



Clerk to the Council

Mrs Sally Harrop
32 The Orchard
Kings Langley
Herts
WD4 8JR
Email: clerk@studhamparish.co.uk

Mr Peter Vosper
Principal Planning Officer
Planning Delivery (South Area Team)
Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House
Monks Walk
Chicksands
Shefford
Bedfordshire
SG17 5TQ

20 April 2023

By Email: planning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Dear Peter,

Application No: **CB/22/04971/FULL**
Location: **Valley View, Hemel Hempstead Road, Dagnall, Berkhamsted, HP4 1QR**
Proposal: **Existing pitch to contain one additional static caravan, parking, hardstanding and associated infrastructure**

I write further to your letter dated 21 March 2023 relating to this planning application and our subsequent extension request.

Introduction

This reply to Central Bedfordshire Council ("CBC") has been subdivided into the following sections:-

- **Executive Summary**
- **Background Information & Pre-Planning Advice**
- **Planning Meeting**
- **Planning Application Documents & Feedback**
- **Conclusions**

(A) Executive Summary

Studham Parish Council ("SPC") wishes to object to consent being granted for this planning application for a third static caravan and associated development at Valley View, Hemel Hempstead Road, Dagnall, Berkhamsted, HP4 1QR.

Studham lies within the Green Belt ("GB"); Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ("AONB") and Area of Great Landscape Value ("AGLV") and as a result, it should be treated accordingly.

(B) Background Information & Pre-Planning Advice

There is much planning history for this site, and I understand that planning matters have been running since 1999.

We do not want to duplicate previous commentary, but I set out a quick summary below.

CB/13/03219/FULL

Permission is sought for one additional Static Caravan and two additional touring caravans for one Romani Gypsy family, with parking for two motor vehicles and associated hardstanding for use of the immediate family.

This planning consent was granted for the above application following a public local enquiry and the calling in by the Secretary of State (on 19 February 2014) in pursuance of Section 77 of the Town & Country Act 1990.

Consent was granted for a temporary 3 year personal permission for the use of the immediate family on 11 July 2016.

CB/18/03451/VOC

Variation of Condition: Conditions 3 & 5 of planning permission CB/13/03219/FULL consent to be changed from temporary to permanent.

I attach our then full response to CBC dated 25 October 2018 in **Appendix 1** for this planning application.

We consider that much of the commentary therein remains valid.

Planning consent was provisionally granted by CBC at their Development Management Committee ("DMC") held on 6 March 2019 subject to the "call in" rights of the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government.

The Secretary of State subsequently decided not to "call in" the application (by letter dated 9 May 2019, copy attached in **Appendix 2**) and that he was content that the matter should be determined by the local planning authority.

Planning consent (personal occupation for Mrs Jade Golby Webb, Mr Charlton Webb and their resident dependents) was then granted by CBC on 15 May 2019 subject to conditions.

For ease of reference, I attach a copy of that permission in **Appendix 3**.

We note that Point 4 stated that no more than 4 caravans (of which no more than 2 shall be a static caravan) shall be stationed on the whole of the site at any time – due to the location of the site within the GB; AONB and AGLV.

CB/19/03288/FULL

Erection of a dayroom.

Planning consent (not personal) was then granted by CBC on 16 January 2020 subject to conditions.

I attach the then proposed site layout plan in **Appendix 4**.

For comparison purposes, we include below a snipped image from Google Maps (2023) showing the site in question.



CB/22/04971/FULL

Existing pitch to contain one additional static caravan, parking, hardstanding and associated infrastructure.

This is the current planning application for the site.

(C) Planning Meeting

This planning application was discussed at the monthly Parish Council meeting held on Monday 3 April 2023.

It was noted that the planning application was submitted back in December 2022 and therefore has a 2022 planning reference number even though SPC were only made aware of the application in March 2023.

(D) Planning Application Documents & Feedback

SPC have reviewed the planning application and associated paperwork.

To start with, the application seems to be basic, missing information and not providing all the relevant facts that would be required.

Planning Application Form

We note that the number of car spaces is increasing by 4.

We note that pre-planning advice was sought from CBC on 18 October 2022 and that CBC apparently replied, *"If Mr Golby still has a need for an additional Static for one of the family, then submit the application so we can decide its merits"*.

It sounds like there has been previous dialogue between CBC and the applicant.

Application Plan (Red/Blue lines)

No comment.

Layout Plan

I attach the then proposed site layout plan in **Appendix 5**.

From looking at the Google Maps image (2023), there are three immediate issues/questions.

- Can CBC confirm that the second "dayroom" has been built in accordance with the approved drawings in terms of size/design?
- There appears to be additional "outbuildings" already constructed on the site. Can CBC confirm whether planning consent is required for such structures?
- We note that the hardstanding area is significantly larger than shown on the Site Development Scheme (2019).

Design and Access Statement

We note that there are no size/dimensions outlined for the proposed third static caravan, and what is additionally required in terms of hardstanding, further outbuildings, and parking areas.

For example, would another "dayroom" be required?

We note that the proposed additional capacity is for the family who already live on the site but there is no detail as to which family, actual numbers, or the relevant ages, nor their connection to Mr Jimmy Golby.

Green Belt Map

This confirms that the site is situated in the GB.

Green Belt/Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ("AONB")

SPC considers that the proposal is an inappropriate development in the GB; AONB and AGLV, and the applicant states the same.

As highlighted before, Studham and the subject site fall within the GB/Chilterns AONB and should be treated accordingly.

The proposal will cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area (taking into account the AONB and AGLV protection) and the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Very Special Circumstances ("VSC")

In accordance with the guidance contained within the revised NPPF document, due to its location within the GB; AONB and AGLV, the only way that the proposed development can be given planning consent is if there are relevant and valid VSC to justify the end development, which outweigh the harm and openness to the Green Belt.

This statement/approach has been applied consistently by the Parish Council when dealing with planning applications within the Parish boundary.

We do not consider that there are any VSC in this matter to justify planning consent being given.

Legal Rights

It was noted in reviewing this application and in particular the Design and Access Statement that much reliance has been placed on specific legal rights beneficial to the traveller community in order to try to justify the "Very Special Circumstances" necessary for the grant of planning consent in the Green Belt.

The Parish Council's understanding is that this can be a very complex area of law and SPC would therefore suggest that CBC's Planning Department seek expert and explicit legal advice on whether such rights are applicable to this application.

In particular, the legal advice should address the issue of exhaustion of rights since this is not the first occasion on which an additional static caravan has been sought on this site based on the rights of the traveller community. In other words, if those rights have been utilised in respect of the previous planning grant, are they therefore exhausted (and thus inapplicable) in respect of this planning application.

Biodiversity/Tree/Geological Issues

The Parish Council believe that any development proposal on the subject site should require the usual biodiversity, tree and geological reports and relevant information as if the applicant were wishing to build a new residential dwelling.

Transport/Sustainability

This is not a sustainable location in terms of public transport provision.

Size

From reviewing the proposed site plan, this development proposal (in total) is a large one in terms of size and land use, even when compared with the adjacent residential dwelling.

The proposed third static caravan is a large building and will harm the landscape value in this setting.

Personal Restriction

There is no reference to the proposal being “personal” to applicant and following Point 5 of the planning permission for CB/18/03451/VOC.

Planning Creep

The Parish Council is fundamentally opposed to “planning creep” which we feel is the case with this proposal and this site.

We consider that the threshold on “harm” to the openness of the GB, and the effect on the AONB and AGLV has already been reached.

Our view is that no further static (or otherwise) caravans (or associated outbuilding or development) should be allowed or permitted at Valley View.

(E) Conclusions

In summary, SPC wish to formally OBJECT to planning consent being granted for this application and request that CBC’s Planning Team refuse the said application.

I trust the above is self-explanatory, but should you have any queries or questions, please let us know.

Yours sincerely,



Cllr Mark Poyner

Studham Parish Council
Chair of the Planning Committee

cc.

Cllr Kevin Collins – Ward Councillor at CBC

Cllr Eddie Perry – Ward Councillor at CBC

Cllr Bob Wilkin - SPC

Cllr Geoff Shute – SPC

Cllr Chrys Smith – SPC

Cllr Alan Wright – SPC

Cllr Lynne Smith– SPC

Cllr Mo Rashid - SPC

Appendix 1

**Copy of Studham Parish Council's response to Central Bedfordshire Council dated 25 October 2018
in respect of CB/18/03451/VOC.**

Judy Martin
Development Management
Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House
Monks Walk
Chicksands
Shefford
Bedfordshire
SG17 5TQ

25 October 2018

By Email: planning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk & judy.martin@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Dear Judy,

Application No: **CB/18/03451/VOC**
Location: **Valley View, Hemel Hempstead Road, Dagnell, Berkhamsted, HP4 1QR.**
Proposal: **Variation of Condition: Conditions 3 & 5 of planning permission**
 CB/13/03219/FULL Consent to be changed from Temporary to permanent.

I write further to your letter dated 27 September 2018 and enclosures in respect of the above planning application.

Introduction

This reply has been subdivided into the following sections:-

- **Executive Summary**
- **Planning History**
- **Planning Meeting & Community Feedback**
- **Parish Council's Observations on the Planning Application Documents**
- **Conclusions**

(A) Executive Summary

Studham Parish Council object strongly to the requested variation of the existing planning consent (CB/12/03219) from a temporary consent to a permanent one for Valley View, Hemel Hempstead Road, Dagnell, Berkhamsted, HP4 1QR.

(B) Planning History

The site has a detailed and lengthy planning history.

The latest planning application (CB/18/03451/VOC) requests a variation to the current planning conditions to change the existing temporary consent into a permanent consent.

For avoidance of doubt, this variation relates to the applicants request for "one additional Static Caravan and two additional touring caravans for one Romani Gypsy family, with parking for two motor vehicles and associated hardstanding for use of the immediate family".

We understand that planning consent exists for one static caravan on a permanent whereas the second static caravan on the site has only been permitted on a temporary basis. This temporary consent for 3 years was confirmed by the Secretary of State ("SoS") in his decision letter dated 11 July 2016 (Ref: APP/P2040/V/14/2214146). A copy of this letter is attached in **Appendix 1**.

This decision was "called in" by the SoS in pursuance of Section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

In this decision [Paragraph 16], the SoS stated that *"the development harm caused by the inappropriate nature of the development and to the openness of the Green Belt attracts substantial weight against the proposal"* and that the *"application should therefore not be approved except where very special circumstances are shown to exist"*. This is confirmed in Paragraphs 24 and 25.

There is further commentary [Paragraph 18] where *"substantial weight in favour of the proposal should be attached to the current unmet need for Traveller sites in the District and to the failure of the development plan to identify a five year supply of specific deliverable sites to meet that need, as required by the PPTS ("Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" – 2015)*. This is confirmed in Paragraph 26.

However, the key wording is contained within Paragraph 29:-

"Having weighed the harm to the Green Belt caused by inappropriate development and any other harm, against the matters which support granting permanent permission including the best interests of the child, the Secretary of State does not consider that very special circumstances exist to grant a permanent permission".

The SoS then granted a temporary (but personal) 3 year consent whilst Central Bedfordshire Council ("CBC") work up and adopt a new Local Plan (with a then target adoption date of September 2018). The formal decision is contained within Paragraphs 36 and 37.

Studham Parish Council considers that the proposed development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ("AONB"). As stated later, Studham and the subject site fall within the Chilterns AONB and this needs to be taken into account.

The reasoning behind the "temporary consent" remains valid as the Central Bedfordshire Council Local Plan 2035 ("CBCLP") remains outstanding albeit has now been submitted to the government on 30 April 2018, and is subject to an independent examination by a Planning Inspector (Regulation 22).

The draft policy is outlined in Section 10 and in particular Policy SP8: Gypsy and Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Pitch Requirement. There is commentary on the PPTS and the change in definition which removed persons who have ceased to travel permanently meaning that those who have stopped travelling no longer fall under the planning definition of a Traveller in terms of assessing the needs for accommodation. As a result, it is noted the need in Central Bedfordshire has been reduced by 43% since the previous assessment was undertaken in 2014.

Policy SP8 states that 71 pitches will be created by 2035 and that only 14 are required by 2021. This is a very small figure and it would seem that this makes the application to turn the temporary planning consent into a permanent less relevant, and is not required.

(C) Planning Meeting Overview & Community Feedback

For the record, 4 residents attended the Planning Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 9 October 2018 but the applicant and their advisors did not attend.

Studham Parish Council had received apologies from 2 people who could not attend the meeting.

I set out the key issues raised (in no particular order) at the planning meeting as follows:-

- The site is in the Green Belt and ANOB.
- The site is prominent within the Gade Valley.
- We were told that the occupants of Valley View have a large number of dogs on-site which are noisy. Is this some form of dog kennels; breeding programme or rearing puppies on the site?
- Following the granting of the “temporary” planning consent, we understand that a further semi-permanent marquee style of tent of similar size to the second static caravan has been erected outside the defined area on the site, along with another caravan.
- If permanent consent is granted, this will simply be the first of many such applications for this site i.e. “planning creep” and as a result, the variation should be refused.
- The site has a significant and controversial planning history.
- The applicant does not own the access road to Valley View.
- The access road is narrow and is not suitable for touring caravans to enter/exit the site.
- There are no new “very special circumstances” to justify the variation.
- It is alleged that none of the touring caravans have moved since arriving at Valley View.
- The occupants of Valley View leave 8 bins of rubbish for CBC to collect every fortnight which is significantly more than you would expect from the occupants of two static caravans.
- The original planning consent (back in 1999) permitted no more than one caravan to be stationed on the site for residential purposes.
- The applicant has had just over 2 years to find an alternative site at the time of this planning application.

We can confirm that there was no support for the proposed variation to the existing planning consent from the parishioners attending the meeting.

Based on the above feedback, Studham Parish Council considers that CBC’s Planning Team should make an unannounced site visit to Valley View to assess what has happened to the site since the temporary planning consent was granted by the SoS as at 11 July 2016, and whether or not any planning conditions to that consent have been breached. The results of which, should be expressly included with the Planning Officer’s report.

(D) Parish Council’s Observations on the Planning Application Documents

We have reviewed all submitted papers for CB/18/03451/VOC and we have no material comments to make thereon.

(E) Conclusions

Green Belt/ANOB

Studham Parish Council considers that the proposed development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ("AONB"). Studham and the subject site fall within the Chilterns AONB and should be treated accordingly.

Very Special Circumstances

In accordance with the guidance contained within the revised NPPF document, the site is within the Green Belt, the only way that the proposed development can be given planning consent is if there are relevant and valid 'Very Special Circumstances' ("VSC") to justify the end development, which do not outweigh the harm and openness to the Green Belt. This statement and approach has been applied consistently by the Parish Council when considering planning applications within the village.

The location is simply inappropriate for such development and it should be refused.

We do not consider that there is any such argument to vary the existing planning consent.

The Chilterns Conservation Board ("CCB")

Studham Parish Council fully endorses and agrees with the objection from the CCB dated 10 October 2018, a copy of which is attached in **Appendix 2**.

The application site falls within the AONB and the reference to the AONB Management Plan 2014-2019 is telling. L5 states that "Developments which detract from the Chilterns' special character should be resisted". As CCB state, "a relocation of this use would be a positive benefit to the landscape character of the Gade Valley".

Other comments made in respect of Section 85 (i) of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act and Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF as revised in July 2018) are equally clear.

Summary

Taking into account all the relevant issues, Studham Parish Council hereby strongly object to the planning application request to vary the temporary consent to a permanent one.

It is clear that whilst the CBCLP approval process is ongoing, there is no need to vary the temporary consent to a permanent one.

However, if CBC Planning Team consider that that the applicant should withdraw this application and submit another for a "one off" extension of the temporary consent by say 12 to 24 months (maximum), Studham Parish Council would consider such an extension to be suitable; justified and appropriate in order for (1) CBC to crystallise their relevant five year supply numbers post the CBCLP being adopted and (2) to allow the applicant additional time to find an alternative site (pitch) in the CBC region or elsewhere.

It is also noted and welcomed that Ward Councillor Richard Stay has formally requested (on 16 October 2018) that the matter is referred to the Development Management Committee ("DMC") if CBC's Planning Team is minded to recommend for approval.

I trust the above commentary and conclusions are self-explanatory but should you have any queries or questions, please let us know.

Yours sincerely,



Cllr Mark Poyner

Studham Parish Council
Chair of the Planning Committee

cc.

Cllr Richard Stay – CBC
Cllr Kevin Collins – CBC
Cllr Eddie Perry – SPC
Cllr Geoff Shute – SPC
Cllr Chrys Smith – SPC
Cllr Andrea Maxted – SPC
Cllr Alan Wright – SPC
Cllr Melissa Newland – SPC
Mrs Julie Cooper – Clerk of SPC

Appendix 1

Copy of the Secretary of State's Decision Letter dated 11 July 2016



Department for
Communities and
Local Government

Ms Alison Heine
10 Whitehall Drive,
Hartford,
Northwich,
Cheshire CW8 1SJ

Our Ref: APP/P0240/V/14/2214146

11 July 2016

Dear Ms Heine,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 77
APPLICATION BY MRS JADE GOLBY WEBB
VALLEY VIEW, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD ROAD, DAGNALL,
BERKHAMSTED, HP4 1QR**

APPLICATION REF: CB/13/03219/FULL

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State to say that consideration has been given to the report of the Inspector, W G Fabian, BA Hons Dip Arch RIBA IHBC, who held a public local inquiry beginning on 5 August 2014 into your client's application CB/13/03219/FULL dated 16 September 2013 for one additional static caravan and two additional touring caravans for one Romany Gypsy family, with parking for two motor vehicles and associated hardstanding for use of the immediate family.
2. On 19 February 2014 the Secretary of State directed, in pursuance of section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, that your client's application be referred to him instead of being dealt with by the local planning authority Central Bedfordshire Council.

Inspector's recommendation and summary of the decision

3. The Inspector recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions.
4. For the reasons given below, the Secretary of State disagrees with some of the Inspector's conclusions and her recommendation and approves the application for a 3year temporary period only. A copy of the Inspector's report (IR) is enclosed. All references to paragraph numbers, unless otherwise stated, are to that report.

Phil Barber
Planning Central Casework Division,
3rd Floor Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF

Tel: 0303 44 42853
Email: PCC@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Procedural matters

5. Like the Inspector, the Secretary of State has considered the application on the basis of the amended site layout plan, revision A, dated 5 August 2014 (IR3).
6. Following the High Court Judgment in the case of *Redhill Aerodrome vs. SSCLG and others* [2014] EWHC 2476 (Admin), the parties' attention was sought for their views on the implications, if any, of the Judgment on their case. However, on 9 October 2014, the Court of Appeal set aside the Judgment and Order of Patterson J dated 18 July 2014. As such, the Secretary of State, like the Inspector, does not take account of the original High Court Judgment in making his decision (IR4).
7. On 19 June 2015, the Secretary of State wrote to parties to seek comments on the Judgments in *Mark Wenman v SSCLG & Waverley Borough Council* [2015] EWHC 925 (Admin) and *Woodcock Holdings Limited v SSCLG & Mid-Sussex District Council* [2015] EWHC 1173 (Admin). On 16 August 2015 the Secretary of State wrote further to parties to seek comments on the replacement Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published in August 2015. On 9 December 2015 the Secretary of State wrote further to parties to seek comments regarding the 1999 planning permission.
8. In reaching his decision on this appeal, the Secretary of State has taken account of all correspondence on the above matters. As this correspondence was copied to the parties to this case the Secretary of State does not consider it necessary to reproduce it here. Copies may be obtained on request to the address at the foot of the first page of this letter.

Policy and statutory considerations

9. In reaching his decision, the Secretary of State has had regard to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
10. In this case, the development plan consists of saved policies of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review 2004. The Secretary of State considers that the development plan policies most relevant to the appeal are those set out by the Inspector at IR13, namely Policies BE8, T10, H15 and NE3.
11. Other material considerations which the Secretary of State has taken into account include the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') and associated planning guidance ('the guidance'), as well as Planning policy for traveller sites 2015 (PPTS).

Development Plan

12. For the reasons given at IR13 and having considered paragraph 215 of the Framework the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that Policies BE8, T10, H15 and NE3 are all broadly consistent with the Framework and gives limited weight to these policies. He notes there are no extant saved development plan policies relevant to gypsy and traveller sites but that the application as applied for is in accord with the development plan as a whole. The Secretary of State is aware that

at the time of the Inspector's report emerging policy consisted of a Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan and a Development Strategy. However, both were subsequently withdrawn.

13. The Council launched a new Local Plan in February 2016 with a draft due to be published for consultation by the end of the year. Having regard to paragraph 216 of the Framework, the Secretary of State concludes there are as yet no relevant policies in the emerging plan and therefore gives no weight to emerging policy at this very early stage.

Main Issues

14. The Secretary of State considers that the main issues are those identified by the Inspector at IR113.

Gypsy status

15. The Secretary of State is satisfied that the applicant meets the PPTS definition for gypsies and travellers and like the Inspector agrees there is no planning reason why a traveller family should not occupy the site (IR117).

Green Belt, openness and purposes

16. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the proposed development would reduce openness to a moderate degree (IR123). He further agrees that the proposal would not result in urban sprawl or encroachment and these aspects do not weigh against the proposal (IR124). He agrees that the development harm caused by the inappropriate nature of the development and to the openness of the Green Belt attracts substantial weight against the proposal (IR125). The application should therefore not be approved except where very special circumstances are shown to exist.

Character of the open countryside, the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), the area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the visual amenity of the Green Belt

17. For the reasons given by the Inspector at IR129 and IR130, the Secretary of State agrees that the proposal would cause only a small degree of visual impact given its minor scale. He agrees with the Inspector that this outcome weighs neither for nor against the proposal.

Other considerations – need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches

18. The Secretary of State notes the Inspector's conclusion at IR141 that substantial weight in favour of the proposal should be attached to the current unmet need for Traveller sites in the District and to the failure of the development plan to identify a five year supply of specific deliverable sites to meet that need, as required by the PPTS (IR136 & 141).

Other considerations - alternative sites and personal circumstances

19. The Secretary of State has noted the current lack of alternative sites or accommodation and the possibility of a roadside existence if the application is refused. He agrees this would not provide a secure basis for family life (IR143–145). He has carefully considered the personal needs and circumstances of the applicant. He agrees with the Inspector that the medical conditions are not unusual but accepts they require ongoing medication and monitoring and gives these needs moderate weight. The Secretary of State has not given any consideration or weight to the health needs of the applicant's father as the application does not include him.
20. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the lack of a settled base would make regular access to education and healthcare very difficult and could prevent the mutual support which is part of the Gypsy cultural way of life (IR147). He further agrees that in such circumstances interference with the right to respect for the private and family life of the occupants, under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 could arise. This incorporates the Secretary of State's obligations under United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child, including under Article 3 (IR148). He gives these matters significant weight in favour of the proposal.

Other matters

21. The Secretary of State notes the Inspector's comments at IR150-157 and agrees with his reasoning at IR153 that the site is previously developed land, which, like the Inspector, he agrees adds a little weight in favour of the proposal.

Balancing exercise

22. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Secretary of State agrees there are no extant saved development plan policies relevant to gypsy and traveller sites as applied for, and agrees with the Inspector that Policies BE8, T10, H15 and NE3 are all broadly consistent with the Framework, and gives limited weight to these policies. He also concludes that there are as yet no relevant policies in the emerging plan and therefore gives no weight to emerging policy at this very early stage.
23. He has gone on to consider whether there are material considerations which indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
24. The Framework and the PPTS state that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is harmful and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Secretary of State has considered whether the potential harm to the Green Belt, by virtue of inappropriate development, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
25. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the harm to the Green Belt due to inappropriateness and loss of openness attracts substantial weight against the proposal. The Secretary of State agrees other harms will not result in urban sprawl or encroachment and gives these factors no weight. The proposal will only

have a small degree of harm on the character and appearance of the open countryside, the Area of Great Landscape Value, the visual amenity of the Green Belt and will conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and he weighs these as neutral in the planning balance.

26. The Secretary of State has also taken into account the benefits of the proposal. He agrees with the Inspector that the failure of the development plan policy to identify a five year supply of deliverable sites, together with the acknowledged unmet need, attract substantial weight in favour of the application. He also agrees with the Inspector that a little weight can be given as the site is previously developed land.
27. Added to this he gives significant weight in favour of the development to the health needs of the applicant and the welfare, educational and health needs of her child (IR163), given the continuity of access to these services that the development would provide.
28. In terms of the appellant's rights under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that these rights are engaged, and he gives significant weight to these. However these rights are qualified and it is his role as planning decision-taker to ensure that any interference with these rights is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society, applying the principle of proportionality. He agrees with the Inspector that dismissing the appeal would likely force the applicant and her family into a roadside existence and that this would represent an interference with their private and family life. However, having considered these impacts the Secretary of State takes the view that in this case the harm to the Green Belt and other harm is such that dismissal of this application for a permanent permission is a necessary and proportionate response in pursuit of safeguards to the Green Belt.
29. Having weighed the harm to the Green Belt caused by inappropriate development and any other harm, against the matters which support granting permanent permission including the best interests of the child, the Secretary of State does not consider that very special circumstances exist to grant a permanent permission.

Consideration of a temporary permission

30. The Secretary of State has gone on to consider the Inspector's analysis regarding the granting of temporary planning permission for a period of 4 years. He acknowledges that there is no 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites as required by paragraph 10 of the PPTS and, that having considered paragraph 24 of the PPTS, considers that this is a significant material consideration in favour of granting temporary planning permission.
31. Having weighed the harm to the Green Belt caused by inappropriate development and any other harm, against the matters which support granting temporary permission as set out at paragraphs 25-27 above, the Secretary of State does not consider that very special circumstances exist such as to grant a 4 year temporary permission. However, he considers that very special circumstances do exist such as to warrant a 3 year temporary permission. The Secretary of State notes that the Council launched a new Local Plan in February 2016 with a draft due to be published for consultation by the end of the year. The Council plan for adoption in September 2018. The Secretary of State notes the expectation that the plan making process will

begin to meet need in 2018. Under this projected timetable the Secretary of State considers it reasonable to expect local sites to be deliverable and available at the end of a 3 year period. Consequently the Secretary of State considers that the totality of harm to the Green Belt is outweighed by other considerations such as to justify a temporary permission for 3 years.

Public Sector Equality Duty

32. In making his decision, the Secretary of State has had due regard to the requirements of section 149 of the Public Sector Equality Duty 2010, and the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those with protected characteristics and those who do not. The application is likely to have an impact on the identified racial group of Gypsies and Travellers.
33. The impacts are likely to be on Article 8 rights. In this regard and in coming to his decision the Secretary of State has considered the provision of and need for sites and the lack of alternative sites. The Secretary of State recognises refusing permanent permission will not provide a permanent home in circumstances where there is a lack of alternative sites. However the Secretary of State considers that approving a temporary permission mitigates the disadvantages caused such as to warrant approval of permission for 3 years.

Conditions

34. The Secretary of State has considered the Inspector's comments at IR108 – 111 and her proposed conditions at Annex A of the IR. He is satisfied that these conditions are necessary and relevant to the proposed development and meet the policy tests of the planning guidance – Use of Conditions and paragraph 206 of the Framework. However, he does not consider that they would mitigate the adverse impacts of the application such as to overcome his reasons for refusing permanent planning permission.
35. The Secretary of State is satisfied with conditions 10 – 18 inclusive as listed within the Inspector's Report for the granting of temporary permission. However, he considers that condition 4 should be included and amended to reflect Annex 1 of PPTS, condition 12 should be amended to limit the period to 3 years from the date of this decision, or the period during which the premises are occupied – whichever is the shorter, and condition 13 amended limiting the time period to 3 years.

Formal Decision

36. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the Secretary of State disagrees with the Inspector's recommendation. He hereby refuses permanent planning permission and grants a 3 year personal temporary permission for one additional static caravan and two additional touring caravans for one Romany Gypsy family, with parking for two motor vehicles and associated hardstanding for use of the immediate family, subject to the imposition of the conditions set out at Annex A to this letter.
37. An applicant for any consent, agreement or approval required by a condition of this permission for agreement of reserved matters has a statutory right of appeal to the Secretary of State if consent, agreement or approval is refused or granted conditionally or if the Local Planning Authority fail to give notice of their decision within the prescribed period.

Right to challenge the decision

38. A separate note is attached setting out the circumstances in which the validity of the Secretary of State's decision may be challenged. This must be done by making an application to the High Court within six weeks from the day after the date of this letter for leave to bring a statutory review under section 288 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
39. A copy of this letter has been sent to Central Bedfordshire District Council. A notification letter has been sent to all other parties who asked to be informed of the decision.

Yours sincerely

Phil Barber

Phil Barber

Authorised by Secretary of State to sign in that behalf

Annex A

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Site Layout, revision A, dated 5 August 2014 and Drainage Plan PP-02861037.

3) The occupation of the site hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following: Mrs Jade Golby Webb, Mr Charlton Webb and their resident dependants and shall be for a limited period being the period of 3 years from the date of this decision, or the period during which the premises are occupied by them, whichever is the shorter.

4) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1 of *Planning policy for traveller sites (2015)*.

5) When the premises cease to be occupied those named in condition 3 above, or at the end of 3 years, whichever shall first occur, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, buildings, structures, materials and equipment brought on to the land, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use shall be removed within one month of the cessation date.

6) Unless within 3 months of the date of this decision schemes for the following works are submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval and unless each approved scheme is implemented within 3 months of the approval of that scheme, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed:

- i) Details of external lighting;
- ii) Details of storage provision for refuse and recycling; and
- iii) Details of the foul and surface water drainage of the caravan hereby permitted and the associated hard standing. Thereafter the drainage shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

7) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no fences, gates or walls or any other means of enclosure or any amenity or storage buildings or other structures shall be erected on the land without the grant of further planning permission.

8) No more than 4 caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 (of which no more than 2 shall be a static caravan) shall be stationed on the whole of the site at any time.

9) No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.

10) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site.

Appendix 2

Copy of Chilterns Conservation Board's Objection dated 10 October 2018



Valley View, Hemel Hempstead Road, Dagnall, Berkhamsted

Variation of Condition: Conditions 3 & 5 of planning permission CB/13/03219/FULL Consent to be changed from Temporary to Permanent.

CBC reference: CB/18/03451/VOC

CCB Comment / Part Objection (based on Sec of State Decision as planning history)

10th October 2018

Thank you for consulting the Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB).

The application site falls within the AONB and the principal legal and policy duties will apply as:

- The **AONB Management Plan 2014-2019** at **L5** - *'Developments which detract from the Chilterns' special character should be resisted'* and **D12** *'Developments should be sought that represent the highest environmental and design standards whilst complementing the character of the AONB'*
- **Section 85 (i) of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act** - *'In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty'*
- **Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** (as revised July 2018) *'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues'*

In this case a long planning history has culminated with the Secretary of State's decision in July 2016 to issue a 3 year temporary consent for the additional static and touring caravans. This is a clear and definitive material planning consideration and weight must be given. The rationale behind the temporary consent was to allow the Local Planning Authority the opportunity within the Local Plan process to deliver new sites after a 3 year period. Whilst the Secretary of State formed the view that there would be a limited visual impact (his paragraph 17), it was accepted that the proposal would have a small degree of harm on the character and appearance of the open countryside *'and will conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB'* (paragraph 25). Even accepting the Secretary of State's point that the AONB impacts were weighed as 'neutral' in the balance, it follows that to end the use at the expiry of the temporary period (thus reverting to an allocated location) would result in a positive improvement to the AONB. In fact the Inspector in her decision balanced a series of very special circumstances against the harm to the AONB and Area of Great Landscape Value (in her decision at paragraph 81). Again it follows that to relocate this use would be a positive benefit to the landscape character of the Gade Valley and would deliver on the planning logic as laid out by the Secretary of

State. To grant a permanent permission would extinguish any possibility that this could happen. Further with the current progress on the new Local Plan, such matters are contained in chapter 10 of the regulation 19 submission to the Secretary of State and will be considered in the forthcoming findings of the Inspector following the examination-in-public.

CCB is grateful for the opportunity to submit these comments. We would raise objection to a permanent consent because an opportunity is lost to enhance the AONB and accommodate longer term needs via the Local Plan process, for the benefit of all parties. Section 85 of the CROW Act 2000 sets out a duty of regard to deliver the conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty (our emphasis).

The Chilterns Conservation Board
The Lodge
90 Station Road
Chinnor
Oxon OX39 4HA

planning@chilternsaonb.org

www.chilternsaonb.org

Appendix 2

**Copy of Ministry of Housing, Communities, Local Government letter dated 9 May 2019
in respect of CB/18/03451/VOC.**



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Ms Judy Martin
South Applications Team
Regeneration and Business Directorate
Central Bedfordshire Council,
Priory House,
Monks Walk,
Chicksands,
Shefford,
Bedfordshire
SG17 5TQ

Please ask for: **Karen Rose**
Tel: 0303 44 4 8069
Email: Karen.Rose@communities.gov.uk
Your ref: **CB/18/0345/VOC**
Our ref: PCU/RTI/P0240/3214997

By Email only:
Judy.Martin@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Date: 9 May 2019

Dear Ms Martin

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Variation of condition of planning permission – changing from temporary to permanent consent for the siting of a gypsy and travellers caravan at Valley View, Hemel Hempstead Road, Herts, HP4 1QR

Application Number: CB/18/03451/VOC

I refer to the above application which has been the subject of third party requests to call in for determination by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government.

The Secretary of State has carefully considered this case against call-in policy, as set out in the Written Ministerial Statement by Nick Boles on 26 October 2012. The policy makes it clear that the power to call in a case will only be used very selectively.

The Government is committed to give more power to councils and communities to make their own decisions on planning issues, and believes planning decisions should be made at the local level wherever possible.

In deciding whether to call in this application, the Secretary of State has considered his policy on calling in planning applications. This policy gives examples of the types of issues which may lead him to conclude, in his opinion that the application should be called in. The Secretary of State has decided not to call in this application. He is content that it should be determined by the local planning authority.

In considering whether to exercise the discretion to call in this application, the Secretary of State has not considered the matter of whether this application is EIA Development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The local planning authority responsible for determining this application remains the relevant authority responsible for considering whether these Regulations apply to this proposed development and, if so, for ensuring that the requirements of the Regulations are complied with.

Yours sincerely

Karen Rose

Karen Rose
Planning Casework Manager

Appendix 3

**Copy of Notice of Grant of Planning Permission dated 15 May 2019
in respect of CB/18/03451/VOC.**

Development Management

Central Bedfordshire Council

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



Mr J Jones
BFSGC
Saga Ct
Unit 3
Sibleys Rise
Great Missenden
HP16 9QQ

Contact Judy Martin
Direct Dial 0300 300 4375
Email planning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
Your Ref
Date 15 May 2019

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England)
Order 2015**

NOTICE OF GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION

Application Number: CB/18/03451/VOC
Application Site: Valley View, Hemel Hempstead Road, Dagnall, Berkhamsted, HP4 1QR
Proposed Development: Variation of Condition: Conditions 3 & 5 of planning permission CB/13/03219/FULL .

Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35

The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process 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 (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

The Council as the Local Planning Authority hereby gives notice of its decision to **GRANT PERMISSION** for the development specified above and shown on the submitted plans, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers as defined in Annex 1 of *Planning policy for traveller sites (2015)*.

Reason: To ensure that use of the site is restricted to Gypsies and Travellers having regard to the location of the site in the Green Belt together with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. (Policies BE8 & H15 SBLPR & Policies H8, SP4, SP8, EE5 & HQ1 of the emerging Central Bedfordshire Local Plan)

- 2 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no fences, gates or walls or any other means of enclosure or any amenity or storage buildings or other structures shall be erected on the

land without the grant of further planning permission.

Reason: In order to ensure that the overall appearance of the development has regard to the views into and over the site and that the development has no unacceptable adverse effect upon general or residential amenity in accordance with Policy BE8 of the South Bedfordshire Local Plan Review and having particular regard to the location of the site in the Green Belt and to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Policies BE8 & H15 SBLPR & Policies H8, SP4, SP8, EE5 & HQ1 of the emerging Central Bedfordshire Local Plan)

- 3 The occupation of the site hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following: Mrs Jade Golby Webb, Mr Charlton Webb and their resident dependants.

Reason: In recognition of the location of the site in the Green Belt and the “very special circumstances” case accepted in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 No more than 4 caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 (of which no more than 2 shall be a static caravan) shall be stationed on the whole of the site at any time.

Reason: In recognition of the location of the site in the Green Belt, AONB and AGLV and having regard to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Policies BE8 & H15 SBLPR & Policies H8, SP4, SP8, EE5 & HQ1 of the emerging Central Bedfordshire Local Plan)

- 5 When the premises cease to be occupied by those named in condition 3 above, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, buildings, structures, materials and equipment brought on to the land, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use shall be removed within one month of the cessation date.

Reason: In recognition of the location of the site in the Green Belt and the “very special circumstances” case accepted in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 6 No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.

Reason: To ensure the retention of planning control by the Local Planning Authority in recognition of the location of the site in the Green Belt, AONB and AGLV and having regard to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Policies BE8 & H15 SBLPR & Policies H8, SP4, SP8, EE5 & HQ1 of the emerging Central Bedfordshire Local Plan)

- 7 No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site.

Reason: To ensure the retention of planning control by the Local Planning Authority in recognition of the location of the site in the Green Belt, AONB and AGLV and having regard to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8 Within 6 months of the date of this permission a native landscape planting scheme shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval, which clearly shows the position of new native hedging to be planted around the boundary of the site, and

to include a satisfactory planting specification. The hedgerow shall be supplied as "Transplants" being of a size range of at least 60 to 90cm, and be comprised of the following mixture:-

40% Hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*)
30% Blackthorn (*Prunus spinosa*)
10% Dogwood (*Cornus sanguinea*)
10% Spindle (*Euonymus europaeus*)
10% Hazel (*Corylus avellana*)

The above mixture shall be set out as a double staggered row, with each row set 500mm apart, and the transplants set 500mm apart in each row. The hedge shall be maintained for a period of 5 years until established, with any losses replaced in accordance with the approved plan.

REASON: To successfully establish a dense, native boundary hedge that shall screen and visually integrate the site into the surrounding rural landscape and soften the visual impact of both new car parking and static homes in the interests of maintaining visual amenity and rural character.

(Policies BE8 & H15 SBLPR & Policies H8, SP4, SP8, EE5 & HQ1 of the emerging Central Bedfordshire Local Plan)

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).



Andrew Davie
Assistant Director - Development Infrastructure

Date of Issue: 15 May 2019

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

NOTIFICATION TO BE SENT TO AN APPLICANT WHEN A LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION OR GRANT IT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

Appeals to the Secretary of State

- If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- As this is a decision on a planning application relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as is already the subject of an enforcement notice [reference], if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application, then you must do so within 28 days of the date of this notice.*
- If an enforcement notice is served relating to the same or substantially the same land and development as in your application and if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision on your application, then you must do so within: 28 days of the date of service of the enforcement notice, or within 6 months [12 weeks in the case of a householder appeal] of the date of this notice, whichever period expires earlier.*
- As this is a decision to refuse planning permission for a householder application, if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks of the date of this notice.*
- As this is a decision to refuse planning permission for a minor commercial application, if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 12 weeks of the date of this notice.*
- As this is a decision to refuse express consent for the display of an advertisement, if you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 8 weeks of the date of receipt of this notice.*
- If you want to appeal against your local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 6 months of the date of this notice.*
- Appeals must be made using a form which you can get from the Secretary of State at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN (Tel: 0303 444 5000) or online at <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
- The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal but will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.
- The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to the Secretary of State that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions they imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.

Appendix 4

Copy of Site Development Scheme at Valley View [Drawing No: BP-01-2019]
in respect of CB/19/03288/FULL.

Valley View Detail
Site Development Scheme
 Revised

Drawing No.: BP-01-2019



KEY	
	Static Caravan
	Touring Caravan
	Parking
	Woodland
	Hardstanding
	Grass
	Tarmac - Access Rd
	Waste & Recycling

Meters
 0 5 10
 Scale: 1:500@A4

Valley View,
 Hemel Hempstead Road,
 Dagnall
 Bedfordshire HP4 1QR



All building works to comply with the relevant British standards and for codes of practice.
 This drawing & design are copyright.

Project	Valley View	Design: BFGSGC
Title:	Aug 2019	Saga Ct, Unit 3 Sibleys Rise,
Client		South Heath. Bucks. HP16 9QQ
Drawing	No.: BP-01-2019	Tel: 07756 917937
Elevation		
Drawings		

Appendix 5

Copy of Proposed Development Scheme at Valley View [Drawing No: BP-01-2023]
in respect of CB/22/04971/FULL.

Block Plan



Drawing No.:BP-01-2023

0m 5m 10m 15m 20m 25m 30m 35m 40m

Proposed Development

Scale 1:500 @ A4

January 2023

**Valley View
Hemel Hempstead Rd
Dagnall
Bedfordshire
HP4 1QR**



Joseph G Jones
Architect
Contact - Tel:
info@bfsgc.info 07756 917937
BFSGC
www.bfsgc.com



KEY	
	Static Caravan Existing No. 1
	Static Caravan Existing No. 2
	Utility Block
	Touring Caravan
	Parking
	Grass / Grazing
	Amenity Grass
	Kennel
	Gas Cylinder
	Waste & Recycling
	Hardstanding Shingle



Clerk to the Council

Mrs Sally Harrop
32 The Orchard
Kings Langley
Herts
WD4 8JR

Email: clerk@studhamparish.co.uk

Fenella Hackney
Planning Department
Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House, Monks Walk
Chicksands, Shefford
Bedfordshire SG17 5TQ

4th April 2023

Email to: planning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Dear Fenella

<u>Application No:</u>	CB/23/00061/FULL
<u>Location:</u>	67 HOLYWELL ROAD, STUDHAM LU6 2PA
<u>Proposal:</u>	Construction of a detached dwelling following demolition of an existing dwelling.

Members of the Studham Parish Council reviewed the amended application documents on Monday 3rd April 2023.

Having considered these amendments, the Councillors have no material concerns and are happy that CBC Planning Team will determine as appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sally Harrop'.

Sally Harrop
Clerk to Studham Parish Council



Clerk to the Council

Mrs Sally Harrop
32 The Orchard
Kings Langley
Herts
WD4 8JR

Email: clerk@studhamparish.co.uk

Jade Moss
Planning Department
Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House, Monks Walk
Chicksands, Shefford
Bedfordshire SG17 5TQ

4th April 2023

Email to: planning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Dear Jade

<u>Application No:</u>	CB/23/00812/FULL
<u>Location:</u>	8 CHURCH CLOSE, STUDHAM LU6 2QE
<u>Proposal:</u>	Erection of a detached single garage and adaptation of existing shared drive and crossover for off road vehicle parking.

Members of the Studham Parish Council reviewed the above application documents on Monday 3rd April 2023.

An area of grass will need to be converted into hardstanding to enable access; this will need to be agreed by CBC. Having considered this proposal, the Councillors have no material concerns and are happy that CBC Planning Team will determine as appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sally Harrop'.

Sally Harrop
Clerk to Studham Parish Council



Clerk to the Council

Mrs Sally Harrop
32 The Orchard
Kings Langley
Herts
WD4 8JR

Email: clerk@studhamparish.co.uk

Luke Burgess
Planning Department
Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House, Monks Walk
Chicksands, Shefford
Bedfordshire SG17 5TQ

4th April 2023

Email to: planning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Dear Luke

Application No:	CB/23/00825/FULL
Location:	34 WOODLAND RISE, STUDHAM LU6 2PF
Proposal:	Single storey front extension

Members of the Studham Parish Council reviewed the above application documents on Monday 3rd April 2023.

Having considered this proposal, the Councillors have no material concerns and are happy that CBC Planning Team will determine as appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "S Harrop".

Sally Harrop
Clerk to Studham Parish Council



Clerk to the Council

Mrs Sally Harrop
32 The Orchard
Kings Langley
Herts
WD4 8JR

Email: clerk@studhamparish.co.uk

Andy Jones – Trees & Landscape Officer
Planning Department
Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House, Monks Walk
Chicksands, Shefford
Bedfordshire SG17 5TQ

4th April 2023

Email to: planning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Dear Andy

Application No:	CB/TRE/23/00096
Location:	8 Holywell Road, Studham, Dunstable, LU6 2PA
Proposal:	Works to trees protected by Tree Preservation Order 4/1973

Members of Studham Parish Council reviewed the above application documents on Monday 3rd April 2023.

The Parish Council have no material issues with this application and are confident that it will be determined as appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Sally Harrop".

Sally Harrop
Clerk to Studham Parish Council



Clerk to the Council

Mrs Sally Harrop
32 The Orchard
Kings Langley
Herts
WD4 8JR

Email: clerk@studhamparish.co.uk

Andy Jones – Trees & Landscape Officer
Planning Department
Central Bedfordshire Council
Priory House, Monks Walk
Chicksands, Shefford
Bedfordshire SG17 5TQ

4th April 2023

Email to: planning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Dear Andy

Application No:	CB/TRE/23/00147
Location:	35 Woodland Rise, Studham, Dunstable, LU6 2PF
Proposal:	Works to trees protected by Tree Preservation Order SB/82/00003/G48

Members of Studham Parish Council reviewed the above application documents on Monday 3rd April 2023.

It was noted the applicant is unsure which trees on the property are subject to TPO's and would like assistance to clarify this. The Parish Council have no material issues with the application and are confident that it will be determined as appropriate.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sally Harrop'.

Sally Harrop
Clerk to Studham Parish Council