

APPLICATION NO: 15/02269/FUL		OFFICER: Mrs Emma Pickernell	
DATE REGISTERED: 30th December 2015		DATE OF EXPIRY: 30th March 2016	
WARD: All Saints		PARISH:	
APPLICANT:	Mr Paul Haskins		
AGENT:	SF Planning Limited		
LOCATION:	83 Hewlett Road, Cheltenham		
PROPOSAL:	Alterations and extensions to the building and conversion to provide 9 additional flats.		

RECOMMENDATION: Permit



1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application site is a public house which was most recently known as The Maple Leaf which is now closed. It is located on the corner of Hewlett Road and Duke Street within the Fairview and All Saints Character Area of the Central Conservation Area. The character area appraisal identifies the building as a positive building within the conservation area.
- 1.2 The site is adjacent to the Hewlett Road neighbourhood Centre with the neighbouring property being a café fronting Hewlett Road. To the rear of the site are the terraced houses of Duke Street. The area is characterised by a mixture of building types fronting Hewlett Road with traditional terraced housing in the side streets.
- 1.3 This application proposes the change of use of the building from public house (use class A4) to residential (use class C3). There is a flat within the building at present and the proposal would create a total of 10 flats, hence an increase of 9. The proposal includes an extension at second floor level, over the part of the building which presently has a parapet roof. The extension would project this parapet upwards by a storey. Further alterations to the existing building comprise the following:
- Installation of doors to a new bin store on the Duke Street elevation
 - Two new front doors on to the Duke Street elevation
 - Opening up of blind windows on the Duke Street elevation and insertion of two new windows on the same elevation
 - The raised bar area would be demolished to create a patio area for 3 of the ground floor flats.
 - An additional window would be inserted in the inward looking wall of the rear wing and roof lights would be installed within the roof slope of the bedroom of flat 8.
- 1.4 The resultant accommodation comprises:
- Ground Floor: 3 x 1 bedroom flats, 1 x 2 bedroom flat, bin storage and bike storage
- First Floor: 1 x studio apartment, 3 x 1 bedroom flat
- Second Floor: 1 x 1 bedroom flat, 1 x 2 bedroom flat.
- 1.5 The plans have been amended since the original submission of the application. The amendments comprise the reduction in the size of the second floor extension to ensure that it extends only over the current parapet area and not over the existing pitched roof rear range. This has resulted in the loss of one studio apartment from the scheme. The bin storage arrangements have also been amended.
- 1.6 The application is before committee at the request of Cllr Steve Jordan.

2. CONSTRAINTS AND RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Constraints:

Conservation Area

Relevant Planning History:

15/01035/PREAPP 28th July 2015 CLO

Proposed first floor external terrace and installation of new sliding folding doors to create cafe style open on the ground floor

81/00367/PF 27th August 1981 PER

The New Inn Hewlett Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire - Alterations To Public House Including Blocking-Up Of Existing External Door

94/00010/PF 17th February 1994 PER

The Pump And Optic Public House - Alterations To Existing Public House Extending Trading Area And Forming New Catering Kitchen And New Access To Function Room (In Accordance With Revised Plans)

94/00608/AI 25th August 1994 PER

Various Illuminated Signs

3. POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Adopted Local Plan Policies

CP 3 Sustainable environment
CP 4 Safe and sustainable living
CP 7 Design
RC 1 Existing community facilities
RC 6 Play space in residential development
TP 1 Development and highway safety
TP 2 Highway Standards
TP 6 Parking provision in development

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Central conservation area: Fairview and All Saints Character Area and Management Plan (July 2008)

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

4. CONSULTATIONS

GCC Highways Planning Liaison Officer

30th December 2015

LOCATION: 83 Hewlett Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 6AJ

PROPOSED: Alterations and extensions to the building and conversion to provide 10 additional flats

The application site is located in close proximity to the junction of Hewlett Road and Duke Street. There are parking restrictions in place along Hewlett Road and the adjoining junctions. There is not a history of recorded personal injury collisions in the area related to the parking of vehicles. Although it would be desirable to provide on plot parking, it is accepted that given the nature of the existing use and the need to make full use of the building, this is not possible.

It is not considered that there are any dangerous locations where cars owned by residents and/or visitors could park, given the parking restrictions in place. Parking is available in the side streets. Although this parking is limited in peak times, it not considered that there are

any highway grounds to object to the development, as the development will NOT have a severe impact on the surrounding highway network.

I recommend that no highway objection be raised subject to the following condition being attached to any permission granted:

Suggested condition

Prior to first occupation, a minimum of 10 secured cycle parking spaces shall be provided within the site and those facilities shall be maintained for the duration of the development.

Reason:- To ensure that adequate cycle parking is provided, to promote cycle use and to ensure that the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up in accordance with paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Statement of Due Regard

Consideration has been given as to whether any inequality and community impact will be created by the transport and highway impacts of the proposed development. It is considered that no inequality is caused to those people who had previously utilised those sections of the existing transport network that are likely to be impacted on by the proposed development.

It is considered that the following groups will not be affected by the transport impacts of the proposed development: gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, other groups (such as long term unemployed), social-economically deprived groups, community cohesion, and human rights.

Heritage And Conservation

26th January 2016

Further to: Application and site visit

Analysis of Site: Prominent corner site, C19th in origin with 20thC single storey extension to the front with central opening and large windows to each side. The side of the building adjacent to Duke St is older and the extension on this side dates from between 1932 and 1954 whilst the other side is much later and of a different style. Recently in use as a public house identified in the Fairview Character Area Appraisal as a positive building within the conservation area but it appears to have ceased its primary use as a public house sometime ago and the condition of the building is deteriorating.

Comments:

1. The principle of redeveloping this building for solely residential use is regrettable as part of the building has been in use as a public house for at least 150years and is shown as such on the 1884 OS Map, its form remaining the same as shown on Merrett's 1834 Map.
2. However, at least part, if not all of its historic use would have been residential and the scale and detail of a domestic building have been retained despite later commercial extensions. The character of the area is mixed with Duke Street being predominantly residential No.83 is situated at the end of a row of buildings in commercial use at street level with residential accommodation above. Recent trends have left many areas with a surfeit of public houses no longer required and new uses need to be found to arrest decay therefore the principle is acceptable.
3. The addition of another full storey to the building is contentious albeit that there are a number of taller historic buildings in the vicinity.

4. The principle visual loss to the building which impacts its presence within the conservation area will be the tall chimney stacks and the stone corncicing/parapet detail, which in my view should be retained.
5. Duke Street is dominated by two storey, terraced, artisan dwellings with simple unadorned fenestration and architectural detailing. The existing rear wing of No.83 sits well in this context with a front facing double pitched roof, slightly higher but in alignment with the adjoining terrace. The front flank section of the building has parapet detailing, string band and a concealed roof which extends around to the front and separates visually this part of the building from the rear range. The front and rear sections of the existing building are of similar width (excluding the later ground floor front extension).
6. The rear service range is in a relatively unaltered utilitarian form whilst the front section is more 'polite' and architecturally similar to the Regency three storey terrace on the opposite corner of Duke Street.
7. Adding another storey to the front section of the building would not, in my opinion, visually harm this row of shops or the wider conservation area but the additional storey should be limited to the front range only and not extend over the clearly delineated rear range.
8. A three storey terrace stepping down to a two storey rear range is a traditional characteristic of Regency terraces with many examples within the town but the proportions and relationship between the two parts of the building is important.
9. The additional height and bulk of the proposed extension if it extends across the rear range is not acceptable and will give the impression of over-intensive development, dominating the terrace and overwhelming the entrance to Duke Street.

Conservation and Heritage summary: Support the proposal in principle but not the proposed depth of the additional storey as it will adversely harm the historic proportions and relationship between the front and rear service range of the building representing overdevelopment that will adversely affect this part of the conservation area.

Please request revised drawings that address my concerns and re-consult or refuse.

Suggested refusal reasons relating to Conservation and Heritage matters:

The proposed additional storey by virtue of its height, bulk and massing would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. Accordingly, the proposals are contrary to section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990, national policy set out in the NPPF and Historic Environment Good Practice Advice In Planning and policy CP7 of the Adopted Cheltenham Borough Local plan.

Campaign For Real Ale

15th January 2016

Ref. Planning application 15/02269/FUL

On behalf of Cheltenham CAMRA (Campaign for Real Ale), I wish to object to the proposed redevelopment of this public house.

This objection is based on a number of false or questionable statements in the submitted 'Design & Access Statement' prepared by SFP planning. Please reference these comments to the relevant paragraphs (listed below) in that statement.

1.2 It is not yet a 'former' public house. This is a deliberate wording to infer the pub is permanently closed. It is currently 'closed seeking a new tenant or sale', preferably as a going concern.

2.2 The accommodation fails to note that there is also a function room on the first floor, something very few pubs can offer. We have already lost the Little Owl in this respect.

4.4 Just because a development plan is 'out of date' should not mean it should be ignored. If it had been updated, it would, no doubt, contain similar policies.

4.5 According to the map, the pub is 'outside' the 'Neighbourhood Centre', however, it is attached to the 'Neighbourhood Centre' and should be considered as a vital part of that centre. It is important to note that this is a 'Neighbourhood' and not part of the town centre, and this pub is the social community hub of this Neighbourhood. In this respect, little weight should be given to there being other pubs in the town centre, about 10 minutes walk, as town centre pubs provide a totally different function to pubs such as this, a local 'Community' pub.

4.6 It certainly isn't considered that converting this 'community facility' to residential use is acceptable. It would result in an increase in the size of the community but reduce the facilities available to that community.

4.7-4.14 These are all based on the assumption that the pub change of use is acceptable.

4.15-4.24 These are 'grasping at straws' arguments seeking out any loopholes in current planning guidelines.

4.25 As stated above, this pub should not be compared to any within the town centre as they perform a very different function. The only nearby comparable pubs on this map are the Kemble, the Sudeley Arms, The Hewlett, the Beaufort (proposing to be a hotel only), and the Russell, (which is also under threat of re-development). Of these pubs, only the Beaufort currently has a skittle alley/function room. This is a large residential area east of the town with very few community pubs left following the loss of the Greyhound and the Sherborne a few years ago. It is a reasonable walk between any of these so the loss of any of these should be strongly resisted and, in any case, each of these belong to neighbouring communities. It should also be noted that on the plan, at least 6 'pubs' no longer exist and that many others are either cocktail bars, wine bars or night clubs. Very few, if any, could be considered as providing a similar function to the Maple Leaf.

4.28 This statement is therefore totally untrue.

4.30 - 4.35. The fall back alternative. This is a threat. A supermarket is unlikely as there is already one opposite. A restaurant is possible but the pub recently tried to focus on food and did not succeed. The only viable solution in the public's interest, is to revert this pub back to a proper 'community pub' at which it was successful a few years ago. They used to have 'Quiz nights' and 'Open Mike Sessions' which were very popular, but not continued under recent management plus sports TV which made it a magnet for racegoers en-route to the racecourse.

4.38 Losing this pub is not going to enhance the vitality of the local community when the community have nowhere left to meet.

I will not comment on further paragraphs as they depend on the principle of re-development being acceptable, this objection is to the basic principle of the change of use.

I trust the local planning authority will support these comments and reject the current proposals.

Architects Panel

2nd February 2016

Design Concept: The panel had no objection to the development in principle and felt that the additional storey was perfectly acceptable, given the height of adjoining and neighbouring properties and the building location on the junction of Duke Street and Hewlett Road.

Design Detail: The panel was pleased that the pub frontage is to be retained which adds to the character of the street and the Conservation Area.

Recommendation: Refinements to the design are needed before the panel could support the application as follows:

- 1) The second floor extension should be reduced in length to retain the original building lines and improve the Duke Street elevation. This would require changing the second floor layout and omitting Studio Apartment 11.
- 2) Further consideration needs to be given to the proportions of the second floor addition, window heights and cornice profile, which could be strengthened to match the existing cornice

Ward Councillors

26th January 2016

These are my thoughts as ward councillor.

The site is currently a pub and although temporarily closed is important to the local community. In recent years the pub has closed down and reopened a number of times with different landlords. The problem has generally seemed to be down to the owners providing minimal support and/or getting onto dispute with the landlords rather than any inherent problem with the location. The pub also has an upstairs function room. This has been used by various local groups including hosting meetings of the Fairview Community Association. The area does not have many community facilities so this change of use would be a major loss. I know both the FCA and local councillors would be happy to work with the current owner to ensure a sustainable future for the pub.

Looking at the proposed use, in my view trying to squeeze 11 flats into the building by adding a story is over development. In addition the scheme while having some cycling spaces, which I would welcome, has no spaces for cars. The people living in the flats are likely to have a significant number of cars between them. No parking is allowed on the Hewlett Road frontage and so any cars are likely to be parked in Duke Street which is already the source to consistent concerns about lack of spaces for residents. In fact this is a major issue in all the surrounding streets where there is minimal off road parking. The situation appears to be getting worse since Gloucestershire County Council introduced more parking restrictions in the Pittville area. The proposed scheme would clearly add to the problem.

For all the above reasons I could not support this application.

5. PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

Number of letters sent	18
Total comments received	67
Number of objections	67
Number of supporting	0
General comment	0

5.1 The application was publicised by way of letters to 18 neighbouring properties, a site notice and a notice in the local paper. Approximately 70 objections have been received which relate primarily to the following matters.

- Parking problems/road safety/access
- Loss of public house and function room/community facility
- Overdevelopment
- Appearance of extension
- Neighbour amenity

6. OFFICER COMMENTS

6.1 Determining Issues

6.1.1 The key issues in determining this application are considered to be (i) the principle, (ii) Design, layout and conservation issues, (iii) Impact on neighbouring properties, (iv) Parking and Highways issues.

6.2 The site and its context

6.2.1 The pub is located adjacent to the Hewlett Road Neighbourhood Centre which comprises a variety of uses, however the surrounding area is primarily residential. The pub currently lies empty, having most recently been known as The Maple Leaf.

6.3 The Principle

6.3.1 A key consideration in determining this application is the principle of the change of use of the building. Concern has been raised locally with respect to the loss of the public house facility (albeit it is presently closed), and particular reference has been made to the upstairs function room which it is understood has been used for a variety of purposes by the local community in the past.

6.3.2 In terms of policy considerations, there is no specific local plan policy which refers to the retention or otherwise of public houses. Policy RC1 of the Local Plan reads as follows:

Development that leads to a loss of land or premises which meet the needs of the community will not be permitted unless:

(a) The use is replaced within the new development; or

(b) Alternative provision is made in an appropriate location; or

(c) There is no longer a need for this site to remain in community use.

6.3.3 Clearly this policy is only relevant if the public house can be considered as a community facility. This matter has been tested at appeal when an appeal (APP/B1605/A/08/2088458) was made against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission for the conversion of

The Greyhound Inn at 198 Hewlett Road. The reason for refusal in relation to this matter read:

- 6.3.4** *“The conversion of this public house is considered to be unacceptable due to the lack of alternative facilities elsewhere within the locality which adequately meet the needs of the community. Alternative facilities that would meet the needs of the community which would arise from the loss of this public house are not located within an acceptable walking distance of the application site and therefore the proposal fails to comply with the aims and objectives of policy RC1 of the Cheltenham Borough Local Plan (Adopted 2006).”*
- 6.3.5** The appeal was allowed on 2nd February 2009, the full text is attached as an appendix. The Inspector stated: *“Having read the policy and its supporting text carefully it seems to me that the relevant of the policy to a public house is open to doubt. I say that as there are no references to the retention of public houses (or other commercial establishments) in either the policy or its supporting text. The Local Plan, rather highlights the importance of retaining community venues for evening classes and club meetings. While these activities can and do take place in public houses, I am doubtful if this brings such places within the terms of the policy.”*
- 6.3.6** The Inspector went on to accept that the loss of the public house was a material consideration however said that it did not compare to a situation where the loss of the pub would leave a community bereft of facilities as there were other pubs within walking distance. The Inspector considered that there were plenty of other places nearby where people can socialise and spend their leisure time and concluded that *“I consider that even if Policy RC1 properly applies to public houses, contrary to my understanding, it does not follow that the appeal proposal is contrary to the policy given the availability of “adequate” alternative facilities.*
- 6.3.7** This appeal decision is a material consideration to which great weight must be attached.
- 6.3.8** It must follow that the applicability of RC1 is equally as questionable in this case. However as was the case with the Greyhound it has been demonstrated that there are numerous other options available locally with 30 licensed premises being available within a 1km radius of the site. Whilst these may not be identical to the Maple Leaf in terms of provision they do provide more than adequate opportunities to socialise and spend leisure time.
- 6.3.9** It must be considered whether there have been any policy developments since this decision which would have a bearing on the decision. The NPPF, at Para 70 states that planning policies and decisions should:
- plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.
 - Guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs.

Whilst this offers support for the provision and retention of community facilities it remains the case that there are numerous opportunities for such activities within walking distance of the site and therefore it is not considered that the proposal is contrary to these objectives.

- 6.3.10** Whilst the loss of the pub is regrettable, it is not considered that there are sufficient grounds to resist its change of use. It must also be considered that the public house is not currently available for use in any event and it is understood that various attempts to rebrand the venue have been unsuccessful. The building is starting to deteriorate visually and if an

appropriate use is not found, will continue to further detract from the area. As such Officers feel that it is appropriate to facilitate the appropriate reuse of this building.

6.3.11 Members should be aware that under permitted development rights the public house could be changed to retail, restaurant or financial or professional services use without the need for planning permission. There is also scope within the regulations for a temporary flexible use falling within use classes A1, A2, A3 or B1. Any of these uses could be implemented without any requirement to include community facilities or in the case of B1 with no public access at all. Furthermore even were the pub to reopen there would be no requirement for the owner to make the upper floor function room available to the public. This 'fall back position' is a material consideration in the determination of the application.

6.3.12 It must also be considered that the proposal is in compliance with a range of policies and will help contribute towards housing provision in the borough. For these reasons it is considered that the principle of the proposal is acceptable.

6.4 Design and layout

6.4.1 The building is not listed however it is historic and relatively prominent in the conservation area. The second floor extension has been the subject of negotiation to reduce its scale to that of the front section of the building. There are three storey buildings to both sides and as such the increase in height would not be imposing or incongruous in the street scene. The building drops down to two storeys to meet the buildings of Duke Street and this is both historically and visually appropriate.

6.4.2 The detailing of the extension and new windows and doors appear to be acceptable although further detail is required by condition.

6.4.3 The demolition of the raised bar area to provide an inner courtyard would not be visible from public vantage points however this improved the layout and function of the flats and provides useful amenity space.

6.4.4 The building retains the façade of the public house at ground floor and this is considered to be appropriate as it allows the history of the building to be understood.

6.4.5 For these reasons the design and layout is considered to be acceptable and is therefore in accordance with policies CP3 and CP7 of the Adopted Local Plan.

6.5 Impact on neighbouring property

6.5.1 It is considered that the proposal has an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties as detailed below:

6.5.2 6 Duke Street

6.5.3 This property has a two storey rear wing adjoining the application site and is therefore somewhat shielded from the proposal. The second floor extension is over 11m from the amenity space of this dwelling which is sufficient to avoid excessive overshadowing. The new windows facing towards this property are a shower room and kitchen window on the rear elevation of the second floor extension, however this is 16m from the amenity space of this property and therefore would not result in significant overlooking. There is also a window within the rear elevation of flat 8 and it is suggested that this be obscure glazed.

6.5.4 85 Hewlett Road

6.5.5 The ground floor of this unit is in use as a café towards the front and a meat processing unit to the rear. What would have once been the garden of this property is now covered over in association with this use. It is assumed that the floors above are in use as flats. The

proposed extension complies with the light tests with regard to the windows on the rear of this neighbouring building. There are side facing windows on the rear section of the building which might result in overlooking to a window in the side return of this property and as such it is suggested that these are obscure glazed.

6.5.6 81 Hewlett Road

6.5.7 The proposed extension is 10m from the garden of this property which is an acceptable distance between buildings and gardens, common in residential areas.

6.5.8 For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with policy CP4 of the Local Plan and advice contained in the NPPF.

6.6 Access and highway issues

6.6.1 The proposal does not provide for any off street parking. The Highways Officer has confirmed that there is no objection on Highway grounds as detailed above. It confirms that there are parking restrictions in the area which prevent parking from occurring in inappropriate and dangerous locations. There are opportunities for parking on nearby streets, although these can be limited at peak times. Whilst this might result in inconvenience for residents who are unable to find a space, the test in planning terms is whether the proposal results in severe impacts upon the surrounding highway network. The advice of the Highways Officer is that this is not the case. He also draws attention to the nature of the existing use and the traffic that this could generate. Also of relevant is the fall back position as referred to in para 6.3.11

6.6.2 In response to the objections received the applicant has carried out a parking survey which has been reviewed by the highways officer who has stated that this confirms his original view on the proposal.

6.6.3 The proposal provides for sufficient cycle parking and this is secured by condition.

6.6.4 As such it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with policies TP1, TP2 and TP6 of the Local Plan and advice contained in the NPPF.

6.7 Other considerations

6.7.1 Bins – The plans have been amended to move the bin storage area out of the access corridor at the rear which would have made access for refuse collectors difficult and also be an unappealing entrance to the ground floor flat. It is now accessed off Duke Street and has been enlarged to provide sufficient space for communal waste and recycling bins.

6.7.2 Standard of accommodation – the flats are relatively small however they have been assessed against the national space standards and they do fulfil them. It is considered that the accommodation provided is acceptable.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

7.1 The site is a vacant public house the condition of which is starting to deteriorate. Whilst the loss of the public house as a local facility is regrettable there are limited grounds on which to resist its loss. Furthermore there are advantages to a residential use in this location, not least that it would contribute to the 5 year supply and secure improvements to the appearance of the building. The Officer view is therefore that the advantages of the proposal outweigh the concerns and the recommendation is to permit the application.

8. CONDITIONS / INFORMATIVES

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in Schedule 1 of this decision notice.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 3 The cycle parking provision shown on the approved plans shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of cycles only.
Reason: To ensure adequate provision and availability of cycle parking in accordance with Local Plan Policy TP6 relating to parking provision in development.
- 4 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Local Plan Policy CP7 relating to design.
- 5 Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the provision or improvement of recreational facilities to serve the proposed dwelling(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The dwelling(s) shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented.
Reason: To avoid any increase in the Borough's imbalance between population and the provision of outdoor play space and related facilities in accordance with Local Plan Policy RC6 relating to play space in residential development.
- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and/or re-enacting that order) the following windows shall be glazed with obscure glass and shall be maintained as such thereafter:
 - South east facing bedroom window to apartment 8
 - North east facing living room window to apartment 7
 - North east facing bedroom window to apartment 9
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining properties in accordance with Local Plan Policy CP4 relating to safe and sustainable living.
- 7 Prior to the installation of any new windows or doors full details to include the design, materials, colour and finish (including cills) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the details so approved and maintained as such thereafter.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with Local Plan Policy CP7 relating to design.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 In accordance with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012 and the provisions of the NPPF, the Local Planning Authority adopts a positive and proactive approach to dealing with planning applications and where possible, will seek solutions to any

problems that arise when dealing with a planning application with the aim of fostering the delivery of sustainable development.

At the heart of this positive and proactive approach is the authority's pre-application advice service for all types of development. Further to this however, the authority publishes guidance on the Council's website on how to submit planning applications and provides full and up-to-date information in relation to planning applications to enable the applicant, and other interested parties, to track progress.

In this instance, the authority sought amendments to overcome the concerns identified.

Following these negotiations, the application now constitutes sustainable development and has therefore been approved in a timely manner.