

**Application Number: 16/02393/FUL****New four bedroom dwelling house****AT Plots 6 And 7 Land Adj To 36, Pearmain Close, Newport Pagnell****FOR Mr Ethan King****Target:** Extension of time until 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017**Ward:** Newport Pagnell South**Parish:** Newport Pagnell Town Council**Report Author/Case Officer:** Paul Keen**Contact Details:** 01908 253239 paul.keen@milton-keynes.gov.uk**Team Leader:** Sarah Hine North West Team Manager**Contact Details:** 01908 252283 sarah.hine@milton-keynes.gov.uk

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The main body of the report set out below draws together the core issues in relation to the application including policy and other key material considerations. This is supplemented by an appendix which brings together planning history, additional matters and summaries of consultees' responses and public representations. Full details of the application, including plans, supplementary documents, consultee responses and public representations are available on the Council's Public access system [www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/publicaccess](http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/publicaccess). All matters have been taken into account in writing this report and recommendation.

1.2 The reason for the determination of this application at Panel is due to the number of neighbour objections received.

### **1.3 The Site**

The site currently forms the bottom of the very long rear garden to 92 Wolverton Road and measures 37m x 18m. It is currently being used as garden area.

1.4 The north eastern side boundary of the application is shared with the side boundary of number 36 Pearmain Close and the end of the cul de sac in Pearmain Close. The south eastern boundary of the site backs onto existing allotments and the south western boundary is shared with the bottom of the long garden at number 94 Wolverton Road. The boundary is currently open along part of the side boundary between number 92 Wolverton Road and 94 Wolverton Road. The remaining boundaries are marked by close boarded fences. There is a large amount of mature planting and some trees along the boundary with the allotments.

1.5 The nearest residential properties to the site are 36 and 16 Pearmain Close. The other nearest residential properties are 90, 92 and 94 Northampton Road and are between 50 metres and 70 metres away from the site.

1.6 There have been no significant physical changes within the locality since the previously refused application 16/01443/FUL which was for the erection of 2 new dwellings on the site.

### 1.7 **The Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a four bedroom detached dwelling house, access, parking and landscaping.

1.8 Amended plans have been received to reduce the height (from 10.3m to 8.7m), bulk and width (of garage by 600mm) of the proposed house.

1.9 Changes made to refused application 16/01443/FUL include:

- Reduced scheme from two dwellings to one.
- Submission of further ecology information (and reassessment of key issues).
- Confirmation of use of the piece of land to the site frontage being within the 'residential curtilage of the new dwelling.

## 2.0 **RELEVANT POLICIES**

### 2.1 **National Policy**

National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs:

6, 7, 8, and 14 – Sustainable Development

17 – Core Planning Principles

32, 37, and 39 – Transport

56, 57, 60, 61,63, and 64 – Good Design

109 – Natural environment

196-198 - Determining Applications

### 2.2 **Local Policy**

#### Core Strategy

CSA - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

CS1 - Milton Keynes Development Strategy

CS10 - Housing

CS13 - Ensuring High Quality Well Designed Places

#### Saved policies in Adopted Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011

D1 - Impact of Development Proposals on Locality

D2 - Design of Buildings  
D2A - Urban Design Aspects of New Developments  
T15 - Parking Provision  
H7 - Housing On Unidentified Sites  
NE1 Nature Conservation Sites

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Parking Standards 2016

New Residential Development Design Guide SPD (April 2012)

Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan

NP4 – Windfall Sites

**3.0 MAIN ISSUES**

*(The issues which have the greatest bearing on the decision)*

- 3.1
- Whether the current proposal has addressed the previous reasons for refusal under 16/01443/FUL.
  - The principle of residential development on the site;
  - impact on the character of the locality;
  - impact on the amenities neighbouring residents and future occupants of the development;
  - Impact on biodiversity and;
  - Impact on Highways
  - Impact on drainage

**4.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out at the end of this report.

**5.0 CONSIDERATIONS**

*(An explanation of the main issues that have lead to the officer Recommendation)*

- 5.1 Whether the current proposal has addressed the previous reasons for refusal under 16/01443/FUL

The reasons for refusal under 16/01443/FUL related to impacts on ecology and habitat, and the maintenance of land to the front of the proposed building.

- 5.2 Given that the scheme is substantially different the previous proposal, it is considered necessary to revisit all material planning considerations in this case. The assessment of the listed in section 3.1 above are discussed below.

5.3 The principle of residential development on the site

The application site is within the settlement boundary in a sustainable residential area in Newport Pagnell where residential development is acceptable in principle in accordance with paragraphs 6, 7,8 and 14 of the NPPF.

5.4 In addition the Council does not have a 5 year housing land supply and paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply.

5.5 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states where the relevant development plan is out of date the local planning authority should grant planning permission unless:

*“any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or*

*specific policies in this framework indicate development should be resisted”*

5.6 Subject to there not being any adverse impacts in accordance with paragraph 14 above, the principle of development is acceptable.

5.7 Impact on the character of the locality

It is important to note that this issue did not form part of the previous reason for refusal. The proposed design of the current proposal is however very different to what was previously proposed under 16/01443/FUL which consisted to two semi-detached dwellings.

5.8 The character of Pearmain Close consists of piece meal development which generally include traditional pitched roof design with red brick, although with some variance of roof materials.

5.9 The design and layout of the development, as amended during the current application process, is considered to be in keeping with the character of the area and would be a natural extension to the existing estate. The form of development will follow the existing built form of the area.

5.10 In addition the scale, size and style of proposed dwelling is considered to be in keeping with the existing dwellings in the area. Whilst the proposed design detailing and partial render material are not necessarily consistent with other dwellings within the locality, it does include a traditional pitched roof design and would be part of a modern development. These differences are not considered sufficient to substantiate a reason for refusal as on balance, due to a lack of a 5 year housing land supply, the need for additional housing would outweigh the need to seek a design which repeats the exact design characteristics of other buildings in an area which is not a conservation area nor adjacent to any listed building.

- 5.11 The Landscape Officer has requested further details on the landscaping scheme. The new dwelling will have a small private front garden it is considered that there is limited space to offer any meaningful strategic landscaping and the owners will be responsible for putting in their own planting and maintaining this. This concern is not therefore considered sufficient to refuse the application, but a landscape scheme could be secured by condition if the application is approved.
- 5.12 Similarly, the Arboriculturalist has not objected to the application in relation to the proposed loss of trees currently protected under a Tree Preservation Order. The trees to be lost are low Grade C trees of little individual merit, and the development would be of a satisfactory distance from trees within the rear garden of no. 94 Wolverton Road to not lead to significant damage or loss. The work which could be done to these trees by the future occupants of the development under common law would not put the trees under undue stress. The Arboriculturalist has however requested that replacement tree planting be provided, as well as tree protection measures. Whilst replacement tree planting is not considered necessary, tree protection could be dealt with by condition if the application is successful.
- 5.13 Concern was previously raised under 16/01443/FUL in relation to an area of land opposite the proposed development in that no information was provided to indicate what this area of land was to be used for and how it fits into the development proposed. The current scheme indicates this area of land to be within and maintained as part of the residential curtilage of the dwelling. Officers are therefore satisfied that this area of land should not reasonably lead to an untidy appearance, and would be adequately maintained by the future occupants of the development. Landscaping conditions would deal with the finished appearance of landscaping areas before first occupation.
- 5.14 As such the proposal has addressed the previous reason for refusal in relation to landscape maintenance and now accords with saved Policies D2 and H7 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011 and the aims of the NPPF in this regard.
- 5.15 Impact on the amenities neighbouring residents and future occupants of the development
- It is important to note that this issue did not form part of the previous reason for refusal.
- 5.16 Officers consider that the revised design, location and scale of the proposed development, would not lead to adverse impacts on the amenity, privacy or daylight of existing neighbouring residents, when compared to what has already been considered acceptable in this regard.
- 5.17 The nearest residential properties to the development are 36 Pearmain Close and 94 Wolverton Road. Due to the orientation of these properties to the nearest proposed plot and the positioning of the proposed dwelling and the

separation distances involved it is not anticipated that the development would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of this property in terms of loss of privacy, sunlight and daylight. The other properties in the area are considered to be a significant distance away from the development to not be affected by the proposal.

5.18 However, if successful, it is considered necessary for permitted development rights to be withdrawn, mainly due to fact that the proposed location of the building would project beyond the rear building line of no. 36 Pearmain Close. Removal of permitted development rights for outbuildings would also protect the remaining protected trees within and adjacent to the site.

5.19 Subject to conditions, the application accords with saved policy D1 (iii) of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011 and the aims of the NPPF in this regard.

5.20 Impact on biodiversity

In addition to the potential impact on protected trees (already discussed above), the previous application was refused due to the '*reduction in biodiversity and the impact on the future habitat of protected species*'. However, there is no evidence that the proposed development would lead to direct loss or damage to protected species within or near to the site. Clearly removal of trees within the site would reduce some biodiversity within the site, but through conditions, enhancement can be made as suggested by the Countryside Officer.

5.21 Previous concern was also made in relation to part of the site being within the Railway Walk Wildlife Corridor. However, having searched the Council's GIS system, only a very small part of the site nearest to the railway line is actually within the wildlife corridor. This is similar to the proportion of recently approved neighbouring residential plots at no. 36 Pearmain Close and further towards the north east. It would be unreasonable to take a different stance with proposed development on the application site, particularly in light of the fact that the proposed development is outside the wildlife corridor, and enhancements such as bat/bird boxes could be included into the development.

5.22 With no evidence of direct harm being caused to protected species and in light of the Council being unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, officers cannot support a reason for refusal based on the potential future habitats for protected species

5.23 As such, subject to conditions, the proposal accords with policies D1 (v) and NE1 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011 and advice given in Paragraph 109 of National Planning Policy Framework.

5.24 Impact on Highways

It is important to note that this issue did not form part of the previous reason

for refusal.

5.25 *Impact on the existing access*

Saved Policy D1 (vi) of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011 seeks to resist development that provides for inadequate access to and vehicle movement within the site.

5.26 As found in the previous application, it is considered that Pearmain Close is capable of serving the development as it is an adopted road up to the end of the cul de sac. The access proposed off this cul de sac will follow the same width and alignment as the existing road and is considered capable of accommodating the new vehicle movements associated with the development. Whilst this part of the road is currently private, it will need to be constructed to adoptable standards and this could be conditioned. Overall the existing access is therefore considered to be acceptable.

5.27 There is no turning space provided within the plots but because the traffic associated with Pearmain Close is relatively light it is not considered necessary to provide for turning space within each plot.

5.28 The proposed development would comply with saved Policy D1 (vi) of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011 in terms of accessing the site.

5.29 *Impact on car parking*

Saved Policy T15 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan, the Parking Standards SPD 2016 and the New Residential Design Guide SPD 2012 seeks to ensure that new development makes provision for adequate car parking up to a specified standard.

5.30 The proposed development falls within Zone 3 and would generate a need for two car allocated parking spaces for a four bedroom dwelling in accordance with the Parking Standards SPD 2016. Although not included as parking in the calculation, the dwelling would also have a garage.

5.31 Subject to a suitable condition requiring the parking spaces to be provided and retained, the proposed development would satisfy saved Policy T15 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan, the Parking Standards SPD 2016 and the New Residential Design Guide SPD 2012.

5.32 Impact on drainage

Saved Policy D1 (ii) of the Milton Keynes Local plan 2001 – 2011 seeks to ensure that development does not cause inadequate drainage. One of the residents has commented on the potential impact of the development on the drainage system. The site is located outside any flood zone and any area of ground water aquifer and there is no reason to believe that the public sewers are not capable of serving the development. It is not anticipated that the site will lead to drainage problems in this area subject to suitable drainage details

being agreed which can be dealt with through the imposition of a condition on any planning permission.

### 5.33 Conclusion

Based on the above assessment and subject to conditions outlined in section 6 of this report, it is considered that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, and would not have an adverse impact on the amenity or privacy of neighbouring residents or highway safety once occupied. There would be no adverse impact on protected species and trees, nor on highway safety. In this respect the proposal has addressed the previous reason for refusal under 16/01443/FUL. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.

## 6.0 **CONDITIONS**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To prevent the accumulation of planning permissions; to enable the Local Planning Authority to review the suitability of the development in the light of altered circumstances; and to comply with section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Prior to commencement of works above ground level, details of the external materials to be used in the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not detract from the appearance of the locality.

3. The parking spaces shown on the approved drawings shall be retained as a permanent ancillary to the development and shall be not used for any other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient off street parking is provided to meet the needs of the development.

4. All existing trees, woodlands and hedges to be retained are to be protected according to the recommendations contained within the provisions of BS 5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'.

Reason: To protect existing natural features in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

5. Details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings and the finished ground levels of the site, in relation to existing site levels of

surrounding property, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before any work commences. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels. (G03)

Reason: To ensure that construction is carried out at suitable levels having regard to drainage, access, the appearance of the development and the amenities of neighbouring properties.

6. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Philip Irving dated April 2016. Prior to works above ground level, a Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reasons: To mitigate against the impact of the development in the interest of ecological enhancement.

7. Pursuant to the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 or any Statutory Instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order, the provisions of Article 3(1) and Classes A, B, C, D and E; of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the said Order (relating to Householder Development) shall not apply to any dwelling to which this permission relates and no such development shall be carried out without the permission of the Local Planning Authority being first obtained.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to consider future development in the site with regards to the impact on neighbouring residents and the ecology visual amenity of the area, in accordance with policy D1 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011.



## Appendix to 16/02393/FUL

### A1.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

*(A brief outline of previous planning decisions affecting the site – this may not include every planning application relating to this site, only those that have a bearing on this particular case)*

#### A1.1 15/03039/FUL

Erection of 2 new dwellings on the land adjacent to number 36  
REFUSED 09.03.2016 for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed layout includes a detached garage block containing a garage to serve each dwelling, inadequate allocated and unallocated parking and gardens which do not relate well to the proposed dwellings. The parking area has no surveillance. The provision of inadequate parking would be likely to lead to additional on street parking to the detriment of highway safety and convenience. The proposed development would not comply with Saved Policies D1 (vi), T15, D2 (v and vi) and D2A (iii) of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011*
- 2. Insufficient information accompanied the application to determine whether or not the development would result in physical damage to the site including statutorily protected species, natural features and wildlife habitat. The development did not include any mitigation measures or biodiversity enhancements. The development would be contrary to saved policies D1 (v) and NE2 of Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001-2011 and advice contained within paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

#### 16/01443/FUL

Erection of 2 new dwellings on the land adjacent to number 36 (resubmission of 15/03039/FUL)

REFUSED 26.09.2016 for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed development, due to its location within part of the Milton Keynes Wildlife Corridor would cause damage to and seriously impact on the future of wildlife within this area due to the reduction in biodiversity and the impact on the future habitat of protected species. The proposed development would also potentially cause damage to the roots of protected trees within the vicinity of the site which would impact on the health and longevity of these trees to the detriment of the wildlife habitat and the visual amenity of the area. The development would be contrary to saved Policies D1 (v) and NE1 of the Milton Keynes Local and advice given in Paragraph 109 of National Planning Policy Framework.*
- 2. The proposed development includes an area of land to the front of the proposed plots on the opposite side of the proposed access road. The application makes no reference as to how this piece of land is to be used and how it would integrate into the proposed development. This*

*lack of clarity means that the land could become unkempt, unattractive and appear at odds with the rest of Pearmain Close. In this respect the development does not reinforce better quality in the design elements of the layout or clearly define the public and private areas which would be contrary saved policy D2 (ii) and (v) of the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 - 2011 and advice within Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of encouraging good design.*

## **A2.0 ADDITIONAL MATTERS**

A2.1 None

### **A3.0 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS**

*(Who has been consulted on the application and the responses received. The following are a brief description of the comments made. The full comments can be read via the Council's web site)*

#### **Comments**

#### **Officer Response**

##### **A3.1 Landscape Architect**

In summary, amendment to revise the layout away from retained TPO trees.

Noted. The Arboriculturalist considers the position of the building to be acceptable, subject to conditions in section 6 of this report. Landscape conditions are also suggested.

Further information on proposed levels and the impact on trees to be retained.

Landscape scheme required.

##### **Highways Development Control**

No representation received at the time of writing this report.

##### **Councils Countryside Officer**

In summary:

The southeast part of the proposed development site is part of a Milton Keynes Wildlife Corridor.

Noted. These issues are discussed in sections 5.20 to 5.23 of this report.

I thus would object to this application on the grounds of.

Suggested conditions in section 6 of this report.

Damage to a Milton Keynes Wildlife Corridor, so contravening Local Plan policy NE1 – To protect from development all designated sites of importance for nature

conservation.

- If developed, the new dwelling would need to incorporate two bat tubes and two artificial Swift boxes. Their specifications and locations, will need to be submitted to the Planning Authority for approval.
- A planting plan based upon Section 6.1 Habitats and Vegetation of the PEA will need to be submitted to the Planning Authority for approval.
- If appropriate, an external lighting plan will need to be submitted to the Planning Authority for approval.
- Avoidance measures regarding protected animals based upon Section 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5 will need to be conditioned.

#### Environmental Health Manager

No comments in respect of contaminated land.

Noted

#### Cranfield Airport

No representation received at the time of writing this report.

#### Landscape Services Manager – Trees

There is a tree preservation order covering this and adjacent sites. On the site the TPO trees are two Apple trees. The Tree preservation order was served following the loss by early site clearance of some trees on the land now

Noted. Suggested conditions in section 6 of this report.

occupied by 14, 16 and 36 – 40 Pearmain Close, thus it was not possible to take those trees into account in the planning and development of that site. The tree preservation was thus served in order to keep in place the better of the existing trees on the potential development sites, so the council was not robbed of the opportunity to consider them in the planning process for future developments, and to decide which trees should be retained and which could be removed.

This proposed development affects two Apple trees on the site and four Apple trees to the southwest of the site but close enough to be affected by the development. The two Apple trees on the site are typical old garden Apples, they are not good quality in the pure arboricultural sense being of BS 5837 2012 grade 'C' category only due to defects such as cavities, tight junctions and unsympathetic pruning. However they have reasonably healthy crowns and good extension growth, new wood may be laid down by such trees that will keep up with the rate of loss of old wood to decay, which is why big old Apple trees often continue to grow well and provide good crops for decades despite having cavities, hollows and contorted branch structures, indeed these features provide good habitats for a variety of wildlife and give character to the trees, enhancing their visual amenity. Thus while they are worthy of protection they are also, unfortunately, of BS 5837 2012 'C' category and therefore the recommendation is that they should not form a constraint to development.

The four trees outside the site to the southwest but close enough to have their root zones adversely affected by the development are proposed to be protected by tree

protection fencing along the root protection zone boundaries and by ground protection adjacent to that. I assessed what impact reversing the layout of the development would have and found it would not offer as much protection as that proposed on the submitted 'Location, existing and proposed layout' plan.

Rather than as shown on the submitted plan the tree protection fencing should be as figure 2, page 20 in BS 5837: 2012, the proposed ground protection as shown on the submitted plan appears to be as specified in 6.2.3.1 - 6.2.3.5 pages 21/22 in BS 5837: 2012.

The proximity of the proposed dwelling to the trees may in future result in some conflict between the residents and the trees on the basis that they cause shade, overhang, drop material etc. however these trees are not within the demise of the site and beyond exercising their common law right to prune up to the boundary (after obtaining TPO permission) this should not result in any great threat to the trees. The trees are also to the southwest and so their shading potential to the development site will not be too significant.

If a smaller dwelling were proposed similar to that at no.36 and it were located to the northeast side of the property this would enable sufficient space to both avoid development pressure on the four adjacent trees to the southwest and the retention of the two TPO trees within the site , however this may not be seen as efficient use of the site area by the developer.

If permission is granted for this development significant

replacement tree planting should be conditioned, the 'Location, existing and proposed layout' plan indicates three new trees to the rear of the site and two to the frontage which is good though the positions and species suggested would need to be revised; three trees should be planted along the lawn area to the dwelling frontage and three along the allotment boundary to the rear. They should be of good size (14-16's) and two could be protected being planted as direct replacements to the two TPO trees lost, though I suggest a new TPO be served to protect the six new trees at completion of planting.

Suggested conditions relate to tree protection of retained/neighbouring trees, replacement trees, pruning, excavation within root protection areas, and for a method statement to be submitted.

Parish - Newport Pagnell

No objections.

Noted.

Ward - Newport Pagnell South - Cllr Alexander

No representation received at the time of writing this report.

Ward - Newport Pagnell South - Cllr McCall

No representation received at the time of writing this report.

Ward - Newport Pagnell South - Cllr Eastman

No representation received at the time of writing this report.

### **Local Residents**

The occupiers of the following properties were notified of the application:

8 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
6 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
4 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
2 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
84 Wolverton Road Newport Pagnell MK16 8JG  
3 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
1 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
5 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
7 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
9 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
11 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
46 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
14 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
16 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
86 Wolverton Road Newport Pagnell MK16 8JG  
88 Wolverton Road Newport Pagnell MK16 8JG  
44 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
42 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
40 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
38 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
36 Pearmain Close Newport Pagnell Milton Keynes  
90 Wolverton Road Newport Pagnell MK16 8JG  
92 Wolverton Road Newport Pagnell MK16 8JG  
94 Wolverton Road Newport Pagnell MK16 8JG

Representations were received from the occupants at no's 36 Pearmain Close and 94 Wolverton Road raising the following concerns:

- Objects on the grounds of loss of trees and protected trees being affected.
- Loss of biodiversity and impact on protected species and wildlife corridor.
- Proposal not in keeping with the rest of the road due to size and material.
- Traffic safety concerns, parking and disruption
- Reference that is does not accord with the Newport Pagnall Neighbourhood Plan and other larger development meeting the housing needs of the area.
- Not sufficient street lighting
- Inconvenience to existing residents from construction vehicles

Noted. The issues raised have been discussed in section 5 of this report.

It should be noted that the issue raised in relation to construction vehicles is not a material planning consideration and would be dealt with under Highways legislation.