
Case Number	24/01500/CHU (Formerly PP-13006955)
Application Type	Planning Application for Change of Use
Proposal	Change of Use of Dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to Children's Care Home (Use Class C2)
Location	110 Halesworth Road Sheffield S13 9AB
Date Received	20/05/2024
Team	South
Applicant/Agent	MPD Built Environment Consultants Ltd
Recommendation	Grant Conditionally

Time Limit for Commencement of Development

1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act.

Approved/Refused Plan(s)

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following plans, except as may be specified in the conditions attached to this permission, which shall in all cases take precedence.

Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No. PL01 (published 20.05.2024)

Reason: In order to define the permission.

Pre-Commencement Condition(s)

Pre-Occupancy and Other Stage of Development Condition(s)

Other Compliance Conditions

3. The care home hereby approved shall accommodate a maximum of 3 no. residents at any given time and there shall be no intensification of the use.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality and highway safety.

Attention is Drawn to the Following Directives:

1. The Local Planning Authority has dealt with the planning application in a positive and proactive manner in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Planning Authority considered that it wasn't necessary to have detailed discussions in this case.
2. Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

Site Location



© Crown copyright and database rights 2016 Ordnance Survey 10018816

LOCATION AND PROPOSAL

The application refers to 110 Halesworth Road, a relatively large three-storey end-terrace property located northwest of Halesworth Road. The site is identified as within a housing area as designated within Sheffield's Unitary Development Plan (UDP). As such, the area is wholly residential in character.

This application seeks planning permission for use of existing dwelling (Use Class C3) as a residential children's care home (Use Class C2) for up to 3 no. residents (between the ages 7-18), as well as the conversion of an existing integral ground-floor garage into a staff accommodation room and home office.

The application form submitted identifies 7 no. members of staff are required for this proposed use. The draft rota accompanying the application clarifies the staff arrangement as follows:

- 1 x Children's Home Manager working 0900-1700 hours from Mon-Fri.
- 6 x Working Staff working rotas of 0700-2300 hours followed by 8 hours sleep over and recommence duty at 0700.

To clarify the work rotas, the 6 no. working staff members will be divided into three teams. All shifts are 16 hours long, followed by an 8-hour sleepover. Each team will cover 48 hours during the week, followed by four days off. Therefore, the staff change over times, as specified in the accompanying mock rota and letter, are at 0700 hours every other day.

It is noted that the proposed alteration of the ground floor garage would have no material impact on the external appearance of the host dwelling. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to assess the proposal against visual amenity/design.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The relevant planning history associated with this site is highlighted below:

04/01622/OUT	Residential development – Granted Conditionally (05.01.2005)
05/01134/REM	Erection of 210 dwellinghouses and 96 apartments, highways and landscaping works and erection of sewage pumping station (amended layout received 3/1/2006) – Reserved Matters Approved Conditionally Legal Agreement (16.01.2006)

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours were notified of the change of use application by letter. This application has received 47 objections letters (notwithstanding multiple letters received from the same address).

The following concerns raised are as follows (summarised):

Amenity Issues

- The property would not facilitate a space for these children to thrive due to lack of suitable space and infrastructure; vulnerable children unsupervised throughout the night (after 11 pm).
- There would be an increased nuisance (i.e., noise or disruption) owing to the sensitive and tight-knit nature of dwellings in the immediate area; existing soundproofing in the row of townhouses is poor; nuisance generated due to potential increase in police activity.
- The area has recently experienced instances of anti-social behaviour (loitering, littering, drug-use, theft, vandalism etc.); not ideal for vulnerable children who are at risk or could potentially bring risk to the area as they would potentially be of a 'high risk category'; exacerbate existing crime rate in the area.
- Potential for safety and safeguarding issues; risk to vulnerable adults and children on the estate; create unsafe environment for children to play outside by allowing 'troubled' children in; impact quality of life for residents.
- Increased crime and feeling of unease amongst local neighbours; constant coming, and goings will cause further anxiety to residents.

Highway Issues

- Disruption to road use and on street parking; roadway regularly used by residents (incl. visitors); parking is over-capacity on this estate; increased traffic and parking; increased obstructions for pedestrians and road hazards for disabled users and children.
- Application site benefits from single driveway with limited on-street parking due to close proximity with other driveways.
- Middlewood Rovers Junior Football Club periodically occupy the road for additional parking, which is exacerbated during children's football tournaments.
- Conversion of garage would result in loss of on-site parking – not sufficient to accommodate 2/3 carers, including visitors.
- The site is situated on the main entrance into the estate impacting vehicular movements; impact all modes of access (vehicular, cyclists and motorists etc.) into estate, particularly emergency services; exacerbate existing issue regarding illegal parking on street, pavement and verges around the application site (110 Halesworth Road) often partially blocking access into the estate.

Other Matters

- Not in-keeping with the residential character/use of the area; impact the community atmosphere of the neighbourhood; detrimental to the peaceful environment that residents enjoy; this is a family-oriented neighbourhood; impact on the cohesion and stability of the community.
- Lack of neighbourhood consultation.
- Resident's doubt the applicant's 'parent-led' approach for vulnerable children when there are 3 shifts of short-term rotated teams, and part-time management.

- Introduction of commercial use would detrimentally impact existing infrastructure designed to support residential area.
- Overburden public services.
- Commercial properties often generate more waste requiring additional services.
- Set precedent for further commercialisation/ commercial use in the area.

Non-material Matters

- De-value properties within the vicinity; impact for buyers of nearby properties being able to get a mortgage; discourage future buyer.
- The site is located within Handsworth Gateway estate, privately managed by SIMARC, where residents pay both management and leasehold fee as well as adhering to terms of the estate, commercial use in breach with Gateway Estate regulations/deeds.
- Query regarding the funding to support operation/management of the care home.
- The applicant's company is listed as dormant; query regarding overall validity of the application statement; company primarily deal with property development; lack of experience within social care; no substantiated data/report to back up claim as a good service provider in the Planning Statement.
- No indemnity insurance to protect residents from any harm or property damage.
- Query whether Sheffield City Council has considered the banding implications of the council tax payment if application gets approved.
- Reference to a similar planning application on Green Street, Rotherham; refused as the facilities are not suited for residential area; implied that this has increased the area's crime rate.
- Potential impact onto adjoining neighbours who will be affected by mismanagement of the home.
- The property does not offer full security for a Children's Care Home; location and house type (end-terrace house) not suitable for vulnerable kids.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Planning Policy Context

Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70(2) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provision of the development plan, as far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. Other material planning considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the National Planning Policy Guidance.

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF is clear that the starting point when assessing the principle of development is the development plan. The adopted local plan is the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009) and relevant saved policies from the Unitary

Development Plan (1998).

The emerging Sheffield local plan has been submitted to the government but is awaiting examination. Accordingly, at this time, the policies are given no significant weight in decision making.

Due to the time lapsed, some of the policies contained in the UDP and Core Strategy are not considered to be up-to-date when assessed against the NPPF. In such instances, planning applications should be considered against the tilted balance test contained in paragraph 11 of the NPPF which states that a presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied and that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or where the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date (e.g. because they are inconsistent with the NPPF). In application of paragraph 11, development should be approved without delay unless any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

In addition to the potential for a policy to be out of date by virtue of inconsistency with the NPPF, paragraph 11 of the NPPF makes specific provision in relation to applications involving the provision of housing and provides that where the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer) the policies which are most important for determining the application will automatically be considered to be out of date.

Under the revised NPPF, as the Local Plan has been submitted for examination Sheffield is required to demonstrate a 4-year supply of housing (instead of 5 years). The 4-year supply figure is 3.01 years.

Because the Council is currently unable to demonstrate the required four-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the relevant policies for determining applications that include housing are considered to be out-of-date according to paragraph 11(d) of the Framework.

Notwithstanding this, NPPF paragraph 225 advises that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the NPPF. As such, relevant policies contained within the Core Strategy are given due weight according to their degree of consistency with the framework.

Principle of Development

The site lies within a Housing Area, as designated by the UDP. The development should therefore be assessed against UDP Policies H8, H10 and H14.

UDP Policy H8 relates to housing for people in need of care. This includes supportive accommodation which is defined as purpose-built or converted exclusively for specific groups of people, consisting of grouped self-contained accommodation or a shared house with residents or visiting caring support. This definition applies to this proposal and while the reasons for the policy suggest that it

was mainly intended to apply to adult accommodation, this is not explicit. Policy H8 states that supportive accommodation will be permitted provided it would:

- Be within easy reach of shopping centre and public transport.
- Be suitable for people with disabilities.
- Provide a reasonable and attractive area of accessible private open space or be immediately next to an area of public open space; and
- Not involve extensions which would remove essential open space.

Policy H10 states that housing (Use Class C3) is the preferred use of land, however residential institutions (Use Class C2), such as care homes, are described as acceptable uses.

Policy H14 states that non-housing uses must occupy only a small area and not lead to a concentration of uses that would threaten the residential character of the area.

UDP Policies H8 and H10 are considered to be consistent with government guidance contained in the NPPF, which states at paragraph 63 that the needs of groups within the community with specific housing requirements should be addressed.

Policy H14 is broadly in line with government policy contained in paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF which states that decisions should ensure that development creates places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users, and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

In relation to Policy H8, the site is conveniently located (approx. 300 metres) from local amenities and public transport, with frequent bus routes to the City Centre and Crystal Peaks Shopping Centre on Handsworth Road, all of which are easily accessible by foot.

The residents would be served by an open public space approximately 20 metres away from the site, as well as a reasonably sized private garden - no extensions are proposed that would reduce or eliminate essential outdoor open space. It is also noted that the proximity to Middlewood Rovers Junior Football Club may be beneficial. Therefore, the site can be considered to be in a sustainable location due to the wide range of existing amenities, existing highway infrastructure, good public transportation routes and frequency within a well-established residential neighbourhood.

The submitted proposed floor plan identifies 3 no. residents' bedrooms (one on the ground floor, two on the second floor with en-suite facilities). The existing ground-floor garage will be converted into a staff sleeping room for the 2 no. non-resident staff members as well as a home office. Therefore, the property would be occupied by a maximum of 3 no. children and minimum of 2 no. staff members at any one time providing care and support. On weekdays, a home manager will be on site from 9 am to 5 pm. As a result, there would be a maximum of six residents on the property at any given time.

Further, the accompanying document states that social workers and other professionals may conduct visits depending upon the child's needs, in addition to monthly gardening visits and maintenance visits as needed. However, the applicant asserts that the use would seek to function as a family setting with residents living as a household, albeit dynamics which differ from that of a typical C3 use (staff would not reside permanently at the property) thus acknowledging its designation as within C2 use class.

Notwithstanding its C2 use class designation, it is in the Officer's opinion that the proposal would reflect the residential context of the area and the number of occupants at any at any one time, including expected footfall would be no more than one could expect if a similar-sized family occupied the site.

In terms of the more strategic considerations of policy H14 relating to non-C3 housing uses, such as this, the proposal would be in accord with the points: (i) occupy only a small area and not lead to concentration of non-housing uses that would threaten the residential character of the housing area; (j) not prejudice the provision of sufficient housing land; and (l) be on a scale consistent with the residential character of the area and occupying an existing building set in its own grounds. Therefore, there is no development plan objection in principle to the proposed the use of the dwellinghouse to provide assisted living for up to 3 no. children/young people (ages 7-18).

In the context of paragraph 11 of the NPPF and Sheffield's current shortfall in 4 year housing supply, the loss of one Class C3 unit from the market is a negative aspect of the scheme although this is given little weight owing to the fact the replacement use is an alternative form of residential accommodation, which has strong similarities with Class C3 uses.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

UDP Policy H14 states that for non-housing uses, change of use will be permitted provided that it would not lead to air pollution, noise, smell, excessive traffic levels or other nuisance or risk to health and safety for people living nearby. Furthermore, it states that sites should not be overdeveloped or deprive residents of light, privacy, or security. This is consistent with NPPF paragraph 135 (f) which states that developments should promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

It is considered the proposal would not have any impact on existing residents by means of overshadowing, overshadowing, and overlooking as there are no alterations and/or extensions proposed to the building or its plot.

In terms of its use, as stated above, it has been established that a residential care home, in conjunction with other residential uses in this Housing Area, is an appropriate use in planning policy context. The proposed use, with 3 no. resident bedrooms and 1 no. staff bedroom, would be operated on a domestic scale and thus function similarly to a typical family home.

In regard to noise and disturbance, it is acknowledged that working staff may

generate noise while performing caring duties or other care-related activities to the detriment of other immediate dwellings. However, it is not considered that such noise would be indistinguishable or significantly greater from domestic noise found within a family setting, and there is no reasonable evidence to suggest otherwise.

Indeed, it could be argued that the children/young people occupying the property are more likely to exhibit emotional and behavioural characteristics that contribute to noise and disturbance within the host property for the neighbours. However, this is unlikely to be excessive and would not go above and beyond that of a parent caring for and managing a child/young person with such difficulties.

In terms of comings and goings into and out of the property, shift changeovers will take place every other day at 0700 hours, so there will only be very brief periods of time when there are more than two carers on site due to shift changes. This volume of activity would be barely perceptible, and given the proposed work pattern, this is relatively infrequent and would not occur during antisocial hours. This would occur at a time when many residents will be leaving for work and is unlikely to give rise to significant nuisance as a result.

Compared to a C3 use, there would be a higher likelihood of visits from various service providers depending on the child's needs and circumstance; however, families are not exempt from this and occasional planned visits from care professionals or emergency services are not entirely uncommon within residential settings.

In light of the above, the ensuing day-to-day operation of the care home, including vehicular and pedestrian movements, has potential to generate noise to some extent. However, the nature and intensity of such noise is not atypical in residential areas. As such, and given its small scale operation, any noise or disturbance this is not considered to present a basis for refusal.

A number of objectors have expressed concerns about the lack of adequate soundproofing in this row of townhouses. While this has been considered, given the reasons stated above, sound attenuation measures are deemed unnecessary.

Concerns were raised regarding the potential increase in anti-social behaviour and criminal activity associated with accommodating children/young people with variety of issues, including emotional and behavioural difficulties, as well as the risk of poor management at the care home. This is often a concern amongst nearby residents in the consideration of the creation of residential institutions (as established by case law).

While the perception of fear in anti-social behaviour and crime is material, there is no substantial evidence to imply that such non-C3 use, particularly of this scale, would result in detrimental increase of anti-social behaviour/crime rates above and beyond that experienced by local residents or a children/young people that form part of a family unit.

The concerns raised by local residents about existing crime and anti-social behaviour levels in the area officer are noted however, such concerns are not

evidenced and are not uncommon or unique to this part of the city. Concerns about anti-social behaviour/crime rates, however, would be a police matter rather than a material planning justification for a refusal, for the reasons stated above.

Objectors have referred to a similar planning application on Green Street in Rotherham (ref: RB2022/0890). However, they are advised that this is a live application (at the time of Officer's writing) and lies within a different Local Authority boundary and as such cannot serve as a material consideration for this application.

The proposal would therefore accord with UDP Policy H14 (c). The site would not be over-developed or deprive residents of light, privacy or security, and (k) not lead to air pollution, noise, smell, excessive traffic levels or other nuisance, or risk to health and safety for people living nearby.

Living Conditions

The proposed care home would provide good living conditions for residents, with 3 no. well-proportioned bedrooms, two of which would benefit from an en-suite accommodation, with good outlook and daylight, as well as ample living space, including private outdoor amenity and play space. This residential area is an appropriately quiet location for a care facility, benefitting from an open space area and in proximity to local infrastructure.

The proposal would therefore in accord with UDP Policy H14 (e). There would no concerns envisaged for future residents as result of unacceptable air pollution, noise or other nuisance or risk to health or safety.

HIGHWAYS

UDP Policy H14 sets out at part (d) that in Housing Areas, new development will be permitted provided that it would provide safe access to the highway network, be provided with appropriate off-street parking, and not endanger pedestrians.

This generally aligns with paragraph 115 of the NPPF, which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The requirement for appropriate off-street parking is not directly reflected in the NPPF, with government policy suggesting that a shortfall in off-street parking should only be refused in instances where this would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or lead to severe impacts on the road network.

The current site has two on-site parking spaces (a driveway and an integral garage), which is the guideline requirement for a three-bedroom property. However, as previously stated, the proposal would require internal changes to the garage to accommodate the care staff on shift, resulting in a loss of on-site parking.

During an officer's visit to the site on July 25, 2024, between 1730 and 1800 it was acknowledged that there is currently on-street parking within the wider estate, as indicated by many local residents, and this has been taken into account in the

assessment. The nearby bend on Halesworth Road was relatively unaffected by this at the time of the visit. Many vehicles were parked in front of garages and on private driveways, but some were parked on the street or on the pavement near individual properties. Nonetheless, it is accepted that there may be more on-street parking later in the evenings and at weekends when residents are not at work, or during occasional football tournaments at Middlewood Rovers JFC, as many have stated that this bend is frequently used as additional parking space, albeit temporarily.

However, in their response to neighbour's representations, the applicant clarified that none of the residents will have access to a vehicle and that staff typically live nearby, implying that they will commute on foot or by public transport. As previously stated, the site is within a sustainable transport location, therefore there are reasonable bus service provisions on Handsworth Road, so occupants and staff can travel to and from the site and other parts of the city with relative ease. While this may be the case, it cannot be relied upon that staff will not travel by car. The maximum number of vehicles must therefore be considered.

The staff parking requirement is expected to be a maximum of 3 cars, possibly 4 if there are occasional visitors on site. However, this three-bedroom terrace property could be occupied by a large family, with both parents and older children having their own cars.

As a result, it is expected that the proposed occupancy size will have no significant impact on parking demand levels, as a similar size household may acquire the same number of vehicles and require similar levels of vehicle parking accommodation (e.g. visits from family, friends, or relatives).

It should also be noted that there are no previous conditions attached to the site or the wider estate (i.e., from the original planning application to erect the residential estate) that would prevent the garage from being converted, so the site would benefit from permitted development (PD) rights should the current occupants decide to convert the garage into a home office or additional living space etc. The PD criteria do not require additional parking spaces to compensate for the loss of a garage, so the impact on street parking and highway safety would be similar in this case.

In addition, although the removal of the garage as an option for parking has the potential to increase on street parking it is accepted that a significant proportion of garages are used for purposes other than the storage or parking of cars and residents cannot be made to use the space for its intended purpose. The same would apply to driveways although these are used more routinely for parking. So, the property could currently be occupied by a family with a number of vehicles who choose not to utilise the garage for parking and park on street. The proposed use would be very similar to this situation, and it is unlikely that the proposal would have a significantly detrimental impact on highway safety or severe impacts on the road network compared to its existing use.

To ensure that there would be no intensification of use, a condition will be attached requiring that there be no more than 3 no. permanent residents on the premises at any time.

On balance, while the loss of a garage leaves the site with only one on-site parking space, the scale and nature of the proposed use, as well as the potential of a PD fall-back position, would not sufficiently justify a refusal based on highway impacts.

C3 to C2 Use as Lawful Development

A children's care home can be classified as Use Class C2 (residential institutions) or C3 (b) (dwellinghouses) under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2015.

The distinction is largely determined by whether the children are capable of living as a single household and whether the care is provided on a permanent or shift basis. It has been established that if the children are cared for by a permanent occupant of the dwelling, the use will typically fall under Use Class C3 (b). However, if the care is provided on a shift basis and the carers are not permanent residents, they are less likely to be considered to be living together as a single household. As a result, the use would fall under the definition of Use Class C2.

However, it is worth noting that in recent years, uses of this nature (C2) have been subject to successful application for lawful certificate development in the Sheffield area, notably Harvey Clough Road, S8 8PG (ref: 21/03774/LU1) and, more recently, Hutcliffe Drive, S8 0EW (ref: 24/00377/LU2), on the basis that, while acknowledging that it would result in a different use class as outlined above, the use and operation of this scale would not be materially different to that of a C3 dwelling. This is consistent with case law in the form of the appeal decision in North Devon DC v SOS 31/1/2003, which established that a change of use from C3 to C2 does not require planning permission given that there is no material change in use from a C3 dwelling.

In this case however, the applicant has applied for planning permission for the use, so this is provided purely for context.

OTHER ISSUES

Management/Operation of Facility

Local Planning Authority decisions should focus on whether the proposed development is an acceptable use of land, and the planning decisions should be made with the assumption that separate legislation governing the operation of children's homes will be effective, and it is not the responsibility of the planning authority to duplicate these controls. This principle holds true even if the children's home operators have no prior experience and are starting a new business. The Children's Homes (England) Regulations 2015 establish quality standards for children's homes. Ofsted, the registration authority, oversees and monitors these facilities that provides children's care social services in accordance with the Care Standards Act (CSA 2000).

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATION

It is considered that the issues raised in the representations have been addressed in

the main body of the report. The following points respond to other issues raised that have not been discussed or that are non-material to this application:

- Objectors raised issues regarding the lack of consultation, it is noted that neighbourhood notification has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, and Code of Practice for the Publicity of Planning Applications.
- Impact on property value, acceptability of mortgage offers and the saleability of other properties within the estate are not material planning matters.
- Private rights under covenants on the land, etc, are not material planning matters.
- Indemnity for potential losses or damages caused by the proposed use is not a material planning matter.
- The proposal would have negligible impact on local services and infrastructure given the nature and scale of its use. It would be comparable to that of an identical sized household occupying the property.
- Objectors have raised concerns about the likelihood of 'high risk' children and young people occupying the property. However, use class C2 does not differentiate between the types of residents, so this is not a material planning issue. Concerns about a variety of anti-social behaviour/crime issues have been raised previously. Should such matters ever arise, they would be police matters.
- Separate legislation and regulatory frameworks address safeguarding issues, staff training, and funding, and therefore are not a material planning matter. However, since concerns were raised about overnight supervision, it should be noted that the children/young people will benefit from 24-hour on-site care.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Class C2 uses are acceptable in principle in Housing Areas in accord with UDP Policy H10. It would also be in accord with the relevant considerations of UDP Policy H14 as it is on scale consistent with the residential character of the area, as well as catering for a diverse housing need for which there is demand within the Local Authority Area.

The impacts on the living conditions of future and neighbouring residents have been demonstrated to be acceptable. Concerns raised regarding antisocial behaviour and criminal activity associated with children's care home are taken into consideration, however, this is not a material planning reason for refusal given the lack of substantive evidence to support this claim.

The shortfall in off street parking has been noted. However, vehicle movements and on-street parking levels would be acceptable given the proposal's modest scale and

are not expected to significantly worsen highway safety compared to the current scenario.

According to NPPF paragraph 115, the development does not indicate that it will have an unacceptable or severe impact on highway safety.

Overall, whilst the proposal seeks permission for a Class C2 use, distinguishable from a Class C3 family home, there is no evidence that general activity of a small-scale children's residential home as proposed would be significantly in excess of that of a family household.

Given all of the preceding considerations, it is concluded that the development complies with the Local Development Plan as a whole and is also consistent with the aims of the NPPF. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

This page is intentionally left blank