

# Officer delegated report - DC/23/0012/FUL

## Hazel Stub Depot Burton End Haverhill Suffolk

**Date registered:** 15 February 2023    **Expiry date:** 14 April 2023  
EoT: 14 June 2023

**Case officer:** Ed Fosker    **Recommendation:** Refuse application

**Parish:** Haverhill Town Council    **Ward:** Haverhill West

**Proposal:** Planning application - a. conversion of existing light industrial depot building (class E) to nine apartments (class C3) b. external car and bicycle parking, refuse area and landscaping

**Applicant:** Baljit Virk

### Proposal:

Planning permission is sought for the conversion of the existing light industrial depot building (class E) to nine apartments (class C3) with associated external car and bicycle parking, refuse area and landscaping.

### Site details:

The application site comprises a two-storey light industrial building (Class E) which is located in the countryside (outside of any defined settlement boundary) set behind a small cluster of residential properties which in the main are relatively large and set in spacious plots, with a small number being listed. To the southern side are dwellings and the highways, whilst to the northern and western sides are open countryside.

### Planning history:

Reference	Proposal	Status	Received date	Decision date
DC/21/0473/VAR	Planning application - retention of mixed use office and storage use (sui generis), without compliance with condition 1 of E/98/2710/P	Application Withdrawn	4 March 2021	3 August 2021

SE/10/1133	Planning Application - Retention of two storage containers contrary to conditions 2 and 6 of planning permission E/98/2710 and conditions 6 and 9 of planning permission SE/03/3642	Application Granted	26 August 2010	19 October 2010
SE/03/3642/P	Planning Application - Erection of two storey extension for B1 (Business) use (following demolition of attached and detached outbuildings)	Application Granted	11 November 2003	19 January 2004
SE/03/2230/P	Planning Application - Erection of two storey extension (following demolition of attached and detached outbuildings) as supported by letter dated 10th June 2003 clarifying use of premises	Application Refused	23 May 2003	10 July 2003
E/98/2710/P	Planning Application - Continued use of building for B1 Business Use and change of use in part to B8 Storage	Application Granted	26 August 1998	9 November 1998
E/97/1460/P	Planning Application - Change of use of building from B8 - Storage to B1 - Business Use (assembly of parts of display systems) as amended by plan received 12th May 1997 relating to site area	Application Granted	19 March 1997	12 June 1997
E/82/3050/P	Alterations to access and construction of driveway to depot	Application Granted	13 October 1982	1 December 1982
E/80/2725/P	ERECTION OF RADIO MAST	Application Granted	15 July 1980	11 September 1980
E/78/3479/P	CHANGE OF USE TO	Application	9 November	15

	STORAGE PURPOSES AND GRADING AND BLENDING OF TEA	Refused	1978	December 1978
E/75/1457/P	STORAGE OF FRESH AND PREPACKAGED FRUIT AND VEGETABLES FROM EAST ANGLIA	Application Refused	17 March 1975	19 March 1975
E/74/2545/P	CHANGE OF USE FROM APPLE STORE TO STATIONARY STORE / WAREHOUSE / DESPATCH	Application Refused	21 October 1974	7 November 1974

## **Consultations:**

### **Ward Councillor**

No ward member comments received.

### **Town Council**

The Town Council object to the loss of small affordable business units, which were built for the purpose of use by starter/set up businesses. The site is not sustainable, there is no bus service, therefore there will be a need to travel by car. There is no footpath to the site and pedestrians would have to cross the Haverhill Bypass, which is a 60mph road. The site is outside the town settlement.

### **Public Health and Housing**

No objection subject to conditions.

### **Waste Management Operations Manager**

No comments.

### **Environment Team**

#### **CONTAMINATED LAND:**

The application is supported by a Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment, undertaken by Groundsure, reference GSP-2023-2252-1 dated 14 February 2023. The report presents a summary of the history and environmental setting of the site and surrounding area together with a findings of a site walkover survey. The report presents the findings in a conceptual site model and risk assessment. The risk assessment identifies a moderate risk as a result of historical contamination. The report recommends intrusive investigations are undertaken.

The scope and the recommendations of the report are acceptable. Given that the report recommends intrusive investigations, we recommend the standard land contamination condition is attached, should planning be granted,

#### PROPOSED CONDITIONS:

Standard conditions 04G, 04H and 04I

1. No development approved by this planning permission shall commence until the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority:

i) A site investigation scheme,  
ii) The results of a site investigation based on i) and a detailed risk assessment, including a revised Conceptual Site Model (CSM),  
iii) Based on the risk assessment in ii), a remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken. The strategy shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency actions.

2. No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works as set out in the remediation strategy is submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

3. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason (for all three conditions)

To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters, future end users of the land, neighbouring land, property and ecological systems from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 174, 183, 184, Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3), Policy CS2 (Sustainable Development) of the Core Strategy and Policy DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policy.

#### AIR QUALITY/ELECTRIC VEHICLES:

Paragraph 107 of the NPPF states that 'local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.' Paragraph 112 of the NPPF states that 'applications for development should be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.'

Air Quality Planning Policy Guidance lists mitigation measures for reducing the impact of air quality and includes the provision of "infrastructure to promote modes of transport with a low impact on air quality (such as electric vehicle charging points)."

St Edmundsbury Core Strategy Policy CS2, Sustainable Development, requires the conserving and, wherever possible, enhancing of natural resources including, air quality.

Policy DM14 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document states that proposals for all new developments should minimise all emissions and ensure no deterioration to either air or water quality.

Section 3.4.2 of the Suffolk Parking Standards also has requirements for electrical vehicle charging infrastructure, including the installation of a suitable consumer unit capable of providing 7.4kW charge in all new dwellings.

Part S of the Building Regulations requires an electric vehicle charging point to be included for new dwellings where there is an associated parking space. In this case the dwellings will have associated spaces as defined.

We therefore do not require a planning condition requiring EV charging in this instance as this will be enforced by the building regulations, however, should the layout change we would request the opportunity to review the amendments to assess whether they impact the above conclusion.

### **Environment and Transport – Highways**

The Highway Authority recommends a REFUSAL of this application because it is not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in respect to safe access for all users and the promotion of sustainable transport.

- Insufficient information has been brought forward to explain how future residents will share the private access road with motorised vehicles. Furthermore, the proposed site will need to accommodate the movement of all users including children and other vulnerable people. The application must evidence how this will occur. NPPF 110.b requires that safe and suitable access is provided to the site for all users. This has not been evidenced.
- The absence of footways to access the nearest settlements along with the distances involved are likely to act as a disincentive to sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. This would particularly be the case during the wintertime, in times of darkness and inclement weather.
- The same constraints would likely discourage use of local bus services which run along Chivers Road and Burton End, to the northeast, approximately an 8-minute walk. These are separated by a Category C Road and a Category A road with no formalised footways. Residents would be required to cross a roundabout intersection which has no footways and no safe, formalised pedestrian or cyclist crossings to the nearest footway located on Cleves Road.
- In addition, it is approximately a 20/25 minute walk to Haverhill Town centre. The development has not provided evidence to promote Active Travel alternatives to motorised transport apart from the required cycles storage.
- This application does not appear to be in accordance with NPPF 104.C. Given the size and scale of the proposed development, the site appears to

be unsuitable for residential development. It has poor accessibility, and it fails to provide a well-connected development that prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, and public transport services above use of motorised transport.

### **Conservation Officer**

Conservation do not wish to comment on the proposed development on the basis the works would not affect the significance of any nearby listed buildings.

### **Ecology**

No comments received.

### **Representations:**

Representations from the occupiers of Burton End House, Hazel Stub House, Hazel Stud House, 1 Hazel Barns, Cowslip Pightle and 5 Hazel Stub cottages, raising concerns with regard to:

- o Out of character
- o Loss of value of property
- o Access
- o Highways safety
- o Loss of amenity
- o Loss of jobs
- o Overlooking
- o Not policy compliant
- o Drainage issues
- o Lack to close amenities

### **Policy:**

On 1 April 2019 Forest Heath District Council and St Edmundsbury Borough Council were replaced by a single authority, West Suffolk Council. The development plans for the previous local planning authorities were carried forward to the new council by regulation. The development plans remain in place for the new West Suffolk Council and, with the exception of the Joint Development Management Policies document (which had been adopted by both councils), set out policies for defined geographical areas within the new authority. It is therefore necessary to determine this application with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved St Edmundsbury Borough Council.

Policy DM1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy DM2 Creating Places Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness

Policy DM5 Development in the Countryside

Policy DM6 Flooding and Sustainable Drainage

Policy DM7 Sustainable Design and Construction

Policy DM11 Protected Species

Policy DM12 Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity

Policy DM13 Landscape Features

Policy DM15 Listed Buildings

Policy DM17 Conservation Areas

Policy DM22 Residential Design

Policy DM27 Housing in the Countryside

Policy DM33 Re-Use or Replacement of Buildings in the Countryside

Policy DM46 Parking Standards

Core Strategy Policy CS1 - St Edmundsbury Spatial Strategy

Core Strategy Policy CS2 - Sustainable Development

Core Strategy Policy CS3 - Design and Local Distinctiveness

Core Strategy Policy CS4 - Settlement Hierarchy and Identity

Core Strategy Policy CS7 - Sustainable Transport

Core Strategy Policy CS13 - Rural Areas

### **Other planning policy:**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in July 2021 and is a material consideration in decision making from the day of its publication. Paragraph 219 is clear however, that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework; the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework; the greater weight that may be given. The policies set out within the Joint Development Management Policies have been assessed in detail and are considered sufficiently aligned with the provision of the 2021 NPPF that full weight can be attached to them in the decision making process.

### **Officer comment:**

The main consideration in the determination of the pre application enquiry are:

- o Principle of development
- o Impact upon character and appearance of the area
- o Highways
- o Ecology
- o Other Matters

### **Principle of development**

The site falls within the countryside for planning purposes as it falls outside the Haverhill settlement boundary.

Policy DM5 states that areas designated as countryside will be protected from unsustainable development. New residential development would only be considered in relation DM27.

Policy DM27 states:

Proposals for new dwellings will be permitted in the countryside subject to satisfying the following criteria:

- a. the development is within a closely knit 'cluster' of 10 or more existing dwellings adjacent to or fronting an existing highway;
- b. the scale of development consists of infilling a small undeveloped plot by one dwelling or a pair of semi-detached dwellings commensurate with the scale and character of existing dwellings within an otherwise continuous built-up frontage. Permission will not be granted where a proposal harms or undermines a visually important gap that contributes to the character and distinctiveness of the rural scene, or where development would have an adverse impact on the environment or highway safety.

Note: A small undeveloped plot is one which could be filled by one detached or a pair of semi-detached dwellings where the plot sizes and spacing between dwellings is similar to adjacent properties and thereby respects the rural character and street scene of the locality.

It is quite clear that this site is not within a closely knit cluster of 10 or more dwellings. It would also not consist of the infilling of a small undeveloped plot within an otherwise continuous built up frontage. The principle of residential development on the site would not therefore be supported as a matter of principle as it would be contrary to policies DM5 and DM27.

Policy DM33 offers some scope for the replacement of buildings in the countryside. However, it also explains that buildings which are remote, or which are otherwise incapable of adaptation or reuse will not be considered favourably for replacement. Furthermore, the supporting text to DM33 also makes it clear that replacement would only ordinarily be permitted where the replacement dwelling was for employment purposes, and even then only in 'exceptional' circumstances.

Taken together it is clear that little or in fact no support for the proposal can be given to the proposal when assessed against the current provisions of the Local Plan.



Noting that the current use of the site is suggested as being light industrial this would appear to fall within the provisions now of Use Class E. This might in ordinary circumstances mean that there is scope to change the use of the building under permitted development rules, for example to dwellings. However, condition two of planning permission SE/03/3642/P restricts the use of the premises to B1 purposes only, and this would therefore prevent the use of the building for residential purposes under permitted development. In any event, this proposal is not for the change of use of the building.

Planning law requires decisions to be taken in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, wider material considerations might include national planning policy.

In this regard, there are two provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which are of some relevance. Firstly, paragraph 80 of the NPPF sets out the provisions that must apply in order to justify the approval of 'isolated' dwellings in the countryside. In this case officers are not however satisfied that this location is isolated, being located away from the settlement boundary of Haverhill but otherwise on a currently developed site immediately adjoining existing dwellings. On balance, it is not considered that the provisions of Para. 80 can be given any weight therefore.

Secondly, is the fact that the site is brownfield land. The reuse of such is encouraged within the NPPF, although not to the exclusion of adopted local policy. Furthermore, and crucially, the support offered within the NPPF relating to the reuse of brownfield land, relates principally and specifically to 'land within settlements'. On this basis, any weight that could be attached to the brownfield status of the land is modest, and certainly not of sufficient weight to overcome the identified policy harm.

The other factor to consider would be whether any weight could be attached to the removal of the current use, such that, as a matter of planning balance, this outweighed the conflict with policy otherwise. Whilst there might be some modest benefit arising as a result of the cessation of the current use officers are not convinced that the current use has created such overwhelming environmental impacts or problems, such that this would justify setting aside the provisions of the Development Plan.

### **Impact on character and appearance of the area**

Policy DM2 requires all new developments to recognise and address key features, characteristics and local distinctiveness and maintain and create a sense of place. Policy DM2 also seeks to prevent the loss of gardens which contribute to the character and St Edmundsbury Core Strategy policy CS3 requires all new development to be designed to a high quality and reinforce local distinctiveness. Design that does not demonstrate it has regard to local context and fails to enhance the character, appearance and environmental quality of an area will not be acceptable.

The site is set behind a small cluster of residential properties which in the main are relatively large and set in spacious plots, a small number are listed and

whilst the conservation officer raises no object to the impact on the setting of these properties the introduction of a somewhat utilitarian residential scheme adjoining the open countryside does not follow the overall grain of the development of the area and would erode the distinctive, spacious character of the rural locality regardless of scale and positioning. The proposed development would therefore lead to material harm to the open countryside, and is considered to be not in accordance with DM2.

The proposed dwellings would lead to an erosion of the rural character of the area and lead to an urbanising effect on the area. The inclusion of poorly designed residential development in this location is considered to harm the rural character which currently exists. Therefore, again the development is not in accordance with DM2 or CS3.

### **Impacts on amenity**

Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document requires development to take mitigation measures into account to not adversely affect the amenities of adjacent areas by reason of noise, smell, vibration, overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light, other pollution (including light pollution), or volume or type of vehicular activity generated.

Whilst the concerns of neighbours are noted the proposed dwellings would be located in a position that would have sufficient distance from neighbouring amenity that the development will not lead to material harm to neighbouring amenity over and above the current use to an extent that could warrant refusal for this reason alone.

### **Highway matters**

The NPPF provides that applications for planning permission should, where it is possible to do so, enable the safe use of public highways for all stakeholders. The extent to which this is required will of course be dependent upon and commensurate to the scale of development proposed.

Policy DM2 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015) also requires proposals to maintain or enhance the safety of the highway network.

Suffolk County Council as Highway Authority have commented that insufficient information has been brought provided with the application to explain how future residents will share the private access road with motorised vehicles.

Furthermore, the proposed site will need to accommodate the movement of all users including children and other vulnerable people. The application has not evidenced how this will occur. NPPF 110.b requires that safe and suitable access is provided to the site for all users. This has not been evidenced.

The absence of footways to access the nearest settlements along with the distances involved are likely to act as a disincentive to sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. This would particularly be the case during the wintertime, in times of darkness and inclement weather.

The same constraints would likely discourage use of local bus services which run along Chivers Road and Burton End, to the northeast, approximately an 8-minute walk. These are separated by a Category C Road and a Category A road with no formalised footways. Residents would be required to cross a roundabout intersection which has no footways and no safe, formalised pedestrian or cyclist crossings to the nearest footway located on Cleves Road.

In addition, it is approximately a 20/25-minute walk to Haverhill Town centre. The development has not provided evidence to promote Active Travel alternatives to motorised transport apart from the required cycles storage.

The agent has been given the opportunity to try and address some of these concerns, however no further information has been received.

The application is not considered to be in accordance with NPPF 104.C. Given the size and scale of the proposed development, the site appears to be unsuitable for residential development. It has poor accessibility, and it fails to provide a well-connected development that prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, and public transport services above use of motorised transport.

## **Ecology**

As required by the National Planning Policy Framework the Local Planning Authority have a duty to consider the conservation of biodiversity and to ensure that valued landscapes or sites of biodiversity are protected when determining planning applications. At a local level, this is exhibited through policies CS2, DM10, DM11 and DM12.

The absence of any biodiversity information does not allow the LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006 as updated by the Environment Act 2021. The site contains an existing building of some age, located generally within a rural area, where the potential for it to provide suitable habitat cannot be easily discounted.

## **Other matters**

### **Air Quality**

Section 3.4.2 of the Suffolk Guidance for Parking states that "Access to charging points should be made available in every residential dwelling." Policy DM2(1) and DM46 seek to ensure compliance with the parking standards and to promote more sustainable forms of transport. The NPPF at para 106 seeks to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles and para 112 (d) states 'Within this context, applications for development should be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.' On this basis a condition could be attached to any consent to secure a vehicle charging point for the new dwellings.

### **Sustainable Construction**

DM7 states (inter alia) proposals for new residential development will be required to demonstrate that appropriate water efficiency measures will be employed. No specific reference has been made in regard to water consumption. However, a condition could ensure that either water consumption is no more than 110 litres per day (including external water use), or no water fittings exceeds the values set out in table 1 of policy DM7.

### **Conclusion:**

The site is located within the countryside where policies DM5 and DM27 allow for small scale residential development of small undeveloped infill plots. The proposal in this case is not considered to meet the criteria of policy DM5, it does not represent infill development within an otherwise continuous built-up frontage and is not within a closely knit cluster of dwellings.

Being contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan there is a presumption against this development. The proposal would make a marginal contribution to the local economy including the provision of construction jobs and some additional local spend. The new dwellings would have a social role by making a very limited contribution to housing supply. This can only be attributed limited weight in favour of the proposal.

The proposal is not considered to be in accordance with NPPF 104.C. Given the size and scale of the proposed development, the site is considered to be unsuitable for residential development. It has poor accessibility, and it fails to provide a well-connected development that prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists, and public transport services above use of motorised transport.

The absence of any biodiversity information does not allow the LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006 as updated by the Environment Act 2021.

The proposal is considered to lead to material harm to the surrounding rural character of the area. There are no material considerations which indicate the planning application should be determined other than in accordance with the Development Plan, the Council can demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and the relevant policies are considered to be broadly consistent with the NPPF. Therefore, full weight can be attached to the relevant local plan policies.

### **Recommendation:**

It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason/s:

1. The application falls outside any settlement boundary. The site is therefore in the countryside in planning policy terms where housing development is not generally acceptable. There are exceptions to allow for housing development in the countryside as set out under DM5, DM26, DM27 and DM29 (affordable, rural workers dwellings, replacement dwellings and infill where there is a cluster of 10 or more existing dwellings), but this proposal does not satisfy any of these exceptions.

It is quite clear that this site is not within a closely knit cluster of 10 or more dwellings. It would also not consist of the infilling of a small undeveloped plot within an otherwise continuous built up frontage. The principle of residential development on the site would not therefore be supported as a matter of principle as it would be contrary to policies DM5 and DM27.

The site is also not well connected to services and facilities by public footpaths and cycle routes or public transport. Therefore, occupiers of the proposed dwelling are likely to frequently rely on the private car to access services and facilities which has negative environmental and social effects. Therefore, the application site is in an unsustainable location and deemed unsuitable for residential development, contrary to the aims of the NPPF as a whole and particularly paragraph 80, which seeks to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside.

Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to explain how future residents will share the private access road with motorised vehicles. Furthermore, the proposed site will need to accommodate the movement of all users including children and other vulnerable people. The application has not evidenced how this will occur. NPPF 110.b requires that safe and suitable access is provided to the site for all users. This has not been evidenced.

The absence of footways to access the nearest settlements along with the distances involved are likely to act as a disincentive to sustainable modes of travel including walking and cycling. This would particularly be the case during the wintertime, in times of darkness and inclement weather.

The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policies DM5 and DM27 of the Joint Development Management Policies Local Plan and the NPPF. There are no material considerations in this case to indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

2. Policy DM2 requires all new developments to recognise and address key features, characteristics and local distinctiveness and maintain and create a sense of place. Policy DM2 also seeks to prevent the loss of gardens which contribute to the character and St Edmundsbury Core Strategy policy CS3 requires all new development to be designed to a high quality and reinforce local distinctiveness. Design that does not demonstrate it has regard to local context and fails to enhance the character, appearance and environmental quality of an area will not be acceptable.

The site is set behind a small cluster of residential properties which in the main are relatively large and set in spacious plots, a small number are listed and whilst the conservation officer raises no object to the impact on the setting of these properties the introduction of a somewhat utilitarian residential scheme adjoining the open countryside does not follow the overall grain of the development of the area and would erode the distinctive, spacious character of the rural locality regardless of scale and positioning. The proposed development would therefore lead to material harm to the open countryside, and is considered to be not in accordance with DM2.

The proposed dwellings would lead to an erosion of the rural character of the area and lead to an urbanising effect on the area. The inclusion of poorly designed residential development in this location is considered to harm the rural character which currently exists. Therefore, the development is not in accordance with DM2 or CS3.

3. As required by the National Planning Policy Framework the Local Planning Authority have a duty to consider the conservation of biodiversity and to ensure that valued landscapes or sites of biodiversity are protected when determining planning applications. At a local level, this is exhibited through policies CS2, DM10, DM11 and DM12.

No ecological documents have been submitted as part of this application. Preliminary Ecological Appraisal is necessary, prior to determination, as paragraph 99 of the ODPM Circular 2005 highlights that: "It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision."

Additionally, no biodiversity enhancement measures are identified in the documents provided. The absence of any biodiversity information does not allow the LPA to demonstrate its compliance with its statutory duties including its biodiversity duty under s40 NERC Act 2006 as updated by the Environment Act 2021. The lack of this information is deemed to represent a conflict with policy DM11 and DM12 and the advice contained within the NPPF.

#### **Informatives:**

- 1 When determining planning applications The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires Local Planning Authorities to explain how, in dealing with the application they have worked with the applicant to resolve any problems or issues arising. In this case the Local Planning Authority attempted to discuss its concerns with the applicant but was not able to secure the necessary improvements to the scheme that may have enabled the proposals to be approved.

#### **Documents:**

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online.

Case officer:	Ed Fosker	Date: 13 <sup>th</sup> June 2023
Authorising officer:	Dave Beighton	Date: 13 June 2023