uses listed in paragraphs 89 & 90 of the National Planning Policy Framework. No very special circumstances have been established in this case to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The harm would comprise harm by reason of inappropriateness, harm by reason of impact on openness, harm to the character and appearance of the area and encroachment into open countryside. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and policy 36 of the Development Strategy in Central Bedfordshire, revised pre-submission version June 2014.
- 2 The limited facilities within Slip End are likely to result in additional journeys by private car to other locations to access health, retail and leisure opportunities. The proposal is not considered to be sustainable development and therefore is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policy SD1 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and policies 1 and 24 of the Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire,

Notes to Applicant

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 5, Article 35

Planning permission has been refused for this proposal for the clear reasons set out in this decision notice. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant in an attempt to narrow down the reasons for refusal but fundamental objections could not be overcome. The applicant was invited to withdraw the application to seek pre-application advice prior to any re-submission but did not agree to this. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraphs 186 and 187) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

DECISION

.....
.....
.....