

Item No. 08

APPLICATION NUMBER	CB/16/01036/FULL
LOCATION	80 Church Road, Aspley Heath, Milton Keynes, MK17 8TA
PROPOSAL	Demolition and replacement of existing log cabin with a proposed single residential dwelling, with associated driveway alterations and all ancillary works
PARISH	Aspley Heath
WARD	Aspley & Woburn
WARD COUNCILLORS	Cllr Wells
CASE OFFICER	Debbie Willcox
DATE REGISTERED	09 March 2016
EXPIRY DATE	04 May 2016
APPLICANT	Mr Peter Ballard
AGENT	Nett Assets Limited
REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE	Called in by Councillor Wells because the proposal is within the Green Belt infill boundary where infill development is acceptable in principle. The character is defined by individual houses set back from the road and the proposal would be in character with the area. Precedents have been established in the area, including 67A, 69A and 80A Church Road. The dwelling would replace an existing building of similar size bulk and visual impact and will have no adverse impact on the setting of the site, the character of the area or the surrounding properties and uses.
RECOMMENDED DECISION	Full Application - Recommended for Refusal

Recommendation:

That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following:

RECOMMENDED REASONS

- 1 The site is located in the South Bedfordshire Green Belt, within the infill boundary for Aspley Heath. However, the proposal does not constitute infill development as it would comprise backland development on an existing residential garden that would be contrary to the prevailing pattern of development in the area. As such the proposal is considered to represent inappropriate development and would therefore be harmful to the Green Belt by definition. The proposed development would also have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances case has been submitted which would outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt. The proposal is thus contrary to Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy DM6 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (North).

- 2 The proposal, by reason of its excessive scale and siting, constitutes an undesirable, backland form of development that would push residential development closer to the boundary of the settlement with the open countryside and would be inappropriate to and at variance with the prevailing form of development in the vicinity; as such the proposal is contrary to the principles of good design as set out in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS14 and DM3 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (North).
- 3 The proposed development would result in the unacceptable loss of trees within a Conservation Area to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area, especially views from the public footpath at the rear of the site. The proposed access track would also pose a high risk of future harm to trees within the Conservation Area that are shown to be retained, which would result in further harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal is contrary to Sections 7 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies CS13, CS16, DM3 and DM14 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (North).
- 4 To permit the proposed backland development on land within the Green Belt infill boundary against the background of existing planning policies would establish a precedent whereby it would be difficult for the Local Planning Authority to resist other similar proposals elsewhere within the Aspley Heath Conservation Area and Green Belt infill boundary.

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 to seek pre-application advice prior to any re-submission but did not agree to this. 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.

[Notes:

1. In advance of consideration of the application the Committee received representations made under the Public Participation Scheme.
2. In advance of consideration of the application the Committee were advised of additional comments as detailed in the Late Sheet from the following:
 - a. A revised plan, drawing no. 3PL 01 Rev A had been received.
 - b. A letter from the applicant had been circulated to members.
 - c. Green Belt consideration
 - d. Access to the site
 - e. Neighbour intrusion
 - f. Visual Impact
 - g. Tree Preservation

h. Refusal Reason 4 be omitted and Refusal Reason 5 be renumbered]