

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2017/0395
Valid 01/08/2017

11A FAUVEL ROAD
GLOSSOP

PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE
OF LIGHT INDUSTRIAL UNIT
TO DWELLING

(FULL - MINOR)

- Principle of development (inc. loss of light industrial unit)
- Design/impact on the street-scene and character & appearance of the area
- Highways safety
- Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties
- Ecological issues
- Sustainability

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises a detached building currently used as a light industrial unit (picture framing workshop). The building has a Fauvel Road (Glossop) address but is actually located off Fauval Road, to the east, apparently on or close to Fauvel Place. The north-western elevation of the application building is adjacent to the rear yard boundary of number 11 Fauvel Road, which is a dwelling. There are residential properties along Fauvel Road. Along and at the head of Fauvel Place other industrial buildings have been converted to residential properties in recent years. The south-western elevation of the application building is opposite a building that is in the process of being converted to residential use. The land adjacent to the north-eastern facing elevation of the application building appears to be 'garden' associated with number 13 Fauvel Road and there is a domestic garage located on it. The south-eastern facing elevation of the application building is adjacent to what appears to be the road/turning area of Fauvel Place.

The site is located within the built up area boundary of Glossop and 'urban' landscape area, as defined in the Local Plan.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning permission for "*proposed change of use of light industrial unit to dwelling.*"

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

HPK/2013/0547 – Proposed residential development (Outline). Refused, 01.04.2014. It is noted that the reasons for refusal were: 1) It had not been demonstrated that a new dwelling could provide a good standard of amenity for future occupiers whilst maintaining existing amenity levels with neighbouring properties and 2) there was insufficient information for the LPA to be confident that roosting bats would not be affected by the proposal.

PLANNING POLICIES, GUIDANCE AND OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

High Peak Local Plan Adopted April 2016

S1 – Sustainable development principles
S1a – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
S2 – Settlement hierarchy
S3 – Strategic housing development
S5 – Glossop sub-area strategy
EQ1 – Climate change
EQ2 – Landscape character
EQ5 - Biodiversity
EQ6 – Design and place making
EQ10 – Pollution control and unstable land
EQ11 – Flood risk management
E4 – Change of use of existing business land and premises
H1 – Location of housing development
H2 – Housing allocations
H3 – New housing development
H4 – Affordable housing
CF6 – Accessibility by public transport

SPD - Residential Design Guide

National Planning Policy Framework

- 1 - Introduction
- 2 - Achieving sustainable development
- 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 6 - Building a strong, competitive economy
- 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
- 11 – Making effective use of land
- 12 - Achieving well-designed places
- 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

National Planning Practice Guidance

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 26/09/2017
Neighbour consultation period ends: 20/09/2018
Press Advert: No

Public Comments

7 No. representations have been received (some objectors having submitted more than 1 No. representation), details of which can be read on file. In summary, the issues raised are as follows:-

- There doesn't appear to be any significant difference between the current application and the previously refused application
- The address of the application site should now be Fauvel Place
- The access road to the site (Fauvel Road) is unadopted; tarmac has been laid on Fauvel Place and NOT Fauvel Road (as suggested in the Statement)
- The outdoor area proposed would not be sufficient to accommodate bins, clothes drying facilities and an outdoor seating area
- The property does not have designated parking spaces on Fauvel Road, nor any on Fauvel Place
- Fauvel Place also provides right of access to the rear of 13 Fauvel Road, which would be hindered as a result of the proposal
- The residential developments on Fauvel Place have already impacted on the highway network
- There is not enough room for any more cars
- There is not enough room for a house in the space
- The proposal would be dangerous for children playing on Fauvel Place (some properties on Fauvel Place do not have back gardens)
- The Statement is confusing – is the proposal 3 No. bedroom or 2 No. and a study?
- An application to convert a workshop to the rear of 44-48 Howard Street was subject to vehicular access being from Howard Street and no parking on Fauvel Place
- The plans show 2 No. parking spaces on Fauvel Place, but the land is not in the ownership of the applicant and there is no consent given for such parking
- The 'escape windows' shown on the plans are directly into the rear yard of number 11 Fauvel Road, which would affect privacy and not meet building regulations; the current windows are non-opening and obscure-glazed which ensures privacy is maintained
- Carrying out construction works would require access onto land not in the ownership of the applicant
- Windows are shown on the plans opposite the development being renovated off Howard Street (rear of 44-48) which would affect privacy.

DCC Highways Authority

The application details propose a Change of Use of the existing premises from light industrial to a single 3no. bedroom dwelling served by 2no. off-street parking spaces. It is noted that access to Fauvel Place and the area identified for parking are not included within the red line boundary and I trust that you will satisfy yourself that the applicant has the necessary control/rights to secure these.

Notwithstanding, given that the existing use of the site is 130sqm GFA light industrial, it is considered that conversion to a single residential unit would be unlikely to result in such a change in traffic generation (compared with the existing use) as to cause any further detriment to the safe operation of the highway network.

Therefore, if you are minded to approve the proposals, the Highway Authority recommends that Conditions for the following be included within the Consent:-

- The premises, the subject of the application, shall not be occupied until space has been provided within the site curtilage for the parking/ manoeuvring of residents/ visitors vehicles, located, designed, laid out and constructed all as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and maintained throughout the life of the development free from any impediment to its designated use.
- Before any other operations are commenced (excluding demolition/ site clearance), space shall be provided within the site curtilage for storage of plant and materials/ site accommodation, laid out and constructed in accordance with detailed designs to be submitted in advance to the Local Planning Authority for written approval and maintained throughout the contract period in accordance with the approved designs free from any impediment to its designated use

In addition, the following Note may be included for the information of the applicant:-

- Car parking provision should be made on the basis of 2no. spaces per 2/3 bedroom dwelling. Each parking bay should be of 2.4m x 5.5m minimum dimension with an additional 0.5m of width to any side adjacent to a physical barrier (e.g. fence, wall, etc.) and adequate space behind each space for manoeuvring.

DWT (Ecology)

We have checked the site against the Trust's data sets and we have considered the relevant documents submitted as part of the planning application with particular reference to the following:

- Bat and Bird Assessment letter. Ecology Services UK Ltd. June 2017
- Design and Access Statement. AP Design Architects. July 2017

Response

Bats

The report details that the building has negligible potential to support roosting bats and therefore no further bat surveys are recommended, providing the works take place prior to the next bat activity season (May-August 2018). Should there be a delay, we would recommend that an update inspection is undertaken.

Birds

The building does have potential to support nesting birds. Should the Council be minded to grant the planning permission, the following conditions should be attached:

No works shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity on site during this period, and details of measures to protect the nesting

bird interest on the site, have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and then implemented as approved.

Through the redevelopment of the building, it is likely that suitable nesting features for birds will be lost. To mitigate for the loss of these features, it is recommended that a condition is attached to secure the incorporation of bird boxes. The incorporation of a bat box could also be considered to provide an enhancement to the scheme in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2012.

Prior to the commencement of development details of ecological enhancement measures that shall include details of bird and bat boxes (positions/specification/numbers) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Such approved measures shall be implemented in full and maintained thereafter

Environmental Health

No objection to the proposed development subject to the conditions set out below being applied to any permission granted. The Phase 1 Environmental Assessment (ref: 41645LR1, 4 Feb 2014) submitted in support of the application recommends that a discovery strategy is developed should unexpected contamination be encountered during the development. For this reason and to protect the health of the public conditions 1 and 2 are recommended.

1. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

If during development any contamination or evidence of likely contamination is identified that has not previously been identified or considered, then the applicant shall submit a written scheme to identify and control that contamination. This shall include a phased risk assessment carried out in accordance with the procedural guidance of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 Part IIA, and appropriate remediation proposals, and shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority without delay. The approved remediation scheme shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

2. Importation of Soil/Material

No soil is to be imported to the site until it has been tested for contamination and assessed for its suitability for the proposed development, a suitable methodology for testing this material should be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to the soils being imported onto site. The methodology should include the sampling frequency, testing schedules, criteria against which the analytical results will be assessed (as determined by the risk assessment) and source material information. The analysis shall then be carried out and validity evidence submitted to and approved in writing to by the Local Planning Authority

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The following documents were submitted with the application, details of which can be read on file:

- Phase I Environmental Assessment
- Ecology Report
- Design and Access Statement

During the course of the application revised plans have been submitted and a Supporting Letter, details of which can also be read on file.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of development (Inc. loss of light industrial unit)

Principle

Policies H1, H2, H3, H4, H5 and H6 of the Local Plan provide for housing development within the Borough in accordance with specific site allocations, other sites and instances as outlined in policy H1.

Policy H2 identifies the specific sites that are allocated for housing development across the Borough. The application site is not an allocated site.

Policy H1 states that provision will be made for housing by supporting development of allocated sites, promoting the effective reuse of land (inc. change of use of existing buildings to housing, on sites suitable for that purpose), supporting housing development on unallocated sites within defined built up area boundaries of the towns and larger villages, encouraging the inclusion of housing in mixed use schemes, supporting development identified through a Community Right to Build Order and supporting self-build housing schemes. The proposed development is change of use of an existing building; if deemed suitable for such purposes then the proposal would fall within this category.

The NPPF (bullet point 'c' para. 118) states that substantial weight should be given to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs.

Policy E4 of the Local Plan allows for change of use of industrial or business premises (B1, B2 or B8) for non-employment uses where certain criteria are met, thus:

- The premises are no longer suitable or commercially viable for industrial or business use...*"as demonstrated by marketing evidence commensurate with the size and scale of development and the proposed use is compatible with neighbouring uses"*
- The change of use would form part of an enabling development package to fund improvements to business premises or supporting infrastructure

The policy also states that

- *“Proposals that would result in an under-supply of suitable employment land in relation to identified needs will not be permitted.”*

It is noted that no marketing evidence has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the premises are no longer suitable or commercially viable for industrial or business use. As such, the proposal does not accord with Local Plan policy E4.

However, the applicant has, during the course of the application, submitted a Supporting Letter to support the proposal, which includes, inter alia, reference to policy E4. Details can be read on file but the key points of the Letter in respect of policy E4 are summarised as follows:

1. The policy is there to protect employment land/premises in order to support the local economy
2. The supporting text of the policy recognises that there will be circumstances during the plan period that will require the redevelopment of some employment land for other beneficial uses, eg. housing, if the site is suitable (eg. no longer compatible with existing neighbouring residential uses in terms of amenity)
3. Policy E4 is sufficiently flexible therefore to permit a change of use without the need for a marketing exercise
4. The existing light industrial use is now clearly incompatible with the surrounding residential properties; change of use to residential would improve the residential environment (noting that the current picture framing business is low key...other light industrial uses may not be)
5. An application could currently be made to change the use of the building under permitted development rights (Class PA, of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the GPDO); prior approval of the LPA would be required but the procedural factors would be satisfied and the key aspects which the LPA has to consider (i.e. highways, contamination, flooding and noise) would not raise any issues that would result in the prior approval of the Council being required and not granted
6. The fact that such a change of use can be secured under permitted development is a material consideration; this is a genuine fall-back position
7. There are therefore significant material considerations that outweigh the need for a marketing exercise to be undertaken.

Bearing the above points in mind, although the proposed development does not satisfy the requirement of policy E4 (as a marketing exercise has not been undertaken, and as such the proposal does not accord with the policy and therefore is not acceptable in principle), there are other material considerations to consider in mind in the planning balance. Hence, any decision should be arrived at weighing all development plan policies and relevant material consideration in the planning balance.

Design – Impact on the street-scene & character and appearance of the area

The NPPF highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Local Plan Policies S1, EQ2 and EQ6 seek to secure high quality design in all developments.

The proposal consists of converting the existing building into a dwelling. The building is made up of what appears to be 2 distinct sections – a) a two-storey section at the north-western end which has a dual-pitched roof covered with slates and b) a single-storey section (which is longer than the two-storey section) at the other end with a non-pitched roof covered in asbestos sheeting. The building is apparently all constructed of brick (the brick is visible on some elevations) but on some elevations the brick has been rendered and on others painted. There are a number of existing door and window openings. The building is considered not to be of any architectural merit.

It is noted that revised plans have been submitted which seek to address some concerns originally raised by the Officer. The proposed conversion would entail demolishing a section of the single-storey element in order to create an outdoor area (for storage of bins, amenity and/or parking of 1 No. vehicle), change the non-pitched roof section to a dual-pitched roof and inserting fenestration to meet the requirements of the converted internal area.

The internal area would now provide a lounge/dining/kitchen area plus bedroom, bathroom, lobby and utility/bicycle store at ground-floor level with a bedroom and en-suite at first-floor level.

The proposed materials are a) removal of render and paintwork from elevations, repair brickwork as necessary and provide a new slate roof.

Given that the proposal is a conversion and noting the varied architectural styles of buildings in the area with a mixed palette of materials, it is considered that the design is acceptable. Moreover, the proposal would improve the appearance of the building which would be beneficial to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposed development therefore accords with the design tenets of policies S1 and EQ6 of the Local Plan and section 12 of the NPPF.

Highway safety

The NPPF promotes sustainable transport and recommends that local planning authorities should seek to encourage and facilitate where possible sustainable patterns of transport using practical alternatives to private motor vehicles so that people have a real choice about how they travel.

Local Plan Policy CF6 seeks to ensure that new development can be accessed safely, provides access to a range of transport modes, minimises the need to travel by unsustainable modes and does not lead to an increase in street parking to the detriment of the free and safe flow of traffic.

The existing building and application site boundary does not have a designated parking area. It is noted that the application as originally submitted illustrated 2 No.

parking spaces on Fauvel Place, adjacent to the south-western facing elevation of the building. These spaces were outside the site edged red. However, the applicant has stated that he believes he has a right to park vehicles there. At this stage no evidence has been provided to confirm that this is the case.

The Highway Authority commented on the plans originally submitted and the comments included the following key points: a) the parking spaces were outside the application boundary, b) the proposed 3 No. bedroom conversion would not be detrimental to the safe operation of the highway network and c) recommended conditions for i) details of on-site parking, at specified sizes, plus turning and ii) details of a construction site compound.

It is noted that:

1. The existing use of the building generates a theoretical parking requirement of 1 No. space per 25 sqm floor area (Appendix 1 of the Local Plan); therefore with a floor area of approx. 150sqm (ground and first floors) this equates to 6 No. spaces
2. The revised plans show 2 No. bedrooms, illustrate that the outdoor amenity area could potentially accommodate 1 No. parked car and in addition a utility/bicycle storage room is provided
3. The location of the site is literally just around the corner from the train station and within easy walkable access to all the facilities and services available in Glossop Town centre.

Bearing the above 3 No. factors in mind and the opinion of the Highway Authority, i.e. that the proposal would not be detrimental to the safe operation of the highway network, it is considered that a) a refusal on highways grounds would not be sustainable (noting that para 109 of the NPPF states that *“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”*), b) that the site is located in a highly sustainable location with access to modes of transport other than the private motor car and c) the recommended conditions by the Highway Authority are unreasonable as it is evident that i) 2 No. parking spaces cannot be provided within the site edged red and ii) the size of the site could not accommodate (fully) a site compound for parking, storage of materials etc.

Therefore, it is considered that, subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development raises no significant highway safety issues, promotes modes of transport other than the private car and is located in a highly sustainable location; as such the proposal complies with Local Plan policies CF6 and S1 and section 9 of the NPPF.

Impact on neighbouring residential amenity/amenity for future occupants

Bullet point ‘f’ of Para 127 of the NPPF requires a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Local Plan policy S1 also states that development should provide a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings and policy EQ6 states that development

should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and should not result in unacceptable levels of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing or other adverse amenity impacts.

The 2 No. properties potentially affected most by the proposal are 1) number 11 Fauvel Road and 2) the property opposite the south-western facing elevation of the application building as this has planning permission to convert the building to a dwelling (HPK/2015/0371).

As regards number 11 Fauvel Road, concerns were raised by the occupants themselves and the Officer as 2 No. existing windows on the north-western facing elevation of the existing building were initially proposed to be 'escape' windows...and the escape would be straight into the back yard of the occupants of number 11. However, the revised plans a) retain the existing 2 No. windows on the north-western facing elevation of the existing building as non-opening and obscure-glazed and b) provision is made elsewhere on the building for escape windows.

As regards the building associated with approved application HPK/2015/0371, this has been approved with habitable room windows on the ground and first-floors facing Fauvel Place. Regardless of whether the application of concern here is approved or not, the relationship of the resultant converted building associated with approved application HPK/2015/0371 and Fauvel Place remains as it is, i.e. vehicles and pedestrians will pass by the approved habitable room windows. Given this approved relationship it is considered that the resultant relationship with the application building if approved would not result in the amenities of the occupants of the property approved under application HPK/2015/0371 would not be significantly worsened.

In addition to the above comments, it is considered that the removal of a light industrial unit in such close proximity to residential units would be generally beneficial to the surrounding residential properties.

As regards amenities for the future occupants of the proposed dwelling, a (all-be-it small) outdoor amenity area is now provided (which was not the case with the previously refused application). As such it is considered that the previous reason for refusal relating to amenity for future occupants has been overcome.

Therefore, on balance, it is considered that the proposal does not significantly harm any existing residential amenities and the level of amenity provided for future occupants of the dwelling will be satisfactory. As such the proposal accords with the amenity tenets of Local Plan policies S1 and EQ6 and bullet point 'f' of para 127 of the NPPF.

Ecological issues

It is noted that one of the reasons for refusal of application HPK/2013/0547 was insufficient information to be able to conclude whether or not roosting bats would be harmed.

As noted above, a survey has been submitted with the current application re bats and birds and DWT are satisfied that the potential for roosting bats is low; the building does have potential for nesting birds. However, no objections are raised subject to conditions.

Therefore it is considered a) that the previous reason for refusal re insufficient information regarding bats has been overcome and b) the proposal accords with Local Plan policy EQ5 and section 15 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

The Environmental health Officer has not objected to the proposal subject to conditions re a) unexpected contamination and b) importation of soil/material. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not result in any harm to public health or amenity.

Planning balance, sustainability and recommendation

Bearing all the above matters in mind, in summary and conclusion, it is considered that: 1) in principle the proposed development is not acceptable as no marketing information has been submitted regarding the loss of the industrial unit and therefore the proposal does not accord with Local Plan policy E4; 2) however, given that the building could be converted to residential use under permitted development rights (Class PA, of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the GPDO) – AND that the prior approval of the LPA is unlikely to be required/not provided (given that the site is not in a flood-zone, would not raise any significant traffic/highway safety issues, or land contamination issues and there would be no noise issues from neighbouring land uses) – it is considered that this is a material consideration which should be afforded significant weight; 3) the design is acceptable (and indeed an improvement to the area); 4) there are no significant amenity issues (again, the removal of a light industrial unit would improve residential amenities); 5) there are no ecological or environmental health issues, and 6) there would be minor social and economic benefits resulting from the proposal. Hence, bearing all these factors in mind it is considered that the social, environmental and economic benefits of the proposal and the significant material consideration re permitted development rights weigh heavily in favour of the proposal. Although the proposal does not accord with policy E4 of the Development Plan it is considered that there are material considerations that override this. As such, it is considered that the proposal is a sustainable form of development which accords with policies S1 and S1a of the Local Plan and the concept of sustainability at the heart of the NPPF. Therefore it is recommended the application be approved, subject to appropriate conditions and informatives.

Additional comments by Jane Colley

The officer comments in respect of the loss of the employment use and amenity sections are noted. However I disagree with the recommendation.

The site is current in a commercial use whereby Policy E4 seeks to retain existing commercial uses, unless the following criteria can be demonstrated:

1. The continuation of the land or premises in industrial or business use is constrained to be extent that it is no longer suitable or commercially viable for industrial or business use as demonstrated by marketing evidence commensurate with the size and scale of development and the proposed use is compatible with neighbouring uses, or

2. An appropriate level of enabling development is required to support improvements to employment premises or supporting infrastructure. In such cases, a viability appraisal should be submitted to demonstrate that change of use or redevelopment of the site is required to fund the improvements. Mixed use proposals should not create any environmental, amenity or safety issues.

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that sufficient employment land and premises are available to support the local economy, thus reflecting the NPPF which emphasises the significant weight that should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account local business needs and wider opportunities for development. (paras 8 a) and 80). In this case, no marketing evidence has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the premises are no longer suitable or commercially viable for alternate business/industrial uses. Typically when application such as this, is made to the Council, a marketing exercise (comprising advertising on line (which the Council can assist with), advertisement boards etc), for a minimum period of 6 months, is submitted which can demonstrate compliance or otherwise with Policy E4.

Whilst it is noted that an application could be made to change the use of the building under permitted development rights (Class PA, of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the GPDO), the applicant has not submitted this form of application and therefore the fall back position is less than certain until this has process has been applied for and determined. Moreover, the Council can currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. As at March 2018, the Council could demonstrate a supply of 6.29 years. It is therefore considered that although Policy H1 of the adopted Local Plan supports the principle of a residential conversion, the current housing supply position when combined with the lack of a marketing exercise demonstrating why the premise cannot be used for alternative business/industrial uses weighs in favour of refusing the application.

Amenity considerations

Policy EQ6 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to ensure that the amenities of both existing and future residents are not undermined taking into account factors such as overlooking, the overbearing effects of development, noise and light pollution. The Councils adopted Residential Design SPD identifies that in order to protect privacy a 21m separation distance should be provided between facing windows.

Number 11 Fauvel Road is located just 5m to the west of the application site. At the present time there are two ground floor windows which look directly to towards this neighbouring property. These windows would serve a utility/bike store and a bedroom. Whilst both of these windows could be obscured glazed and fixed, thus preventing overlooking, the permanent use of the building for residential purposes would affect the amenities of this neighbour, with a noticeable and perceptible

change in the use of these rooms. Whilst it is accepted that the existing commercial uses is likely to be noticeable from the neighbours garden and ground floor windows, it is unlikely that the existing use would continue late into the evening/early morning. The permanent use of the building for residential purposes, and the use of the bedroom and the associated lighting would be more intensive and intrusive use than the existing use.

The premise opposite the south-western facing elevation of the application building is currently being converted to a residential unit pursuant to planning consent HPK/2015/0371. On the elevation facing towards the application site are two ground floor windows and three first floor window. The windows at ground floor serve a dining room and lounge, at first floor two bedrooms and a bathroom. This building is just 5.4m from the southern elevation of the application site which would be served by a total of 7 windows at ground floor, of which those serving the lounge would directly face this neighbour. Given the extremely close proximity to this neighbour, the proposals would cause directly overlooking and a loss of privacy to both parties, contrary to Policy EQ6 of the adopted Local Plan and the Councils privacy standards.

The plans also show the provision of one off road parking space to the east of the building and a bin storage area, no outdoor amenity space such as a garden or patio area would be provided. This demonstrates that the constrained size of the plot would not allow sufficient amenity space to serve future occupiers (for example to sit out) to the detriment of their amenities.

Overall it is considered that the lack of marketing information to support the conversion of the premises and significant impact on residential amenity outweighs the provision of one additional dwelling and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. Therefore despite the recommendation made by the case officer, I consider that planning consent should be refused.

Jane Colley

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Case Officer: John Williamson
Recommendation Date: 31/07/2018

X *J Colley*

Signed by: Jane Colley

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council