

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0134
Valid 25/04/2024

VICTORY HALL
WHITEHOUGH HEAD LANE
WHITEHOUGH

REMOVAL OF EXISTING
RAMPED ACCESS AND
CREATION OF IMPROVED
ACCESSIBILITY ACCESS,
INTEGRATED WITH
EXTERNAL ACCESSIBLE WC

(FULL - MINOR)

MAIN ISSUES

- Design & Conservation
- Flood Risk
- Trees
- Amenity

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application relates to Victory Hall, a detached building located at the junction of Whitehough Head Lane and the recently constructed Forge Manor housing development. The site lies at the fringes of the hamlet of Whitehough and the village of Chinley, outside of the built-up area boundary, in the open countryside and within the Chinley Conservation Area. The site is also situated within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

The building is understood to date from the early 20th Century and has an attractive appearance constructed of stone which whilst not listed, is protected by virtue of the fact it is located within the Conservation Area, and has for a considerable period of time, functioned as a meeting space for the local Scout Group and is also used as a Polling Station for local and general elections.

The front elevation faces the public highway is characterised by an existing ramp constructed on a stone base bounded by metal railings, providing access to the main entrance.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning permission for the removal of the existing ramped access and the construction of an improved access, in order to improve accessibility to the Hall and undercroft and lower ground floor level, eliminating the step up at the top of the existing ramp.

The aspects of development can be summarised as follows:

- *Removing existing ramp up to the main Hall*

- *Removing existing and replacement of the new ramp down to the Undercroft and activity room*
- *Construction of a new ramped access to the East of the building*
- *New steps at the front of the building*
- *A 1500mm wide platform allowing suitable room for manoeuvring wheelchairs outside the main entrance*
- *A new accessible W/C at the lower ground level and a storage cupboard under the platform above*

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan taking into consideration any material considerations relevant to the determination of the application.

The Local Development Plan for this site comprises the High Peak Local Plan (2016). Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance documents and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are also material considerations in determining applications.

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S1 Sustainable Development Principles
 S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
 EQ3 Rural Development
 EQ6 Design and Place Making
 EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
 EQ9 Trees Woodland and Hedgerows
 EQ11 Flood Risk

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

Achieving Sustainable Development	Chapter 2
Promoting Healthy and Sustainable Communities	Chapter 8
Achieving Well Designed and Beautiful Places	Chapter 12
Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change and Flooding	Chapter 14
Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment	Chapter 16

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0001/2539	Storage area in existing building
HPK/0001/4412	Proposed Storage Hut (Approved)
HPK/0002/0585	Extension to Scout Headquarters (Approved 22/02/1984)

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 5th July 2024

Neighbour consultation period ends: 30th May 2024

Press Advert: 6th June 2024

Public Comments

6no. letters of support have been received in connection with this application, with grounds for support summarised as follows:

- Lack of wheelchair access denies local children the opportunity to take place in local community groups and activities
- Enhancement of a local community asset

No formal objections have been received however representations have been made by Peak Tree Consultancy Ltd on behalf of residents of a neighbouring property which raises concerns/objections in connection with protected and mature trees that exist on the boundary and potential impacts to those resulting from the proposed development.

The representation confirms that the concerns/objections can be overcome providing appropriate conditions are applied to any decision notice.

Chinley Buxworth and Brownside Parish Council Comments

No comments received

Historic England

No comments to make

HPBC Conservation Officer

No Objections

HPBC Tree Officer

I have the following comments on this application, seeking planning permission for removal of existing ramped access to the hall and creation of a new accessible ramped access, etc.

The applicant has not submitted any tree survey/arboricultural impact assessment report with the application. There are no significant trees within the application site which are likely to be affected by the proposed development. There are trees protected by TPO and also some non-TPO trees, close to/adjacent to the application site boundary and situated within the curtilage of the neighbouring residential

property (Spring Meadow) to the south; these trees must be taken into account in determining the application. A copy of TPO No. 273 is attached for reference. Both the application site and Spring Meadow are located within the Chinley Conservation Area.

I previously suggested that the applicant should be requested to provide a tree report to support the application, following contact from the owners of Spring Meadow expressing concerns about the potential impact of the proposed development on their trees. The TPO plan indicates that the stem-centre position of tree T6 (a Beech, and the closest TPO tree to the application site) is within approximately 4m of the boundary, and this would certainly raise the prospect of its default circular Root Protection Area (RPA – derived in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations) extending into the site if the stem is of diameter c.330mm or more. Hence my initial advice to request submission of a tree report.

However, I have now visited the application site, from where clear enough views of the various relevant trees at Spring Meadow are available to enable realistic, erring-on-the-side-of-caution estimates of tree stem diameters and positions to be made, and gain better understanding of the existing/proposed ground levels/structures/development etc, in order to provide sufficient information to take account of the potential impact on the various trees (TPO and non-TPO) and determine the application without after all requiring submission of a formal tree survey/assessment report in this instance.

Furthermore, the owners of Spring Meadow have in the meantime engaged their own arboricultural consultant to survey their trees and provide advice in support of their own objection to the application, and this enables us to make informed assessment on likely tree impacts with even greater confidence.

Within the application site, the only tree feature of notable relevance with regard to the proposed development is a large Ivy-clad stump immediately adjacent to the existing part-retaining wall running approximately east-west from the rear (eastern-most) corner of the Hall. Google Streetview images dated June 2023 prior to felling show this to have been a large mature Ash notably declining due to Ash Dieback Disease; its removal would have been advisable and appropriate in the interests of the safety of the Victory Hall, its occupiers/users, adjacent property and its occupiers.

In fact TPO Beech tree T6 is situated approximately 8.5m from the site boundary and with a stem diameter of 480mm (as noted by Peak Tree Consultancy on behalf of the owners of Spring Meadow) its RPA of radius 5.76m does not extend into the application site, and this tree can for practical purposes be regarded as unaffected by the proposed development. The other TPO trees are even further away, and are similarly unaffected.

Between T6 and the application site boundary are 5 Holly trees noted by Peak Tree Consultancy. The default BS 5837 circular RPAs of T1, T2 and T3 are shown to extend into the application site in the location of the proposed new ramped access. The ramp is shown to be supported on intermittent posts, and within any combined

of these RPAs of adjacent trees there are 6 posts shown. Of these, 2 are shown to be supported on top of a new retaining wall alongside a new down-sloping path leading to the Victory Hall undercroft; however, within any RPA the relevant length of new retaining wall is located virtually exactly on the position of an existing retaining wall around the undercroft entrance door, and it is considered that this new retaining wall and the 2 ramp posts supported off it will have no significant impact on tree roots.

This leaves 4 proposed support posts to consider.

Of further and significant relevance to this, trees T1, T2 and T3 are all situated behind (south of) the east-west partly retaining wall mentioned above. It may be assumed that this wall is that referred to from points C to D in the conveyance and trust deed extract submitted by Peak Tree Consultancy on behalf of the neighbours, and reasonably further assumed that this wall was indeed constructed within 12 months of the deed date (December 1947) making the wall some 75 years old. It appears unlikely from their size/form that the Holly trees T1, T2 and T3 are older than the wall, and therefore the existing presence of the wall is likely to have prevented or greatly restricted growth and development of roots from these trees into the application site (i.e. the area beneath the existing container to be removed and around the Ash stump – where the 4 support posts under consideration are proposed). Even if any of these 3 trees were present prior to the wall being built, they would have been very young/small trees at that time and construction of the wall would have been very likely to have cut any roots then extending into the current application site and also likely to have prevented/restricted any new root growth in this direction.

On this basis, I consider it unlikely that the installation of these 4 post supports will have significant harmful impact on these early-mature non-TPO Holly trees, and I therefore do not object to this application. Nevertheless I consider that it would be an appropriate precaution to impose a condition in the event of planning permission being granted requiring submission and approval (prior to commencement) and subsequent implementation of an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) setting out details of construction design, specification and working methods for the installation of the post supports within the BS 5837 default circular RPAs to demonstrate how any harmful impact on roots of adjacent trees would be avoided, minimised and/or mitigated. The AMS should also address the removal of the Ash stump in view of its position immediately adjacent to the wall behind to demonstrate avoidance of damage to this feature (a point of concern also raised by/on behalf of the owners of Spring Meadow).

There may be a reasonable need, in the event of this application being approved, to carry out very minor trimming of the closest Holly trees where they overhang the application site in order to accommodate construction of the proposed new access ramp, and also to maintain on-going pedestrian clearance over the ramp in order to avoid obstruction/scratching/other injury to ramp users. This would literally comprise trimming projecting/hanging ends of very small diameter lower twiggy growth back to a line level with the site boundary, and this would have no significant adverse effect on the condition or amenity value of the trees, nor realistically on their screening function. I have no objection to such minor trimming. Notwithstanding the location

and consequential protected status of these trees within the Conservation Area, any such trimming directly required to implement development which has the benefit of full planning permission is automatically authorised by the planning permission which overrides and dispenses with the otherwise normal requirement to submit formal Conservation Area tree work notification to the local planning authority.

In conclusion, I have no objection to this application subject to the following condition being imposed in the event that planning permission is granted:

1. Before the commencement of development (including any demolition, site clearance, site stripping, site establishment, or formation/improvement of temporary/permanent access) a comprehensive Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, addressing any element of the development hereby approved (including its construction and any associated activity) within the Root Protection Area (as normally derived in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 *Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations*) of any tree located within or adjacent to the application site or affecting above-ground parts of such trees. Such an AMS shall demonstrate how harm to existing trees on and adjacent to the application site shall be avoided, minimised and/or mitigated, and shall in particular include full details of all relevant design, construction specifications, working methods for construction operations and related site activity, and any arboricultural management operations, in connection with the implementation of the development hereby approved, in relation to:
 - Removal of the existing container as indicated on the approved plans
 - Removal of the existing ramped path and associated retaining wall leading down to the undercroft entrance of Victory Hall
 - Removal of the existing tree stump as indicated on the approved plans, with particular reference to avoidance of damage to the existing adjacent stone wall to be retained
 - Excavation for the proposed ramped path leading down to the undercroft, along with construction of this path and any associated new retaining structure
 - Installation of post supports for the proposed new ramped access structure leading to the upper ground floor
 - Any accommodation tree works directly required in order to allow implementation of the approved development
 - Any temporary or permanent tree protection measures proposed to ensure successful implementation of the AMS

The development hereby approved shall be implemented in strict and full accordance with the AMS.

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No Objections

Lead Local Flooding Authority

No comments received at time of writing

High Peak Access

The proposed improvements to the existing ramped access to building are welcomed. However we would expect the improvements to comply with current standards outlined in BS 8300, 'Design of Buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people'. Also Building Regulations, Part M.

The proposed ramp shows gradients of 1 in 8.5 on three sections. This is above the maximum gradients in BS 8300. Maximum gradients are 1 in 12 for ramps not exceeding 2m and 1 in 14 for ramps up to 4m in length.

It is not clear why these gradients cannot be achieved with any new proposals. The Design and Access Statement provided gives context to the proposals and refers to the impact of a ramp that would meet the requirements set out above. It suggests that the ramp would dominate the building and site. The gradients proposed do however, provide an unacceptable challenge to independent wheelchair users and would detract from the whole purpose of ramped access. If it is technically possible to provide a ramp that complies with BS 8300 then this should be done.

The ramp would also be more challenging for users in wet conditions. The surfacing material needs to be non-slip. It would appear that the ramp has not been provided with a handrail at a lower level that can be used by independent wheelchair users to assist in ascending and descending the ramp. BS8300 recommends that a ramp in public use and also used by children should be fitted with a lower handrail at 600mm above the ramp surface.

We also note that the Design and Access Statement refers to the provision of an accessible toilet in the Hall. We would encourage this provision although note that it is not part of the application.

We have not commented on the design of surfaces, handrails and associated landings or steps proposed as no detailed drawings or specifications have been provided. Once again these should comply with BS 8300. Accessible parking for wheelchair users should also be provided, with suitable level access to the ramp. We hope that these comments assist and would be pleased to discuss them further if this would help

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application seeks full planning permission for alterations to an existing building that functions primarily as a community space, in order to facilitate an improved access for disabled users.

The proposal fully supports the aims of Chapter 8 of the NPPF which contains policies that require policies and decisions to achieve healthy inclusive and safe places which promote social interaction, and provides social and recreational activities by planning positively for the provision and use shared spaces.

The site is located outside of the built-up area boundary in the open countryside, and within the Chinley Conservation Area and Flood Zones 2 and 3, and as such, the application must demonstrate compliance with Local Plan (LP) Policies EQ3, EQ7 and EQ11, in order to be supported as a matter of principle.

Design and Conservation

Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that with respect to any buildings or land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

LP Policy S1 sets out a number of sustainability principles which all new development proposals should incorporate in order to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and to protect, and where possible enhance the environment.

LP Policy EQ3 refers to rural development proposals which lie outside of the defined built-up area boundaries and seeks to ensure that new development is strictly controlled in order to protect the landscape's intrinsic character and distinctiveness. The policy supports extensions and alterations to existing buildings provided they are subsidiary to the building and do not have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape.

LP Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed to respect and contribute positively to the character, identity and context of High Peak's townscapes, having regard to matters of scale, height, density, layout, appearance and materials.

LP Policy EQ7 has regard to the Built and Historic Environment. It states that the Council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This will take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and will ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment.

Chapter 12 of the NPPF contain national policies aimed at creating well designed and beautiful places. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states amongst other things that decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; and are sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Chapter 16 of the NPPF contains the relevant restrictive national planning policies that aims to conserve and enhance the historic environment, underpinned by Sections 66 and 72 of the Act 1990.

Paragraphs 205-209 of the NPPF sets out how a local planning authority should assess the significance of a heritage asset and the potential impact of a development proposal upon that asset. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The site contains an existing building which has a traditional attractive appearance, reflecting the vernacular of the High Peak, with walls constructed in stone, a slate tiled roof, with other traditional architectural finishes. The building lies within a prominent location within the street scene, in the open countryside and within the Chinley Conservation Area, and therefore any proposed extensions or alterations must be handled in a sensitive manner.

The proposed access aims to introduce a ramp which is compliant with modern standards, and to mitigate existing step access at the entrance to the Hall. The existing ramp, which is considered to be rather unsympathetic, is to be replaced with a ramp that has an additional 200mm height to the total lift, built on stone platform area, with steps and landing over an accessible WC and storage.

The walling would be finished in gritstone, compatible with the parent building, supplemented by gritstone steps, flagged landing, copings and a wrought iron handrail.

The plans and elevations present a scheme which is clearly subordinate and secondary to the parent building by virtue of its scale, height and mass. When taking account of the fact that an existing ramp with balustrades is in situ, it is considered reasonable to replace it with an access of a similar nature, providing that it respects and preserves the rural landscape character and the character and appearance of the building and wider setting of the Conservation Area,

Given the site's location and relationship with existing residential development, and the fact that a similar aspect of development is currently in situ, it is judged that the replacement with a similar access, albeit slightly larger, would not be detrimental to the rural landscape character, and, having regard to the careful choice of materials and that the Conservation Officer has no objection to these proposals, it is judged that the proposed development preserves the character and appearance of the building and wider setting of the Conservation Area.

In light of comments received from High Peak Access, Officers sought to explore an alternative scheme that fully aligns with their requirements. However, upon receipt of such plans, it is apparent that if the design desirable to High Peak Access were to be implemented, this would result in harm to the character and appearance of both the building and the wider setting of the Conservation Area. The alternatives are explored and described in detail within the 'Other Matters' section.

As such, an appropriate balance has to be struck between the desirability of making the historic building accessible for all users, and preserving the attractive traditional character of the heritage asset.

In light of the above, it is concluded that the application complies with LP Policies S1, EQ3, EQ6 and EQ7, and relevant policies relating to design under Chapter 12 of the NPPF, and relevant restrictive policies relating to heritage conservation contained under Chapter 16 of the NPPF, the latter underpinned by Section 72 of the Act 1990.

Flood Risk

LP Policy EQ11 refers to Flood Risk Management and requires all applications to demonstrate that the proposed development will not give rise to any unacceptable increase in flood risk either onsite or elsewhere in the Borough. Chapter 14 of the NPPF contains the relevant national planning policies aimed at meeting the challenge of climate change which includes flood risk.

The accompanying Design and Access Statement contains a section on Flood Risk which confirms that the nature of proposed development requires the application to comply with Environment Agency Standing Advice.

The levels in relation to Ordnance Datum (height above average sea level) are marked on the plans, which confirms that no floor level is any lower than the existing levels. It is stated that the W/C will be tanked in order to reduce water penetration from the ground, with internal finishes and construction implemented in such a way that if flooding does occur, it does not damage the structure.

Whilst no comments have been received from the LLFA, it is considered that appropriate measures have been taken to ensure that the proposed development will not give rise to any increase in flood risk, in accordance with standing advice published by the Environment Agency, and LP Policy EQ11 and relevant paragraphs under Chapter 14 of the NPPF.

Trees

LP Policy EQ9 relates specifically to trees, woodland and hedgerows, and requires that existing woodlands, healthy mature trees and hedgerows are retained and integrated within a proposed development unless the need for, and benefits of, the development clearly outweigh their loss.

A number of mature trees are identified to be located close to the southern boundary of the site, with trees located within the neighbouring residential plot covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). In any event, all trees within a Conservation Area are protected, and as such any development proposal must be handled in a sensitive manner that ensures that trees will be protected.

A detailed representation prepared by Peak Tree Consultancy Ltd on behalf of the occupiers of the neighbouring property Spring Meadow has been received, which identifies aspects of works associated with the development which have the potential to adversely impact trees within close proximity of the site.

In reviewing this submission, the Council's Tree Officer has provided a detailed and comprehensive response, concluding that subject to an appropriately worded planning condition that requires an Arboricultural Method Statement to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development.

Having regard to these comments, it is concluded that subject to compliance with this condition, there would be no harm arising from the proposed development, in accordance with LP Policy EQ9.

Amenity

LP Policy EQ6 requires all new development to have a satisfactory relationship with existing land and buildings and protects the amenity of the area, which includes residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Aspects of residential amenity include impacts such as a loss of sunlight, overshadowing and overbearing impacts, loss of outlook, and loss of privacy.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that planning should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The site shares its southern boundary with the large domestic curtilage associated with the detached property known as Spring Meadow, the boundary characterised by mature trees and dense vegetation.

Whilst the proposed ramp would be situated in an elevated position close to this boundary, it is transient in nature as an access point, and is not to be used as a habitable space. Notwithstanding the significant distance (40m) separating the boundary and the property, and the nature of boundary treatment, it is considered that the proposed ramp would not give rise to any harm to neighbouring residential amenity, in accordance with LP Policy EQ6 and paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

Other Matters

Equalities Act

Local planning authorities, like other public bodies, are subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) duty in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010

A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

In assessing this application, Officers have fully acknowledged the comments received by High Peak Access, and the need to ensure that all users of the building are considered equally and without prejudice.

Officers are required to consider the duties of the LPA under the Equality Act, alongside their duties under the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

In considering this application against both pieces of legislation presented above, the applicant was asked to submit an alternative scheme that aligns with the desirable dimensions set out by High Peak Access. A Plan was duly submitted (Ref: 'Alternative Ramp Layouts as Proposed SP-CSH01 SK/02).

An analysis of the alternative schemes shows one with a 1:12 gradient which has a width double of that proposed with two additional legs. Not only would this dominate and be disproportionate to Victory Hall but this would also result in the entrance being further away from the pedestrian gate on Forge Road.

Another alternative shows a ramp which achieves a 1:20 gradient, which, whilst close to the gate, is even bigger still and would therefore also dominate and be disproportionate to Victory Hall.

Whilst the proposals are (only slightly) below the BS:8300 guidelines and Part M of the Building Regulations, it is crucial to strike the appropriate balance between the desirability of enhancing the access to the building for all users without discrimination or prejudice, and preserving the character and appearance of the historic asset.

On this occasion, as a matter of planning judgement it is considered that the scheme presented to the Council achieves this balance between accessibility and preserving the heritage asset and is, on balance, acceptable.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

LP Policy S1a reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking, this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or, where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission, unless:

- the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- 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.

The application seeks to replace an existing access ramp serving Victory Hall, an historic attractive building within the Chinley Conservation Area which facilitates community activities including the local Scout Group and as a Polling Station, with an

enhanced access that complies with modern building standards and regulations, improving the accessibility to the building more disabled users.

The proposed development fully supports the aims and objectives of relevant paragraphs contained under Chapter 8 of the NPPF, with regards to promoting healthy and sustainable communities. Significant weight is attributed to the public benefit of providing more inclusive access to a community building.

The site lies outside of the built-up area boundary of town of Chinley, in the open countryside, within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and within the Chinley Conservation Area.

A detailed assessment of the application, taking account of all relevant material considerations including representations made on behalf of neighbouring properties, has found that the proposed extensions and alterations, would, subject to compliance with relevant planning conditions, preserve the character and appearance of the rural landscape, the existing building and wider setting of the Conservation Area, and would not give rise to any increase in flood risk or harm to established trees either within or within close proximity to the site, in accordance with LP Policies S1, EQ3, EQ6, EQ7, EQ9 and EQ11, and relevant policies contained under Chapters 12, 14 and 16 of the NPPF, the latter underpinned by Section 72 of the Act 1990.

The Council have fully considered their duties put upon them by the Equality Act 2010 and balanced these duties against their duty to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the historic asset under Section 72 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

In light of the above the application is considered to constitute a sustainable form of development and in line with Paragraph 11 of the NPPF is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Approve with Conditions

Case Officer: James Stannard

Recommendation Date: 9th September 2024

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council