

## Item No. 13

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/15/04547/FULL</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>Fourwinds Farm, Leighton Road, Stanbridge, Leighton Buzzard, LU7 9HW</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Erection of agricultural building to replace buildings destroyed by fire and provision of hardstanding and fencing (Retrospective) (Resubmission of CB/15/02271)</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Stanbridge</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Heath &amp; Reach</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllr Versallion</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Debbie Willcox</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>23 November 2015</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>18 January 2016</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Mr G McDaid</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	<b>Wilbraham Associates Ltd</b>
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	<b>Called-in by Councillor Versallion on the following grounds:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Loss of amenity</b></li><li>• <b>Impact on landscape</b></li></ul>
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Full Application - Recommended for Approval</b>

### **Summary of Recommendation**

The application is for agricultural development and thus the principle of development is considered to be acceptable. Subject to conditions controlling screening and materials, the proposed barn, reduced hardstanding and fence would not unacceptably harm the openness of the Green Belt or the character and appearance of the area and would not have an unacceptable, detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. It is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on highway safety. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, policies BE8, NE13 and T10 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide.

### **Site Location:**

The application site comprises an agricultural holding located on the south side of Leighton Road on the outskirts of the village of Stanbridge.

The application site is washed over by the South Bedfordshire Green Belt.

### **The Application:**

The application seeks planning permission to erect an agricultural building to measure 23.2m wide by 11m deep. It would have an eaves height of 4m and a shallow pitched roof with a ridge height of 5.2m.

The application also includes retrospective planning permission for an area of hardstanding outside of the barn to measure 20m deep by 18m wide. This is smaller than the existing area of hardstanding, some of which will be removed should planning permission be granted.

The application also includes a proposed 2m high fence around the area of

hardstanding.

## RELEVANT POLICIES:

### National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Section 3: Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy

Section 9: Protecting Green Belt Land

### South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review Policies

BE8 Design Considerations

NE13 Control of Agricultural and Forestry Development in the Countryside

T10 Parking - New Development

*(Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, the age of the plan and the general consistency with the NPPF, policies BE8 & NE13 are still given significant weight. Policy T10 is afforded less weight).*

### Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire (June 2014)

*At the meeting of Full Council on 19th November it was resolved to withdraw the Development Strategy. Preparation of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan has begun. A substantial volume of evidence gathered over a number of years will help support this document. These technical papers are consistent with the spirit of the NPPF and therefore will remain on our web site as material considerations which may inform further development management decisions.*

### Supplementary Planning Guidance

Central Bedfordshire Design Guide: A Guide for Development (2014)

### Relevant Planning History:

Application Number CB/15/02771/FULL

Description Erection of agricultural building to replace buildings destroyed by fire and provision of hardstanding and fencing (Retrospective)

Decision Invalid - Not proceeded with

Decision Date Withdrawn 26/11/2015

### Consultees:

Stanbridge Parish Council

OBJECTION on the grounds that this application is flawed and cannot be taken as truth. The applicant has already broken enforcement notices and the basis for his request is not based on the truth. The report carried out for the council also calls into question the applicants true nature of business and reason for the development and size. Four Winds Farm is now up for sale and can be seen on Right Move so all talk of the business planned for this site are not true. The applicant has not bought the 11 acres they say they have as it is not for sale and the owner can confirm this as they have to the parish council. We cannot agree to the application until we know for sure what it will be used for.

Agricultural Consultant

### 9. Conclusions

9.1 I am reasonably satisfied that there is a small scale agricultural operation recently based at Four Winds site, however, I am sceptical that other land or a contracting

operation is genuinely run from this site. Land stated to be in the ownership or control of the applicant has not been adequately confirmed.

9.2 There is clear local and national planning policy for the principle of new agricultural buildings where there is a genuine need. On balance and considering that this building replaces two other structures of a similar footprint, that it is required for reasonable storage purposes. The reduced area of hardstanding is more acceptable given the likely scale of farming likely to occur.

9.3 The Greenbelt location does, I consider, mean that screening and landscaping need to be considered and at present there is a considerable amount of excavated soil dumped on the site which your Authority may consider appropriate for landscaping or removal, were they to approve this application. I consider the larger area of hardstanding should be returned to grass or agricultural use, unless your authority considers it not to be appropriate.

9.4 Whilst still sceptical about the likely size and scale of farming operation practised and proposed from this location, some outdoor storage for agricultural use only may be acceptable, particularly if other land is to be included within the farming operation.

Highways Officer

The applicant wishes to replace the two former agricultural buildings for a single slightly larger unit, with an associated hardstanding.

The agricultural use already exists at this location and the proposal is considered just to be a continuation of this use.

On this basis I would not raise any highway objection to the application.

As this is a retrospective application it seems pointless imposing conditions for such things like a wheelwash etc, however I would suggest you consider removing permitted development rights to control its future use.

Pollution Team

No comments.

**Other Representations:**

Neighbours  
(37 Orchard Way, 54  
Tilsworth Road & 85  
Leighton Road,  
Stanbridge)

Object to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Concerns with what the ultimate purpose of these buildings are intended for and the attendant dangers of frequent noisy vehicles entering and leaving at all hours;
- The development seeks to convert a family home into

an industrial yard;

- Can access be obtained from the other side of the property?;
- The design of the proposal is industrial and an eyesore;
- So far the development has brought with it the destruction of a landscaped garden, unpermitted laying of hardcore and unrelenting noise from machinery extending into the late evenings and weekends;
- There are discrepancies between the application form and the submitted plans;
- The hardstanding as existing exceeds the amount of hardstanding shown on the plans;
- No information has been given regarding highway impacts, the access is on a bend and the proposal would increase vehicle movements of heavy vehicles, which would negatively impact on highway safety;
- The development includes the movement and storage of vehicles, plant and machinery, but does not include measures to prevent contamination of the land;
- The application form states there are no trees or hedges on the site, but the application relies on there being an existing tree and hedgerow screen along Leighton Road;
- The covering letter states that the agricultural land and house are not visible from outside the site but this is not true and the site is becoming more visible from Leighton Road and Billington Road as the boundary planting is thinned out;
- The letter states that the two buildings were destroyed by fire, but a Freedom of Information Act request was made to Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue and they advised that only 2 incidents were recorded at the site in the last 10 years, the most recent one being in 2015 and involving only one building, a private garage. The other was a false alarm in 2009;
- The applicant has installed commercial CCTV within the site and along the boundaries. This is not included within the application;
- The proposed hardstanding is extensive and is being used not just for the storage/parking of agricultural machinery and plant but also for industrial equipment and for the stockpiling of material that exceeds the requirements for an agricultural holding;
- The previous agricultural report indicates that the applicant has a contract providing services at the Luton Hoo estate and that this is commercial, not agricultural enterprise;
- The access as shown on the plans differs in reality. As the intention is to store agricultural machinery and plant at the site, one would expect the Council would want to be assured that there is adequate access, egress and visibility to allow vehicles to manoeuvre in and out of the site safely;

- The application does not include sufficient details of the proposed materials of the barn, surfacing of the hardstanding or materials of the proposed fence to meet the requirements of the Development Management Procedure Order, which requires that applications be submitted by plans, drawings and information necessary to describe the subject of the application;
- On 31st August 2015 the government issued new planning policy in respect to Green Belt protection and unauthorised development within the Green Belt. The hardstanding was laid without planning permission in May 2015;
- The enforcement report includes a paragraph that states that the landowner explained that the intention was to create a yard area related to his agricultural business which would specialise in the storage and hire of agricultural machinery;
- The applicant did not submit the planning application by the end of June 2015 as required by the Council's enforcement team;
- The NPPF states (in para 89) that agricultural and forestry buildings are not inappropriate within the Green Belt, however, it does not state that engineering operations for the needs of agriculture are not inappropriate. Engineering operations within the Green Belt are only not inappropriate provided that they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The hardstanding fails to preserve the openness of the Green Belt;
- The supporting material states that the building is required to serve the proposed use of the site as an agricultural holding, not an existing agricultural use and thus cannot depend on Para 89 of the NPPF;
- The site is not subject to a tenancy and thus is not the subject of an agricultural holding;
- The previous buildings (whether fire damaged or not) have been removed and the courts have ruled there is no legal right to a replacement. The previous existence of the buildings therefore should not be a material consideration in the determination of the application;
- The application does not include sufficient information to establish need for the building. No business case has been presented to establish the financial viability of the proposed agricultural business.
- The application does not include evidence regarding the need for the hardstanding; the existing hardstanding is excessive and the fact that there is equipment on the hardstanding indicates that there is no intention to reduce it in size;
- The fence would be inappropriate in the Green Belt as it would be a steel fence more appropriate in an

- industrial estate;
- The establishment of a depot or storage area to service a commercial contract to the Luton Hoo estate does not meet the agricultural needs test and would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt;
- The courts require that the Council properly assess the reports of specialist consultants;

### **Determining Issues:**

The main considerations of the application are;

1. Background
2. Principle of Development
3. Affect on the Character and Appearance of the Area
4. Neighbouring Amenity
5. Highway Considerations
6. Other Considerations

### **Considerations**

#### **1. Background**

- 1.1 The application site comprises a parcel of land of approximately 4 acres. Aerial imagery indicates in 2010 it comprised a dwelling, two agricultural buildings, and a curtilage to the dwelling of landscaped garden, with the remainder (some two thirds of the site) comprising a field.
- 1.2 In May 2015 an enforcement complaint was received that a large area of hardstanding had been laid on the site. A meeting was held on the site and the land owner explained that the intention was to create a yard area related to his agricultural business which was to specialise in the storage/hire of agricultural machinery. At this time the base of the hardstanding area extended close to the highway hedge and the posts for the yard enclosure had already been installed. The land owner claimed that the base area excavated was in excess of what he required. Agreement was reached that in the excess area (closest to the front boundary hedge) the soils that had been removed and stockpiled on the adjoining land would be returned and this part of the field would be re-instated. Agreement was also reached that no further work would be carried out related to the creation of an agricultural machinery yard until the anticipated planning application had been considered. The Council confirmed these matters in an email sent to the land owner on 5 June 2015. A period of three weeks (21 days) was given for the planning application to be submitted.
- 1.3 The Planning Enforcement Officer made a further visit to the site on 10 June 2015 and observed that the land owner had co-operated and re-instated part of the field, as requested.
- 1.4 As no planning application had been received by the end of June 2015 a letter to the land owner at Fourwinds Farm was sent on 13 July 2015. This set out that formal enforcement action would be taken in 28 days time (after 10 August 2015) if the land was not re-instated to its former condition by this date.

- 1.5 A planning application (reference no. CB/15/02771/FULL) was submitted on 24 July 2015. Additional information was requested and received and the application was validated on 5th August 2015. However, this application was subsequently found to be invalid as the wrong Certificate had been signed. The application was therefore not proceeded with. A correct Certificate was signed and the original submission transferred to this current application.
- 1.6 The application was accompanied by a letter which stated that the applicant was in the process of purchasing a further 11 acres on the western side of Billington Road. It stated that the two agricultural buildings previously on the site had been destroyed by fire earlier in 2015. The letter states that the applicant intends to carry out sheep and cattle fattening on the land.
- 1.7 A subsequent email from the agent stated that the purpose of the barn would be for smaller items of farm machinery, fodder, fertiliser and a workbench. The hardstanding would provide storage for the tractor, trailer, baler and mower and would also be used to store hay under a tarpaulin.
- 1.8 As part of the previous application, the Council commissioned Landscape Land and Property, an agricultural consultant to assess the proposals. The consultant was advised by the applicant (Mr Gerry McDaid) that the applicant operates a contracting agreement with Luton Hoo taking straw and hay from the estate. Subsequent investigation revealed that the contracting agreement with Luton Hoo is with a Mr Felix McDaid, based in Slip End. The relationship between these two is unclear.
- 1.9 The report concluded that the proposed barn would be of an appropriate scale for the existing landholding at Fourwinds Farm, but the area of hardstanding that formed the subject of the application was overlarge without evidence of the purchase of the 11 additional acres. This was communicated to the agent and he responded to the effect that the purchase had been delayed and may not be able to take place. The proposal was amended and the area of hardstanding was reduced. The application was reconsulted on and this was the point when it became apparent that the application was invalid.
- 1.10 This application is therefore for the barn and the reduced area of hardstanding. The Council has consulted the same agricultural consultant on the revised scheme and the conclusions to the report are reproduced above. This report states that the agricultural holding number is currently unregistered. It contains much of the same information, including doubts about the likely size and scale of the farming operation practised and proposed from this location, nevertheless, it determines that, in a policy context the proposed building and reduced hardstanding are acceptable for a farming unit of the size of Fourwinds Farm, although it indicates that screening and landscaping would be required.

## **2. Principle of Development**

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for three elements, which are the proposed erection of an agricultural barn, the retrospective installation of a hardstanding and the erection of a 2m high fence.
- 2.2 The proposed fence would be located more than 2m away from the highway. It should be noted that permitted development rights exist for the erection of a fence no higher than 2m, provided that it is located more than 2m from the

highway, no matter what the appearance or materials of the fence. As such, it would not be appropriate to refuse planning permission for the fence and it should not form a material consideration in regards to the other aspects of the planning application.

- 2.3 The application site is located within the South Bedfordshire Green Belt and thus Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework is the key policy consideration in the determination of this planning application. The protection of Green Belts is an important part of national and local planning policy. Section 9 states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
- 2.4 Paragraph 89 states that the construction of new buildings is inappropriate within the Green Belt, unless the development falls within the list of provided developments. One of these exceptions is the construction of buildings for agriculture and forestry and this is unqualified. There is no indication that the agricultural enterprise must be existing.
- 2.5 It is acknowledged that there is some confusion over the likely future use of the site, whether that is to be pure agriculture or associated with an agricultural contracting company (which would be a commercial rather than agricultural use). However, the application that is in front of us must be that which is considered and this is for the erection of an agricultural building and associated hardstanding for the purposes of agriculture. The use of the site can be controlled by condition, both to ensure it is used solely for agricultural purposes and to prevent changes of use of the barn from taking place at a later date under permitted development rights for the change of use of agricultural buildings.
- 2.6 The agricultural consultant has stated that, in his professional opinion, the proposed size of the building is appropriate to an agricultural enterprise of the size of Fourwinds Farm. The applicant has stated an intention to use the barn for agricultural purposes. Therefore, the proposed barn would not represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt and, subject to a condition stating that it must be used solely for agricultural purposes, the barn would be acceptable in principle.
- 2.7 The application includes a 360 square metre area of hardstanding, which forms part of the unauthorised hardstanding currently on the site. The laying of hardstanding is an engineering operation and paragraph 90 of the NPPF states that engineering operations are not inappropriate development providing that they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The hardstanding does not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, however, it does not preserve the openness of the Green Belt. The hardstanding therefore constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt and should therefore only be approved if very special circumstances can be established which clearly outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt by the hardstanding both by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm.
- 2.8 When considering whether or not very special circumstances exist, consideration should be given to the likely use of the hardstanding, the existence of agricultural permitted development rights, central government



policy on the encouragement of rural enterprise and level of impact that the hardstanding has had on the Green Belt.

- 2.9 The application states that the proposed use of the hardstanding is to function as a curtilage and turning area to the proposed barn (which is, as established above, appropriate and acceptable) and to provide further storage for agricultural machinery and hay. The report from the agricultural consultant concludes that the revised area of hardstanding is more realistic than the previous area in scale for an agricultural enterprise of the size of Fourwinds Farm. The stated proposed use (which can also be controlled by condition) and proposed scale of the hardstanding is therefore considered appropriate to a farm the size of Fourwinds Farm and this is a material consideration that weighs in favour of the proposed hardstanding.
- 2.10 Also weighing in favour of the hardstanding is Section 3 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that local plans should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas and promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses.
- 2.11 It is also noted that the provision of a hard surface on agricultural land for the purposes of agriculture is permitted development under Class B of Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 provided that it would be located more than 25m away from the metalled part of a classified road and would not materially affect the external appearance of the premises. The existing hardstanding is within 25m of a classified road, however, the proposed hardstanding would not be. Subject to the applicant implementing screening around the site to prevent the hardstanding from being visible outside the boundaries of the application site, the hardstanding would constitute permitted development. This should be given significant weight during the consideration of the application.
- 2.12 Furthermore, while the proposed hardstanding does have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt, by its nature the impact is not significant as it is restricted to ground level. Subject to the provision of appropriate screening around the site, which could be controlled by condition, the impact of the proposed hardstanding on the openness of the Green Belt could be limited to a level that would be outweighed by the considerations stated above.
- 2.13 Weighing against the proposed hardstanding is the fact that it is retrospective, and therefore the Ministerial Statement of 31 August 2015 is applicable. This states that the carrying out of intentional unauthorised development within the Green Belt is a material consideration in the determination of any subsequent application and provides weight towards a refusal of the planning application.
- 2.14 The acceptability of the proposed hardstanding is finely balanced, however, it is considered that, on balance, subject to a condition requiring the provision of an appropriate landscape screen around the site, the national policy contained within Section 3 of the NPPF, the advice of the agricultural consultant and the existence of permitted development rights for hardstanding on small agricultural units outweighs the harm that the reduced area of hardstanding would have on the openness of the Green Belt. The principle of the application is therefore considered to be acceptable.

### **3. Affect on the Character and Appearance of the Area**

- 3.1 It is noted that site clearance and boundary tree thinning has been carried out. It is noted that planning permission was not required for these works, however, it does mean that the interior of the site is more visible. It is considered vital that, should planning permission be granted, that a condition is imposed requiring the submission and implementation of a landscaping scheme detailing the enhancement of the remaining boundary screening.
- 3.2 The proposed building itself would be relatively modest in height at 5.2m and would be appropriate in design to its function. It would be sited quite centrally within the site on the footprint of one of the previous buildings. It is noted that neighbouring occupiers have raised concern about the lack of detail in regards to proposed materials, however, these matters are commonly dealt with by condition, and this is considered to be appropriate in this case.
- 3.3 The agricultural consultant has assessed the proposal against policy NE13 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review, which controls the provision of agricultural development. He concludes that the building proposed is a modern replacement for the original pair of sheds on the site and could be argued to be a modest improvement in the situation, as the previous barns were somewhat dilapidated. The area of proposed hardstanding can only be justified if the area is used for farming purposes and the earlier area is restored and made good.
- 3.4 Again, it is noted that the use of the hardstanding and the wider site can be controlled by condition. It is considered that, subject to the imposition of conditions that (i) control the use of the site, (ii) control the materials of the proposed barn and fence, (iii) require the removal of the additional hardstanding and its replacement with planting and (iv) the implementation of additional boundary screening, the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the application site and the wider open countryside would be acceptable. As such, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policies BE8 and NE13 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide.

### **4. Neighbouring Amenity**

- 4.1 The proposed barn and hardstanding area would be located over 70m from the closest residential properties and thus would not have any impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in regards to light, outlook or privacy.
- 4.2 Neighbouring occupiers have raised concerns in regards to noise levels at the site since its purchase by the applicant, however, these are either connected to the existing agricultural use of the site or to a commercial use of the site. Either way they are not connected to the application before us, which does not include a change of use. The existing use of the site is agriculture and the proposed use is agriculture. Any other use of the site requires a further planning application, during which time the impact of a change of use of the site on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers would be considered.
- 4.3 The increased noise levels could be attributed to the formation of the hard surfaced area, however, it is again noted that, on its own, the proposed area of hard surfacing comprises permitted development. Insufficient weight can therefore be attached to the reported increase in noise levels to justify a

refusal for the application.

## **5. Highways Considerations**

5.1 Neighbouring occupiers have raised concerns about the impact of the proposal on the highway network. However, it is noted that the application site already has an agricultural use that would be likely to generate a certain amount of vehicle movements of a certain size and nature of vehicle. The Highways Officer has not raised an objection to the application and it is not considered that it is likely to have a significant detrimental impact on highway safety and capacity.

## **6. Other Considerations**

6.1 Neighbouring occupiers have raised some other points which should also be addressed:

### **6.2 Discrepancies between the plans and the application form:**

It is noted that there are some minor discrepancies between the application form and the submitted plans, however, these are not considered to be material to the determination of the application and therefore are insufficient to form a basis for refusal. The description of the application and the submitted plans are the important considerations and form the basis on which this report has been written.

### **6.3 No measures to protect the contamination of land**

Given the scale of the proposed development and the proposed use of the land it is not considered likely that the proposal would contaminate the land and therefore it would not be proportionate to require measures to prevent land contamination.

### **6.4 Doubts raised in regards to the fire that destroyed the buildings**

Neighbours have queried the veracity of the claims regarding the fire damage of the previous buildings. Insufficient evidence exists either way to indicate what happened to the buildings, however, this does not have a material impact on the determination of the application as the assessment does not rely on the buildings being accidentally damaged by fire to justify the acceptability of the proposal.

### **6.5 Installation of CCTV at the site**

Planning permission is required for the installation of CCTV at the site and this does not form part of the application. The agent was invited to include the CCTV within this application but has chosen not to do so. This, however, is unrelated to the determination of the current application and is a separate matter for the Council's Enforcement Team.

### **6.6 Use of the Site for Industrial Purposes**

The current application claims to be for a building and hardstanding for agricultural use and should be considered as such. Should the site be in use for industrial purposes, this should again be investigated separately by the Council's Enforcement Team and should not form a material consideration in the determination of this application.

### **6.7 Agricultural Holding**

The report of the agricultural consultant has indicated that the supplied agricultural holding number is incorrect. This has been queried with the agent

and the results will be reported on the Late Sheet.

**6.8 Human Rights issues:**

The proposal raises no Human Rights issues.

**6.9 Equality Act 2010:**

The proposal raises no issues under the Equality Act 2010.

**Recommendation:**

That Planning Permission be APPROVED subject to the following:

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS**

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 No construction shall take place on the construction of the agricultural building hereby approved, notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, until details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs of the building hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fence shall not be erected until details of the materials of the fence have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To control the appearance of the building and the fence in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality.  
(Policies BE8 & NE13, SBLPR and Section 7, NPPF)

- 3 **Within three calendar months of the date of this permission, a landscaping scheme to include the removal of the unauthorised hardstanding and its replacement with planting and the enhancement of landscape screening around the boundaries of the site; and a scheme for maintenance of the landscaping scheme for a period of five years following the implementation of the landscaping scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full by the end of March 2017. The trees, shrubs and other planting shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with the approved landscape maintenance scheme and any which die or are destroyed during this period shall be replaced during the next planting season.**

**Reason: To limit and mitigate the impact of the scheme on the openness of the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside.  
(Policies BE8 & NE13, SBLPR and Sections 7, 9 & 11, NPPF)**

- 4 Notwithstanding the changes of use permitted within Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the development hereby approved shall only be used for agricultural uses and for no other purpose whatsoever.

Reason: To exclude the provisions of the said General Permitted Development Order and thereby ensure the Local Planning Authority retains full control of the future use of the land and building in view of the location of the site within the Green Belt and within close proximity to residential properties.

(Policies BE8 & NE13, SBLPR and Sections 7 & 9, NPPF)

- 5 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers WA/GM/01, CBC/001.

Reason: To identify the approved plans and to avoid doubt.

**INFORMATIVE NOTES TO APPLICANT**

1. In accordance with Article 35 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the reason for any condition above relates to the Policies as referred to in the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review (SBLPR) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
2. This permission relates only to that required under the Town & Country Planning Acts and does not include any consent or approval under any other enactment or under the Building Regulations. Any other consent or approval which is necessary must be obtained from the appropriate authority.

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

The Council acted pro-actively through early engagement with the applicant at the pre-application stage which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively to secure a sustainable form of development 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**

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