

Item No. 8

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/16/01476/FULL
LOCATION	The Harrow PH Carpark, Woodside Road, Woodside, Luton, LU1 4DQ
PROPOSAL	Erection of a single storey dwelling on the site of the redundant carpark of 'The Harrow' public house.
PARISH	Slip End
WARD	Caddington
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllrs Collins & Stay
CASE OFFICER	Debbie Willcox
DATE REGISTERED	14 April 2016
EXPIRY DATE	09 June 2016
APPLICANT	Mr Rooney
AGENT	Butler
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Called-in by Cllr Stay for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal is entirely in keeping with current policies;• The proposal is in keeping with and will enhance the existing village scene;• The proposal does not impact on neighbouring properties;• The parking is adequate;• The design is in keeping with local housing;• A fully supported application which will complete the conversion of the former public house and tidy up a local eyesore.
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Recommended for Refusal

Summary of Recommendation

The proposed development would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would have a harmful impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The very special circumstances case submitted by the applicant is not considered to be sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt. The proposed development would also be cramped and out of character with the grain of the village and thus the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and visual amenities of Woodside. The proposal is therefore considered to conflict with Sections 7 and 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review, and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide.

Site Location:

The application site comprises an area of hard surfaced land which lies on the eastern side of Woodside Road, within the hamlet of Woodside, to the south west of the M1 motorway.

The site was previously used as a car park for the former Harrow public house,

which was recently converted into a dwelling. The site has a frontage to Woodside Road of some 29m and is divided by a definitive right of way: Public Footpath (No. 4 Slip End). To the north of the footpath the site is approximately 15m deep by 7m wide; to the south of the footpath the site is approximately 26m deep by 19m wide. The former public house is located to the north, and ribbon development continues along Woodside Road to the south. At the rear of the site are Nos. 1 & 2 Whyley Cottages. The site is inclined, with the land falling towards the road.

The site is washed over by the South Bedfordshire Green Belt. It is also located in a designated Archaeological Notifiable Area.

The Application:

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a detached, two bedroom bungalow with associated garden, parking, bin storage and cycle storage. The smaller section of the site, to the north of the footpath would provide four parking spaces and a waste storage and collection point. The larger section of the site would accommodate the dwelling, its garden and cycle storage.

The dwelling would measure 10.6m wide and 7.2m deep, with a rear projection measuring 1.8m deep by 3.7m wide. It would have a pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of 4.7m. The dwelling would comprise a lounge/diner, kitchen, two bedrooms and a bathroom. The garden area would be approximately 100 square metres.

Between the public footpath and the proposed dwellings, an access way providing vehicular access to the dwellings behind the site would be retained, measuring 2.6m wide.

The application follows a refusal for a detached chalet bungalow on the site under application reference no. CB/15/00115/FULL, which was refused planning permission in 2015 for the following two reasons:

1. The site is washed over by the South Bedfordshire Green Belt, where new residential development is considered to be inappropriate and therefore harmful to the Green Belt by definition. The proposed development would also have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal would not constitute infilling as the site is defined as being part of the countryside within policy GB3 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and policy 4 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire. The very special circumstances case that has been submitted is not considered to be sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and harm to openness. The proposal is thus contrary to Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy 36 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire.

2. The site is too restricted in size and would appear cramped in relation to adjoining development. In addition, as a result of the site's location in front of Whyley Cottages, the proposal would result in the creation of tandem development that would be out of character with the grain and pattern of surrounding development. The proposal would thus create an unsatisfactory form of development, detrimental to the visual amenities of the surrounding area and the residential amenities of the occupiers of Whyley Cottages. The proposal is therefore contrary to the principles of

good design set out within the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review, Policy 43 of the emerging Development Strategy for Central Bedfordshire and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide.

The application differs from the previous application predominantly in that the application now seeks a single storey bungalow instead of a one and a half storey chalet bungalow. The ridge height would be 1.8m lower than the previous scheme, and the footprint of the bungalow would not be significantly different, measuring 1m more in width but 0.4m less in depth.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review Policies

GB3 Green Belt Villages

BE8 Design Considerations

H2 Making Provision for Housing via 'Fall-in' Sites

H12 Controlling Infilling in Villages

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 GB3, BE8, H2 and H12 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)

Design Supplement 5: Residential Development, 2014

Relevant Planning History:

CB/11/01424/PAPP - Advice given on proposal for the change of use of the Public House to residential and 1 detached dwelling. Advice offered was that there is a presumption against residential development within the Green Belt, particularly new buildings and therefore planning permission is unlikely to be granted.

CB/12/00616/PAPC - Advice given on proposal for the erection of two new detached dwellings. Advice offered was that there is a presumption against residential development within the Green Belt, particularly new buildings and therefore planning permission is unlikely to be granted.

CB/12/00640/FULL - Application withdrawn for the change of use of restaurant on ground floor with 3 beds and bathroom over to 3 bed detached house with garage.

CB/12/02743/FULL - Application refused for alterations and extensions to the Harrow to form 2 new dwellings. Appeal dismissed.

CB/12/04303/FULL - Application granted for change of use of restaurant on ground floor with 3 bedrooms and bathroom over to 1 no. 3 bedroom detached house with garage.

CB/13/03407/FULL - Application granted for the retention of "As Built" alterations and additions.

CB/14/00173/FULL - Application refused for the erection of 2 semi-detached houses.

CB/14/03260/FULL - Application refused for the erection of 2 semi-detached houses on 'Brownfield site' of redundant car park (Resubmission of CB/14/00173/FULL.)

CB/15/00115/FULL - Application refused for the erection of 2 bed chalet bungalow. Appeal dismissed.

Consultees:

Slip End Parish Council The Parish Council fully supports and welcomes this development.

Ward Cllr Richard Stay A single dwelling on the site is entirely appropriate and would clean up an existing eyesore.

Highways Officer The Planning Statement refers to a "raised flat top" across the road to link the two public footpaths and the sum of £10,000 as a financial contribution towards its provision. I would point out that this has not been requested by Highways Development Management and therefore it is not within my remit to offer highway conditions for its implementation. Any proposed traffic calming scheme here will need to be designed, checked, safety audited and implemented by the Highway Authority. I think it's too early at this stage to say what form the traffic calming scheme may take or indeed whether £10,000 would be sufficient to cover the costs.

In relation to the residential unit I have the following comments to make.

This application is for the construction of a two bedroom bungalow on the former car park of The Harrow public house with off-street parking for four vehicles, although this parking area has not been included in the red line but it is referred to in the application form.

There is a public footpath adjacent to the proposed unit and a 2.8m wide vehicle access to serve the existing rear property. This new vehicle access will require the kerbs to be lowered and the existing redundant vehicle crossing to the frontage of the new property will need to be closed and the footway reinstated. This work must be carried out by the Highway Authority, at the applicant's expense. I shall impose a condition to secure its provision. There is

also a footpath 'finger post' type sign which will also require repositioning. The Rights of Way section are aware of this and will be offering their opinion on an alternative location for the sign. The process for the repositioning of the sign will be undertaken as part of the construction works for the new vehicle crossing.

The Planning Statement confirms that there shall be no physical barrier between the public footpath and the access to the rear of the proposed development.

The applicant has indicated pedestrian intervisibility splays for the new vehicle access which is fine, however the existing access to the south west of the development, will also require a pedestrian splay across the corner of the front boundary of the adjacent proposed unit.

Driver / driver intervisibility shall be provided and maintained at the new and existing vehicle access. To secure this splay I would recommend that a 2.4m wide margin, parallel to the main carriageway, is kept clear from all obstruction, measured in to the site from the face of the nearside kerb line of the main carriageway.

I would not wish to raise any highway objection to the application subject to the supplied conditions.

Rights-of-Way Officer

I note that the Public Footpath is to remain unaffected by the proposals and the Planning Statement submitted states that there will be no physical boundary between the footpath and the access to the rear property (point 5) and that provision would be made if necessary to stop drivers driving down or parking on the public footpath (point 6). I acknowledge and welcome the latter, but would prefer no bollards are installed at this stage until we assess whether this has become an issue. Is there a way to require any new property owner to install them at their expense should it become an issue?

On the basis of the above, I have no objections to the application but would suggest conditions to attach these aspects to the granting of permission to cover any future property owners.

I completely support the comments made by Highways Development Management regarding vehicle crossovers and movement of the public footpath signpost. I would reiterate my comment that I would prefer the signpost to remain somewhere on the Harrow side of the road. With regard to construction of the development, consideration will have to be given as to whether Public Footpath no.4 would have to be temporarily closed on public safety

grounds and the applicant would be responsible for all costs associated with any temporary closure. There is no reason why this cannot be considered by the applicant at the same time as submitting information to the Council's Highways Development Management team regarding the details of dealing with construction debris and construction vehicles.

I note the comment regarding the £10,000 Section 106 agreement sum offered and once again suggest that this could be secured for the Caddington and Slip End Neighbourhood Plan's Heritage Greenway proposals should this be more appropriate. The Greenway will involve the creation of a local multi-user route through Slip End and Caddington and involve, among other things, new public path creations and surfacing.

CBC Archaeologist Comments not yet received - to be reported on the Late Sheet.

Pollution Team No objection subject to a condition regarding land contamination.

Other Representations:

Neighbours (No 2
Whyley Cottage)

Support the application for the following reasons:

- The dwelling offers the best case scenario for dealing with the eyesore of the current site;
- The proposal would preserve and improve the village;
- The support of the immediate neighbours should have great weight determining what happens with the land;
- The support of the Local Councillor should also be given weight;
- The land currently looks terrible and the current situation provides a great deal of uncertainty regarding the future of the site;
- There were previous dwellings on the site;
- The reduced height of the building and the elevation of the land means there is no loss of openness;
- The Green Belt and tandem development reasons are understood, but planning should not be a tick box exercise but one that carefully considers the implications of decisions for the people most affected.

Determining Issues:

The main considerations of the application are;

1. **Principle of Development and Green Belt Implications**
2. **Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area**
3. **Neighbouring Amenity**
4. **Parking, Highway Safety and Rights-of-Way**
5. **Other Considerations**

Considerations

1. Principle of Development and Green Belt Implications

- 1.1 The application site is located within the South Bedfordshire Green Belt within the hamlet of Woodside, within the parish of Slip End. Woodside is separated from the village of Slip End to the south by open fields. Woodside is not listed within Policy GB3: Green Belt Villages of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan. Slip End is identified within these policies as being inset from the Green Belt, however, the application site is located a significant distance outside the inset boundaries of Slip End. The application site is therefore washed over by the Green Belt and is considered to be part of the countryside. Neither Policy H2 nor H12 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review, which apply to fall-in sites and controlling infilling in villages respectively, can be applied to this application as these policies specifically exclude sites that are washed over by the Green Belt.
- 1.2 The principle of the development therefore must be considered against Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) , which states that the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt should be considered as inappropriate development, excluding certain limited exceptions. Among these listed exceptions are the following:
 - 1) limited infilling in villages; and
 - 2) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.
- 1.3 Development which is inappropriate is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Section 9 of the NPPF states that planning permission should not be granted for inappropriate development within the Green Belt unless there are 'very special circumstances' which exist and would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm.
- 1.4 In this case it is not considered that the proposal can constitute limited infilling of villages because, as a result of its small scale and rural character, Woodside is not considered to be a village in terms of the Settlement Hierarchy, but part of the open countryside. It is also noted that villages that are washed over by the Green Belt do not have a defined village envelope and therefore it cannot be stated that the site is located within the village envelope. Policy GB3 sets out those villages within the South Bedfordshire Green Belt where infilling will be permitted and Woodside is not included within these lists. It is therefore judged that the proposal cannot be considered to represent "infilling within villages".
- 1.5 It is accepted that the site previously held two dwellings and therefore constitutes brownfield land. However, there is little evidence as to exactly when the building was demolished, it has certainly disappeared from the Ordnance Survey maps by 1971; the site has therefore been open for at least 40 years and in recent years has been used until recently for car parking for the adjoining Harrow Public House. The test must therefore be whether or not

the proposal would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

- 1.6 It is considered that the erection of buildings in this location would have a significantly greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the use of the site for car parking and therefore the redevelopment of this site would not fall within the categories of permissible 'exceptions' and would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
- 1.7 A material consideration in the determination of this application is the Appeal decision on the most recent application, CB/15/00115/FULL. The Inspector concluded that the erection of a new dwelling in this location would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
- 1.8 Another material consideration is an earlier Appeal decision, for application reference no. CB/12/02743/FULL. This application sought to extend the Harrow public house into the northern part of the current application site and to convert the extended building into a pair of semi-detached dwellings. It is noted that the Inspector considered that the proposed development would result in a material increase in the footprint of built development, which would materially erode the openness of the Green Belt and have a significantly greater impact than the existing building. No very special circumstances were submitted and the Inspector concluded that substantial weight should be given to the harm that would have been caused by the proposal to the Green Belt. The Appeal was consequently dismissed. While it is noted that the current proposal is significantly smaller than the previous approval for two, two storey houses, it is the views of Officers that the provision of any new building on the site, including the current proposal for a single storey dwelling, would have a significant detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
- 1.9 The applicant has submitted that, in this case, Very Special Circumstances exist which outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt in terms of inappropriateness and loss of openness. These are as follows:
 - 1) The site is on what used to be a car park to The Harrow public house, which is now a private dwelling house and therefore the former car park is redundant.
 - 2) The site is a brownfield site within the village envelope. There was at one time dwellings on the land which were demolished in the (we believe) 1960s.
 - 3) The applicant is prepared to contribute £10,000 towards the creation of a raised crossing of the Woodside Road, linking the two sections of the public footpath that adjoins the site. The crossing would provide an element of traffic calming and would also form part of a "heritage greenway" which has been identified within the emerging Caddington & Slip End Neighbourhood Plan.
 - 4) The 2 local councillors, the parish council and the representatives of Whyley Cottages are supportive of the proposal.
- 1.10 The first two points have been addressed above and it is considered that neither of these points can contribute to a Very Special Circumstances case.
- 1.11 The fourth point indicates that there is a strong degree of support for the proposal. It is noted that the most recent application was supported by Slip End Parish Council and the representatives of Whyley Cottages, and the

current application is supported by the residents of Whyley Cottages and a Ward Councillor, however it is considered that, on its own, the level of local support an application has is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt by development. Furthermore, this level of local support is not considered to add material weight in the consideration of this application.

- 1.12 The previous two applications were also accompanied by a suggested £10,000 contribution towards the provision of a raised table and this was explored fully during the consideration of those applications. The proposal for a heritage greenway would comprise a route from the southern tip of Slip End to the northern tip of Caddington, which would include the upgrade of existing footpaths to encourage sustainable methods of transport such as walking, cycling and horse riding. The existing public footpath adjacent to the site is part of this route and the section immediately across the road is expected to be one of the first to be upgraded. The viability report that has been prepared for the proposed heritage greenway proposes that the provision of the crossing of Woodside Road should be the second highest priority.
- 1.13 It is noted that there is an issue with the alignment of the crossing with the footpath. A representative from Amey (the appropriate agent for the Highway Authority at the time) has previously indicated that a simple table crossing would cost in the region of £10,000. However, it will not be possible to provide a simple table crossing to align with the footpath desire line due to a number of adjacent accesses to private properties. There are therefore two options: 1) to provide a crossing away from the desire line of the footpath or 2) to raise a much larger section of Woodside Road incorporating the various accesses. The anticipated costing for this is between £20,000 - £30,000.
- 1.14 Paragraph 88 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that, when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. It goes on to say that 'Very Special Circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
- 1.15 The Caddington & Slip End Neighbourhood Plan is at an early stage of preparation, and as yet the draft plan is not complete and formal pre-submission consultation has not been carried out. Due to the early stage of the Neighbourhood Plan, no weight can be given to the aspirations that can be found within it. Therefore the level of weight that can be given to the public benefit that would result from the provision of a crossing to Woodside Road is extremely limited, particularly considering that the proposed contribution would not be sufficient to provide the crossing on the appropriate desire line. Furthermore, the Highways Officer has previously raised concerns in regards to the effectiveness, safety and level of funding towards the proposed raised table in regards to its contribution towards traffic calming within the village, which is considered to also limit the weight that can be given to the proposed contribution.
- 1.16 Given the substantial weight that must be given to potential harm to the Green Belt, it is not considered that the proposed public benefit of the provision of

£10,000 for the crossover of Woodside Road is sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt both by reason of inappropriateness and loss of openness. The applicant has thus failed to demonstrate that Very Special Circumstances exist in this case. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would conflict with Section 9 of the NPPF and significant weight should be given to this harm.

- 1.17 Again, the decision of the Appeal Inspector who considered application reference no. CB/15/00115/FULL is a material consideration in this matter. The same very special circumstances case was considered by the Inspector and he concluded that the very special circumstances case was not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt. He also considered that the use of the site as a car park was at odds with the character and appearance of the area, but concluded that the current appearance and condition of the appeal site is not unduly harmful and does not justify granting planning permission for development that is inappropriate by definition. Finally, he considered that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply and therefore the provision of an additional dwelling would provide limited economic and social benefits. However, he concluded that the provision of one additional dwelling would not be significant within the context of the Council's strategic housing requirements and does not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The appeal was subsequently dismissed.

2. Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

- 2.1 Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review sets out certain requirements in terms of the design of new development and their impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Among other things, development proposals should ensure that:

- proposals take full account of the need for opportunities to enhance or reinforce the character and local distinctiveness of the area; and
- the size, scale, density, massing, orientation, materials and overall appearance of the development should complement and harmonise with the local surroundings, particularly in terms of adjoining buildings and spaces and longer views; and
- the setting of any development should be carefully considered, whether in the countryside or built-up area. Attention should be paid to its impact on public views into, over and out of the site. Those views should not be harmed and opportunities should be taken to enhance them or open up new views.

- 2.2 In terms of appearance and materials it is considered that the proposed bungalow would respond well to its setting and would complement other dwellings within the vicinity, with bungalows not being uncommon within Woodside. The scale and height of the bungalow would also be respectful of surrounding development.

- 2.3 However, in relation to the pattern of development and the grain of the area, it is considered that the proposed development would be out of character. The garden would be cramped in depth, failing to meet the Council's suggested minimum depth and being significantly smaller than rear garden depths for other dwellings within the vicinity.

- 2.4 Furthermore, there are two dwellings located behind the site, Nos. 1 & 2 Whyley Cottages, and the introduction of a dwelling in front of these cottages would relegate them to backland status. The dwellings are set at a higher ground level than the application site and would therefore rise above the proposed bungalow and the cramped rear garden depth of the new dwelling would further give the impression of tandem development of a very different character to the surrounding ribbon development.
- 2.5 The Appeal decision for application reference no. CB/15/00115/FULL is also a material consideration in considering this aspect of the development. The Inspector stated that the proposed dwelling would sit in a visually uncomfortable position in front of Whyley Cottages, creating a form of tandem development that would be at odds with its surroundings. In addition, the relatively short back garden would reinforce this uncharacteristic appearance. He considered that this would add to the Green Belt harm that had already been identified.
- 2.6 Also considered relevant is the Appeal decision for application reference no. CB/12/02743/FULL. The Inspector stated, in paragraph 10, that it was important to maintain a sense of openness and space for Whyley Cottages. This is considered to add weight to the judgement that the development would have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenities of the local surroundings.
- 2.7 Overall it is considered that the proposal would fail to reinforce the character of the area and to complement and harmonise with the local surroundings, particularly in terms of the grain of the area. Public views through the site of No. 1 & 2 Whyley Cottages would be damaged by the introduction of development in front of these cottages and there would be harmful impact on views from the public footpath. It is therefore considered that the proposal conflicts with Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide.

3. Neighbouring Amenity

- 3.1 It is considered that the proposed alterations to the scheme has overcome previous concerns in regards to the outlook of the occupiers of Nos. 1 & 2 Whyley Cottages. The height of the bungalow would be sufficiently modest that there would be no loss of light or privacy and even the loss of outlook would be limited and within acceptable limits.
- 3.2 In this aspect, therefore, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Section 7 of the NPPF, Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide.

4. Parking, Highway Safety and Rights-of-Way

- 4.1 The proposed parking arrangements and impact on the right-of-way would be identical to the most recent previous scheme. No objections were raised by the Highways Officer or the Rights-of-Way Officer to that scheme and it is considered that, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the development would not have a detrimental impact upon highway safety or the

public right of way.

5. Other Considerations

5.1 Human Rights issues:

The proposal raises no Human Rights issues.

5.2 Equality Act 2010:

The proposal raises no issues under the Equality Act 2010.

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following:

RECOMMENDED REASONS

- 1 The site is washed over by the South Bedfordshire Green Belt, where new residential development is considered to be inappropriate and therefore harmful to the Green Belt by definition. The proposed development would also have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal would not constitute infilling as the site is defined as being part of the countryside within policy GB3 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review. The very special circumstances case that has been submitted is not considered to be sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and harm to openness. The proposal is thus contrary to Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The site is too restricted in size and would appear cramped in relation to adjoining development. In addition, as a result of the site's location in front of Whyley Cottages, the proposal would result in the creation of tandem development that would be out of character with the grain and pattern of surrounding development. The proposal would thus create an unsatisfactory form of development, detrimental to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the principles of good design set out within the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide.

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

In the Council's view the proposal is unacceptable in principle and the fundamental objections cannot be overcome through dialogue. The applicant was invited to withdraw the application. The Council has therefore complied 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

.....

.....