



**HOUGHTON REGIS TOWN COUNCIL**  
Peel Street, Houghton Regis, Bedfordshire LU5 5EY

Town Mayor: **Cllr M S Kennedy**

Tel: 01582 708540

Town Clerk: **Clare Evans**

E-mail: [info@houghtonregis.org.uk](mailto:info@houghtonregis.org.uk)

14<sup>th</sup> October 2019

**To: Members of the Planning Committee**

**Cllrs: D Dixon-Wilkinson (Chairman), J Carroll, D Jones, M S Kennedy, S Thorne, K Wattingham and T Welch.**

(Copies to all Councillors for information)

**Notice of Meeting**

You are hereby summoned to a Meeting of the **Planning Committee** to be held at the Council Offices, Peel Street on **Monday 21<sup>st</sup> October 2019 at 7.00pm.**

*Debbie Marsh*

**THIS MEETING MAY BE FILMED/RECORDED**

**Debbie Marsh**  
**Corporate Services Manager**

**Agenda**

- 1. APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**
- 2. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

In accordance with approved Standing Orders 1(e)-1(l) Members of the public may make representations, ask questions and give evidence at a meeting which they are entitled to attend in respect of the business on the agenda.

The total period of time designated for public participation at a meeting shall not exceed 15 minutes and an individual member of the public shall not speak for more than 3 minutes unless directed by the chairman of the meeting.

- 3. SPECIFIC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST & REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATIONS**

Under the Localism Act 2011 (sections 26-37 and Schedule 4) and in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct, Members are required to declare any interests which are not currently entered in the member's register of interests or if he/she has not notified the Monitoring Officer of any such interest.

Members are invited to submit any requests for Dispensations for consideration.

*\*This meeting may be filmed by the Council for subsequent broadcast online and can be viewed at <http://www.houghtonregis.org.uk/minutes>*

*Phones and other equipment may be used to film, audio record, tweet or blog from this meeting by an individual Council member or a member of the public. The use of images or recordings arising from this is not under the Council's control.*

*No part of the meeting room is exempt from public filming unless the meeting resolves to go into exempt session.*

#### 4. MINUTES

To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019 (*attached*)

**Recommendation:** To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019 and for these to be signed by the Chairman.

#### 5. PLANNING MATTERS

*Members are advised that, on receipt of a planning application Central Bedfordshire Council will send the Town Council a full set of plans and a copy of the planning application form only. All supporting documents, that have previously been printed and posted, will only be available on their website. Therefore, members are advised that should they require sight of these documents that they request them prior to the meeting.*

**(a) To consider the following applications:**

- |                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| CB/19/02784/FULL | Single storey front extension<br>10 Fenwick Road, LU5 5RP<br>For: Mrs S Mhlanga   |
| CB/19/02870/RM   | Reserved Matters: Following Outline CB/15/00297/OUT (1850 dwellings and mixed class use) matters for access, landscaping, layout and scale for 160 dwellings on phase CA2<br>Thorn Green, Bidwell West<br>For: Abbey Development Ltd                      |
| CB/19/02534/FULL | Two storey rear extension<br>66 Milton Way, LU5 5UE<br>For: Mr & Mrs A Bassi  |
| CB/19/02686/FULL | Two storey side extension<br>1 Leaf Road, LU5 5JG<br>For: Mr D Grigore  |
| CB/19/02865/FULL | Overcladding of existing elevations and replacement of glazing on the front elevation<br>Unit 33, Humphreys Road, LU5 4TP<br>For: Legal & General Assurance   |
| CB/19/03232/RM   | Reserved matters: Appearance, scale and landscaping for residential development of 336 dwellings on Development Parcels 5a and 5b Bidwell West, Houghton Regis. Outline application (CB/15/0297/OUT) was supported by a full Environmental Statement (ES) |
| CB/19/01907/FULL | Erection of single storey storage outbuilding with use class B2 (general industry)<br>Bcs House, Blackburn Road, LU5 5BQ<br>Revised proposals have been received in respect to the above property. Revised proposals – the proposed storage outbuilding   |



would now have a planning use of B2 (general industry) to more closely resemble the prevailing activities of the site. For information Members of the planning committee considered this application at their meeting held on the 19<sup>th</sup> August 2019.

CB/19/03158/FULL 1.8m high close boarded fence along approx. 3m line to Sundon Road boundary  
Treow House, Parkside Drive, LU5 5QL  
For: Mr G Lapham

CB/19/02056/FULL New dwelling  
Greenside, 134 High Street, LU5 5DT  
*Members are advised that revisions have taken place following the issues raised by Central Bedfordshire Councils Highways Management Team. As plans are not provided Members are strongly advised to view the amendments online. A copy of the correspondence received from CBC is attached.*

#### (b) Decision Notices

##### ***Permissions/Approvals/Consents:***

None at time of going to print.

##### ***Refusals:***

None at time of going to print.

##### ***Withdrawals:***

None at time of going to print.

## 6. BUDGET REVIEW

### *Appendix A*

Members will find **attached** the Planning budget to date.

**Recommendation: To note the information**

## 7. APPEAL DECISION – APP/PO240/W/19/3223086 – HIGHFIELD HOUSE, BEDFORD RD

Members will find attached the outcome to an appeal submitted against Central Bedfordshire Councils planning decision to refuse proposed development at the above location.

**Recommendation: To note the information**

## 8. LOCAL PLAN

Central Bedfordshire Council have provided the following update:

Over the summer, Examination in Public hearings were held at the Council's main offices in Chicksands. These hearings gave the Inspectors the opportunity to explore the plan and its policies in detail and to hear evidence from Council officers and other stakeholders.

Since the close of the hearing sessions, the Council have been anticipating the Inspectors' feedback

---

and this week the Council received a letter from the Planning Inspectorate in relation to the plan.

This correspondence gives the Council confidence that the Inspectors are content with a number of critical points of policy. However, the letter also raises a number of questions, some of which relate to correspondence which the Authority has not seen. In this context, the Council are seeking urgent clarification from the Inspectors about information they seem to be drawing on and why this has not been shared.

Until the Council have received clarification on these important points, the Council's legal advice is that the inspectors' letter should not be published.

Town and Parish Councils will be kept up to date with any developments.

**Recommendation: To note the report.**

## 9. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group along with the Town Councils Planning Consultant met with Central Bedfordshire Council officers, on the 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2019 to discuss the emerging Regulation 14 consultation.

At this meeting Central Bedfordshire Council highlighted some issues they felt should be dealt with prior to public consultation.

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, with the support of BRCC, are due to meet on the 16<sup>th</sup> October 2019 to find a way forward to address these issues. Members are advised that as a result of this there could be a delay in the Regulation 14 consultation.

A verbal update will be provided at the meeting.

**Recommendation: To note the information**

## 10. STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT SITES/LOCAL PLAN– UPDATE/PROGRESS

**Woodside Link** – No substantive update to report.

**A5 M1 Link** – No substantive update to report.

### **All Saints View**

A series of three manholes need to be dug directly between the site and the war memorial, to allow for storm water and foul drainage from All Saints View to connect to the main drainage system.

These works are planned to start on Monday 7 October and be finished by week commencing 28 October. During this time, sections of road and pathway will be closed and diversions in place. The area needs to be closed off to keep people safe, as some of the holes will be dug to 7 metres deep. The diversions either take people back towards the pedestrian crossing in front of the Green, or via an alleyway into Whitehouse Close and onto the High Street opposite All Saints Church.

**Linnere** – No substantive update to report.

---

**Bidwell West** – No substantive update to report.

**Kingsland** – No substantive update to report.

**Windsor Drive** – No substantive update to report.

**Section 106 Monies** – No substantive update to report. Members are advised to follow the link to view the most recent s106 report for the parish.

<https://centralbedfordshire.app.box.com/s/446pmqtlzcnwda67o69keahkikr0hoyx/file/49466973463>

7

**Recommendation:**

**To note the information**

**0-0**

Blank Page



**Houghton Regis Town Council  
Planning Committee  
30<sup>th</sup> September 2019 at 7.00pm**

Present: Councillors: D Dixon-Wilkinson Chairman  
J Carroll  
D Jones  
M S Kennedy  
S Thorne  
K Wattingham

Officers: Debbie Marsh Corporate Services Manager  
Louise Senior Head of Democratic Services

Public: 7

Apologies: Councillor: T Welch

Also present: Councillor: S Goodchild

**10071 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies were received from Cllr Welch.

**10072 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Members of the public addressed the committee and raised concerns in regard to planning application CB/19/02584/FULL Sewell Manor Lodge, Sewell Lane, Sewell.

Concerns raised:

- Conservation land
- Greenbelt land
- On a Quaker burial site
- Land of historical value
- Access only via a soft track
- Building would be too high
- Septic tank on high ground, which would result in any overflow affecting the housing on lower ground
- Security lights would be activated by animals and thereby cause light pollution
- Ownership of the land that the access is proposed is in question
- Similar previous application was rejected

Members advised the members of the public that their concerns would be passed on to Central Bedfordshire Council planning department and thanked them for attending.

**10073 SPECIFIC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**10074 MINUTES**

The Committee received the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2019 for consideration.

**Resolved** To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2019 and for these to be signed by the Chairman.

## 10075 PLANNING MATTERS

(a) The following planning applications were considered:

### *Non - Delegated*

CB/19/02550/FULL Two storey rear extension  
Kirtlington, Cumberland Street, LU5 5BW  
For: Mr R Brammer

### **Comments: No objections**

CB/19/02584/FULL Erection of one 3 bedroom dwelling  
Sewell Manor Lodge, Sewell Lane, Sewell, LU6 1RP#  
For: Mr J Beacon

Members discussed this application at length and agreed that, whilst there had been some minor amendments made, this application had not materially changed from the previous one and therefore the Town Councils reasons for objecting remained the same.

**The Town Council places great value on the setting and nature of the buildings in Sewell. The policy package recognises the special quality of this hamlet. The scattered collection of homes and farm buildings was designated as a conservation area in the 1990s, within the green belt and adjoins the Chilterns AONB. The significant open spaces, trees and landscaping which separates the buildings are all part of the area's character.**

**The National Planning Policy Framework (2018) sets out the weight attached to protecting the green belt, that development would be inappropriate and harmful to the openness of the green belt.**

**The justification put forward to support the application describes historic farm cottages replaced by new dwellings in the 1960s. The site of the proposed dwelling does not reflect the location of any of the former buildings, neither is there any comparison of the sizes - from details provided it appears that the dwellings built in the 1960s were far bigger than the cottages they replaced.**



Therefore, the Town Council raises the strongest possible objections to the application for the following reasons:

The proposal represents significant damage to the openness of this part of the green belt, constitutes inappropriate development within the meanings of the National Planning Policy Framework, fails to demonstrate the very special circumstances required for development and does not match any of the exceptions set out in para. 145 of the NPPF.

The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the historic character and setting of the hamlet of Sewell and its conservation area.

The development if approved would represent a significant precedent, seeking to justify development damaging to the quality of the area on the basis of historical structures in the vicinity which were removed many decades previously.

The access is a narrow, rural lane below modern standards and the proposed development represents unacceptable intensification of this access.

The vehicles required during construction would have a significant detrimental impact on the access by virtue of its narrowness and junction onto Watling Street.

The proposed development is in an area of a Quaker burial site. As was the practice in the 1700's & 1800's, graves were not marked and although the Town Council has obtained a list of names of those buried on the site during this time, there is no plan of those interred and therefore development of this site poses a great risk of disturbing those remains.

The applicant claims that the land was previously developed land under the Town and Country Planning Act 1948, however, it is unreasonable to extend the 1948 Act for this application as this act has been superseded and has new criteria.

The Town Council has concerns that the track leading to the proposed development site is not in the applicant's ownership.

Councillors requested this application be called in.

CB/19/02840/FULL Erection of electric substation and hardstanding  
Land to North of Thorn Road, Bidwell  
For: Bidwell West (Works) Ltd

**Comments: No objections**

CB/19/02838/FULL Erection of electric substation and hardstanding  
Thorn Farm, Thorngreen Farm Road,  
For: Bidwell West (Works) Ltd

**Comments: No objections**

**(b) The following decision notices were noted:**

*Permissions / Approvals / Consents*

**Refusals:**

None received.

**Withdrawals:**

None received.

**10076 LOCAL PLAN**

No substantive update to report.

**Resolved: To note the information.**

**10077 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

Members were advised that it had been noted that although the draft plan had been amended due to grammatical errors. Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group had agreed that further errors needed to be rectified before the draft plan could be put out for consultation. Members noted that the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group were due to meet on Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2019 in order to discuss consultation dates and duties.

Members were also advised that a meeting had been arranged by Central Bedfordshire Council to meet with the Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Martin Small, the Town Councils retained planning consultant for an informal discussion about the plan, prior to submitting their response at the Regulation 14 consultation stage.

**Resolved: To note the information.**

**10078 PLANNING TRAINING**



At the planning meeting held on the 9<sup>th</sup> September 2019, Members nominated Councillor J Carroll and Councillor S Thorne to attend a planning training session on the 19<sup>th</sup> September 2019, organised by Central Bedfordshire Council.

Councillor Carroll and Councillor Thorne were invited to provide a verbal report on this training to the committee.

Cllr Thorne advised members that the content had not been as rudimentary as she had expected and had focussed heavily on policies.

Cllr Thorne requested a list of abbreviations and acronyms from the Corporate Services Manager to aid her understanding of planning terminologies.

Cllr Carroll advised members that he had gained knowledge of the ability to approach members of the DMC regarding planning applications. A PowerPoint presentation had been included on the National Planning Policy, he advised that a copy of the slides would be supplied in due course. Cllr Carroll also provided a flow chart leaflet, provided at the event, on s106 monies in Central Bedfordshire. The Chair requested that a copy of this leaflet be circulated to all members of the committee via email.

**Resolved: To note the information**

#### **10079 STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT SITES/LOCAL PLAN UPDATE/PROGRESS**

**Woodside Link** – No substantive update to report.

**A5 M1 Link** – Members are advised that a reply had been received from Mr Andrew Selous, MP for South West Bedfordshire following the Town Council letter of concern in regard to road safety.

The reply stated that following receipt of the Town Council letter, the matter had been immediately been raised with Highways England and that the Town Council would be provided with an update once received.

**All Saints View** – No substantive update to report.

**Linnere** – No substantive update to report.

**Bidwell West** – No substantive update to report.

**Kingsland** – Members were advised that a report being presented at the Executive Meeting at Central Bedfordshire Council, on the 8<sup>th</sup> October 2019, had information relating to plans for the Kingsland site. This report could be viewed online on Central Bedfordshire Councils website.

**Windsor Drive** – Members were advised that Windsor Drive had been listed as an Asset of Community Value for the duration of five years, members requested confirmation of the end date. The Corporate Services Manager was to look into this and advise members in due course.



**Section 106 Monies** – Members were advised that the most recent s106 report for the parish was on the Central Bedfordshire Council website.

**Resolved:** To note the information

**The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 7.42pm**

**Dated this 21st day of October 2019**

**Chairman**

DRAFT

## Development Management

### Central Bedfordshire Council

Priory House, Monks Walk  
Chicksands, Shefford  
Bedfordshire SG17 5TQ  
www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk



Mrs Clare Evans  
Town Clerk  
Houghton Regis Town Council  
Peel Street  
Houghton Regis  
Beds  
LU5 5EY

**Your Ref**  
**Date** 14 October 2019

Dear Mrs Evans,

**Application No:** CB/19/02056/FULL  
**Location:** Greenside, 134 High Street, Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 5DT  
**Proposal:** New dwelling.

I have received amendments to this application in respect of the above property. Revisions received in connection with the issues raised by the Highways Development Management Team

#### **Access Road Ownership / Rights of Way**

Amended location plan, illustrating a blue line covering the access road utilised to gain access back to the adopted highway.

#### **Amended proposed floor plan drawings illustrating the amended accommodation to 3 beds.**

Due to the sustainable nature of the site, our client believe 2 spaces are suitable for the development. However, they are willing to amend the proposed dwelling to 3 beds, which we believe will require 2 spaces in accordance with the CBC 2104 Design Guide.

#### **Bin Collection**

The site plan has been amended to illustrate private pathway access running parallel to the south west boundary allowing bins to be transferred to The Green on collection day. This will replicate the existing collection arrangements for 134 High Street.

#### **Tracking Vehicle Size**

The swept path diagrams prepared by Milestone Transport utilises a S Type Jaguar car which measures 4939mm in length which is greater than 4840mm Mondeo requested by your Highways Officer.

Internal consultees should follow the consultee procedure available on the [intranet](#). Comments should be submitted by no later than 28 October 2019.

Ward Councillors and other external consultees can view this application by visiting <http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/planning-register> and entering the application reference 19/02056. Please provide any comments by no later than 28 October 2019.

For consultees unable to access documents via the website, please contact us to arrange access

another way.

Consultee comments will be published to our website as they are received.

Yours sincerely,

**Judy Martin**

Senior Planning Officer

Email: [judy.martin@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:judy.martin@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)



14/10/2019

## Houghton Regis Town Council

Page 1

11:09

## Detailed Income &amp; Expenditure by Budget Heading 14/10/2019

Month No: 7

## Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent
<u>401 Growth Area</u>						
4059 OTHER PROFESSIONAL FEES	1,358	2,500	1,142		1,142	54.3%
4062 Neighbourhood Plan	332	20,000	19,668		19,668	1.7%
4992 Trs from Earmarked Reserve	0	(20,000)	(20,000)		(20,000)	0.0%
<b>Growth Area :- Indirect Expenditure</b>	<b>1,690</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>67.6%</b>
<b>Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve</b>	<b>(1,690)</b>					
<b>Grand Totals:- Income</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>			<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>1,690</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>67.6%</b>
<b>Net Income over Expenditure</b>	<b>(1,690)</b>	<b>(2,500)</b>	<b>(810)</b>			
<b>Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve</b>	<b>(1,690)</b>					

Blank page



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 07 May 2019

**by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 9<sup>th</sup> August 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/W/19/3223086**

**Highfield House, Bedford Road, Houghton Regis LU5 6JP**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by 4D Beauty against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
  - The application Ref CB/18/04256/FULL, dated 15 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2019
  - The development proposed is a detached beauty salon.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issues are:
  - (i) Whether the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the green belt,
  - (ii) The effect of the proposal on the openness of the green belt,
  - (iii) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and,
  - (iv) The effect of the proposal on highway safety.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is an enclosed area of land to the north of a group of dwellings. Adjacent to the site is an open field. The Houghton Regis Public Footpath crosses the field towards a new housing development, which was under construction during my visit. The site is accessed from a shared driveway which is loosely metalled. The driveway is accessed from the B5120 Bedford Road. The site is within the South Bedfordshire Green Belt. Highfield House is situated a short distance from the site and appears to be a subdivided dwelling. The appeal site is currently used for open storage of shipping containers and various vehicles, including mobile homes.

#### *Green Belt*

4. The appeal scheme is to erect a new single storey building within the site, replacing a small timber clad building which is sited on a concrete base. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that construction



of new buildings within the Green Belt constitutes inappropriate development, subject to certain exceptions. One exception to this is the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (excluding temporary buildings) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

5. The appeal scheme is to replace an existing timber clad building or structure. A planning permission was granted for a garage building on the site in 1995 and the Appellant refers to the building or structure to be replaced as that building. I do not have the details of that planning permission before me and noted that there is another, more substantial timber clad garage type building on the site, which is to be retained. The timber clad building or structure to be demolished is small in scale. The Appellant suggests that the appeal proposal would be of no greater scale than the timber building or structure plus the motorhome situated adjacent to it. The motorhome is a moveable structure of a modest size which does not have any degree of permanence. As such it is not a building and its replacement cannot be regarded to fall within the exception to inappropriate development. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would introduce built development of a more substantial scale than the existing development, which would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing building
6. In addition, the appeal scheme would be prevalent from the public footpath and open field beyond the site, from which the site appears relatively open, in part due to the boundary fence comprising of open metal palisade. As a result, the visual openness of the Green Belt would also be adversely affected.
7. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposal does not fall within the exception and constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. In addition, the appeal scheme would also cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
8. The Appellant has referred to potential housing development which might surround the scheme in the future. During my visit, I observed housing development under construction across the public footpath, on the other side of the open field. Other than this development, the site and its surroundings were relatively open and rural. Whilst further development may take place in the future, with or without a review of Green Belt boundaries, the site remains within the Green Belt and in its current context, within an open rural Green Belt setting. For these reasons, the potential for future development does not establish that very special circumstances exist to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt which would arise from the scheme.
9. Similarly, the Appellant has highlighted that a large proportion of the existing beauty salon clients are local and as such, that the business provides a local service. The Council contends that the beauty salon is a town centre use which is operating in an out of centre location, with the potential of undermining the viability and vitality of local centres. As such, the appeal scheme would not amount to sustainable development when the social, economic and environmental roles of sustainable development are balanced. As such, the beauty salon use would not establish very special circumstances to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt which would arise from the scheme.



10. The appeal scheme would be inappropriate development and no very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt. The appeal scheme would conflict with the Framework in respect of Green Belt.

*Living conditions*

11. The access to the appeal site would be via the existing shared, unmetalled driveway. The driveway passes by several other dwellings, including Highfield House which is occupied by the Appellant. Some of the dwellings are in close proximity to the access driveway, with Highfield House being somewhat set back behind other buildings. The driveway is mostly single track. The appeal site is located to the rear of dwellings fronting Bedford Road.
12. Given the layout of the site and access, the appeal scheme is likely to cause noise and disturbance to the occupants of the dwellings along the driveway and fronting Bedford Road as a result of vehicles passing and the opening and closing of vehicle doors. The scheme also has potential to cause inconvenience and further disturbance to existing residents due to the mostly single-track nature of the driveway resulting in vehicles having to wait or manoeuvre to pass.
13. The Appellant contends that the beauty salon use currently operates within Highfield House and has not resulted in complaints from neighbours to date and there are no plans to expand the business. As a discrete building, the appeal scheme would provide opportunities for incremental expansion of the business over and above that which is able to operate from the dwelling. The potential increased activity could not be controlled by way of a planning condition.
14. For these reasons, the appeal scheme has potential to cause detriment to the living conditions of neighbouring residents, in conflict with the Framework and Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan (SBLP) which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that new development does not have an unacceptable adverse effect on living conditions.

*Highway safety*

15. The existing drive is loosely metalled and its access from Bedford Road is steep and has a relatively short splay. The visibility splay does not meet the necessary standards for ensuring a safe and convenient access to the highway, and the Highways Officer advises that due to the physical constraints surrounding the access, it would not be possible to achieve a safe standard.
16. The scheme does not propose to alter the existing arrangement, other than to ensure a better standard of hardstanding, and the Appellant asserts that there have been no accidents since the business has been operating. However, the appeal scheme has potential to intensify the use of the inadequate access in a way which cannot be mitigated, thus increasing the risk to highway users. For this reason, the appeal scheme would be detrimental to highway safety in conflict with the Framework.

**Conclusion**

17. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The scheme would also have a detrimental impact

on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and highway safety. The scheme would therefore conflict with Policy BE8 of the SBLP, as well as the guidance in the Framework. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Kim Langford Tejrar*

INSPECTOR