

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00258/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/00258/FUL

CASE OFFICER

Sam Yuen

DETERMINATION DATE 01.08.2024 EXT OF TIME 21.02.2025

Address: Bar House, Halifax Road, Littleborough, OL15 0LG

Proposal: Change of use to residential curtilage and erection of replacement outbuilding

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	Y

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE: 20/02/2025

SITE

The application relates to land associated with Bar House, a two-storey building located at the junction between Halifax Road and Blackstone Edge Old Road on the outskirts of Littleborough. The building is sited in an isolated location against a rural setting within the Green Belt. The property forms one half of the building along with Stormer Hill.

The building dates back to the 19th century and is a rare surviving example of a turnpike tollhouse, with many of its historic and original features retained. It is primarily of stone construction with later redbrick additions in the form of the front porch and first-floor side and rear extension. Under the name Stormer Hill Bar, the building is Grade-II listed due to its architectural and historic interest.

A collection of extant but dilapidated structures and paraphernalia currently sit within the vicinity of the host dwelling. This includes but is not limited to, a garage outbuilding, a converted railway carriage and a linking structure with the former, a caravan and various open-fronted wooden structures and sheds. The site comprises a gravelled area for parking which is accessible from Blackstone Edge Old Road.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of the land associated with Bar House to residential curtilage. Planning consent was previously granted for the subdivision of the single dwelling into two dwellings (11/D54679), however no details have been submitted following determination to confirm the extent of new curtilage; the application seeks to regularise this.

The proposal also seeks to remove three outbuildings sited circa 15m to the south of the host dwelling, to be replaced with a single-storey garage outbuilding. The outbuilding as amended is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form and would be constructed in natural stone, blue slate roof tiles, white painted timber windows and black aluminium guttering. It comprises a footprint of 12m by 5.5m and has a ridge height of 4.47m and a height to eaves of 2.85m.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

Policy JP-G9 The Green Belt

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Policy JP-P2 Heritage

Local

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

P2 Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage

P3 Improving Design of New Development

DM1 General Development Requirements

T2 Improving Accessibility

Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016)

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

12/55762/DOC - Submission of details to comply with conditions 3 and 5 on planning permission 11/D54678 – Request Completed

12/55758/DOC - Submission of details to comply with conditions 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9 on planning permission 11/D54679 – Request Completed

11/D54679 - Conversion Of Single Dwelling House Into Two Dwellings - Grant subject to conditions

11/D54678 - Conversion Of Single Dwelling Into Two Dwellings Together With The Installation Of Ground Floor Windows In The Side Elevation. - Grant subject to conditions

DC00334 - Submission Of Information To Comply With Conditions 1-3 Of Listed Building Consent Application D53920 - Request Completed

10/D53920 - Installation Of Windows To The Side And Rear Elevations Of A Listed Building - Grant subject to conditions

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation and Design

The existing collection of outbuildings to the south of the site do not appear to have consent, but appear to have been in situ for a number of years. They appear to all post-date 1948 and have an unkempt and disordered appearance. There is no objection to the removal of the existing outbuildings as they do not contribute positively to the setting of the adjacent listed building. The majority of the structures are relatively lightweight and are low level. As such, despite their disorderly appearance, they are not overly dominant within the setting of the listed building. While their contribution to the significance of the listed building is undoubtedly negative, their low height and in many cases open nature, reduces the overall level of harm.

Given the appearance of these buildings, there is potential for a replacement outbuilding. However, it is essential that any new outbuilding has an acceptable relationship with the listed building and does not detract from its significance.

The proposed plans show three of the existing structures to be removed and replaced with a new outbuilding. The existing site plan should be amended and clarified so that all of the existing structures are shown. The proposed site plan should be revised, so that the extent of replacement and retention can be properly understood and the impact assessed.

That being said, there are concerns about the height, scale and massing of the proposed outbuilding. It would be significantly taller than the existing buildings. Its fully enclosed nature would also give it a far more permanent and solid appearance than some of the existing structures, which are very lightweight, limiting their visual impact. As it stands, the proposed plans show the building to be a large and dominant feature, which as a result of its scale, height and massing would compete with and draw attention away from the listed building.

This harm would be exacerbated by the overly domestic design of the building and the choice of materials and finishes. The use of render in this location would not be supported, nor would the use of artificial slates. Any outbuilding should be natural stone with a natural slate or stone slate roof.

As it stands, the Officer is not able to support the proposal, as for the reasons above it would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. This harm has not been adequately justified or mitigated. The proposal would fail to comply with the aims of NPPF Chapter 16, Rochdale CS policy P2 and Places for Everyone policy JP-P2.

The proposal would also fail to comply with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as it would not preserve the setting of the listed building.

To overcome these concerns, the scale and height of the building need to be significantly reduced, with steps also taken to reduce its massing. As noted above,

natural materials should be used, along with cast metal rainwater goods and timber windows and doors.

The clearing of the existing buildings and the tidying of the site should also be shown on a proposed plan. This should be secured by condition, alongside conditions relating to materials, large scale details (windows, doors, eaves, ridges), cast metal rainwater goods and a landscaping plan.

It is also noted that there is a carport constructed to the side of the listed building. This does not appear to have listed building consent, and as such would appear to be unauthorised.

UPDATE:

The applicant has submitted amended plans following comments from the Conservation Officer, however, a formal follow-up response has not been submitted. Notwithstanding, the assessment of the amended proposal is set out under the 'Heritage' heading of the report.

Highways and Engineering

The proposed development once completed is unlikely to impact upon the highway.

Highways would not expect any additional traffic nor require any parking additional to that already provided.

There will be no changes to refuse collection or servicing the location.

No additional road safety issues is expected as a result of this proposal.

No changes are proposed to any PROW or Highway.

Highways therefore have no objections to this proposal.

Historic England

Historic England has not provided a response on the grounds they are not required consultees under the relevant statutory provisions.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties and a notice was posted within the vicinity of the host property. No comments were received.

AMENDMENTS

Following the Conservation Officer's comments, amendments were made to the proposed outbuilding:

- The reduction of overall height by 0.55m and depth by 1.5m;

- ☐ Alteration of the side and rear elevation finish from render to natural stone; and
- ☐ The addition of stone cills and lintels to all windows.

ANALYSIS

Lawful Existing Use of Land as Residential Curtilage

The proposal seeks permission for, amongst other things, the change of use of a parcel of land associated with Bar House to residential curtilage. Planning permission was previously granted for the subdivision of the single dwelling into two dwellings (11/D54679), with a condition attached requiring the submission of details indicating the extent of the new curtilage. However, no details relating to the new curtilage boundary have been submitted to the Council following determination. Planning approval for 11/D54679 was issued on 22nd September 2011, with the subsequent discharge of conditions applications for the remaining conditions issued on 6th November 2012. In the time between the issuing of the decision for 11/D54679 and the submission of this current application, the land associated with the host dwelling has been subject to numerous alterations and additions, with the earliest evidence of such works dating from August 2015. With reference to Section 171B and 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, at the date of the current submission, a period of ten years has passed to which enforcement action may be taken, and which the matter constituting failure to comply with the condition attached to 11/D54679 and the use of the land as residential curtilage would be considered lawful. With this in mind, part of the purpose of this current application would be to establish and regularise the extent of the lawful curtilage for Bar House and Stormer Hill, having considered available historic evidence.

Whilst the plans submitted under 11/D54679 confirmed the curtilage of the property to only comprise the footprint of the building, based on historic aerial mapping, the entirety of the land owned appeared to have been closely mown from as early as March 2009, thereby indicative of activities associated with residential use. Sometime between this date and August 2015, equestrian uses were introduced to the eastern half of the site and a stables was erected circa 14m from the host dwelling. Consequently, the extent of the residential curtilage has since been reduced to the western half of the site. This existing residential use is further emphasised by the installation of boundary treatments from the stables and hard landscaping which has been used as parking and access to the numerous outbuildings on site. Subsequent aerial mapping from 2007 onwards shows a clear demarcation has developed between the land for equestrian uses and land associated with residential use. The proposed residential curtilage covers an area consistent with the historic use of the land for residential purposes and follows the edge marked by boundary treatments with the adjoining stables. The extent of the curtilage is considered to comprise sufficient space for a functional amenity space, access and off-street parking.

Regards have also been had to the details submitted under 12/55758/DOC which comprised a site plan (received 15/08/2012) indicating the extent of the proposed garden and parking space for both properties. The highlighted areas extend further

to the east and west than the current proposed curtilage boundary. Notwithstanding, the use of land for residential purposes is mostly limited to the western part of the site and is consistent with the historic use of the land post-2009 and the layout of the proposed curtilage.

Taking into account of the evidence presented, it is considered the proposed curtilage boundary for Bar House and Stormer Hill would be acceptable.

Principle of Development – Green Belt

The application site is allocated as Green Belt under Policy JP-G9 of the recently adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, which establishes a revised Green Belt in the Borough and supersedes Policy G/D/2 of the Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and Policy G4 of the Rochdale Core Strategy. Policy JP-G9 does not set out specific requirements for development proposals within the Green Belt and as such the provisions of the NPPF apply.

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF establishes that, as with previous Green Belt policy, *“local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”*

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF establishes that *“development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions applies:*

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;***
- e) limited infilling in villages;*
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt”***

Therefore, the main consideration in assessing the principle of development is whether the proposed scheme constitutes inappropriate development within the

Green Belt and, if so, whether very special circumstances have been demonstrated which may outweigh the presumption against development.

The proposal seeks permission for the change of use of land to residential curtilage and the construction of a replacement outbuilding, following the removal of three extant structures. The proposed change of use is subject to an assessment of openness in the following section. With respect to the proposed outbuilding, the existing structures comprises a degraded garage, a converted railway carriage, a linking structure between the aforementioned outbuildings, and a lean-to outbuilding which had been used as a cafe but has ceased operations for approximately five years. Notwithstanding, considering the proximity of the structures to the host dwelling, for the purposes of this assessment, the primary existing use has been as storage space associated with the dwellings. The proposed plans indicate the proposed replacement garage outbuilding would serve as a garage and storage space for the occupants of both Bar House and Stormer Hill and would therefore constitute the same use as the buildings it replaces.

The proposed outbuilding, as amended, comprises a volume of 241.56m³ which would be an increase from the combined volume of the existing structures of 213.1m². Notwithstanding, the proposed outbuilding comprises a footprint of 66m² which represents a notable reduction from the combined 82.5m² footprint of the existing structures it replaces. By virtue of its single, consolidated form, the proposed outbuilding would also constitute a reduction in breadth when compared with the cumulative spread of the existing individual structures. The proposed outbuilding would be subject to views from Halifax Road towards the south-west and from Blackstone Edge Old Road towards the south-east. Considering the reduced footprint and depth, the additional volume would mostly be attributed to the dual-pitched roof form and is not considered to amount to a material increase in the scale of the buildings it replaces.

Openness

Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states that *“the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.”*

“Openness”, for the purpose of Green Belt policy is not formally defined within Planning Policy or legislation but is taken to mean the absence of built development. The term “openness”, comprises a spatial and visual component which should be assessed in considering whether a proposal preserves the openness of the Green Belt.

The area subject to the proposed change of use to residential curtilage comprises land including the host dwelling and existing outbuildings, with the intervening space consisting of hard surfacing for vehicular parking. The extent of the area is restricted to existing built development which is clearly demarcated and contained within the surrounding locality. As assessed previously, the activities associated residential use within this area has also been established. On this basis, it is considered the

proposed change of use would not constitute an encroachment into the countryside and would not inflict substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

No harm has been identified in terms of the spatial component of openness as it is considered the proposed garage outbuilding would not be materially larger than the existing structures it replaces.

The proposal would be sited circa 15m to the rear of the host dwelling within the footprint of the existing structures and would be set against a cluster of mature trees. When considering the key views into the proposed outbuilding, it would nonetheless be read and understood in the context of the host dwelling and the mature tree cover. The proposed outbuilding would not be materially larger than the buildings it replaces and as such is not considered to significantly harm the visual openness of the Green Belt.

Planning Balance

In light of the above assessment, it is considered the proposed development would meet inappropriate development exception (d) which would allow for the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces, and (g) which allows for limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No harm through inappropriateness has been identified and no additional harm with regard to the openness of the Green Belt has been identified. The proposal therefore accords with Policy JP-G9 of the PfE and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design and Appearance

Achieving good design to achieve sustainable development is a key component of the NPPF, whereby decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials. In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

The proposed garage outbuilding, as amended, would replace the existing structures and as established previously, would not appear materially larger owing to its consolidated built form and reduced footprint. Its single-storey form and siting at a lower position to the host dwelling would also ensure the garage remains subservient.

The use of a dual-pitched roof form would appear in keeping with the form of the host dwelling. Materials of the proposed development would match the host dwelling and would be designed appropriately for this context. The proposed fenestration are also sized and positioned appropriately with the fenestration of the host dwelling. Notwithstanding, conditions requiring details of materials, windows and doors have been recommended as to not harm the character and appearance of the host property.

The design of the proposal is therefore acceptable and accords with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted CS, the SPD, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Heritage

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states, *“in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority [...] shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”*

Policy JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone and Policy P2 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy strives to *“protect the borough’s heritage by... conserving, enhancing and promoting key heritage assets, both statutory and non-statutory, including consideration of their wider settings.”*

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states, *“when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.”*

Paragraph 213 states *“any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.”*

Paragraph 215 states, *“where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”*

The host dwelling forms part of Stormer Hill Bar, which is designated as a Grade-II listed building due to its architectural and historic interest. Dating back from the 19th century, the building is a rare surviving example of a turnpike tollhouse serving the Rochdale to Halifax and Elland Turnpike road, one of the earliest in the locality. Much of the original and historic stonework features have been retained, along with later redbrick additions.

As it stands, the extant outbuildings and structures within the application site are in various states of disrepair and have resulted in an unkempt and clutter appearance. Whilst the structures are generally lightweight and low level, they do not make a

positive contribution to the setting of the listed building and as such, the removal of the structures would serve to preserve the significance of the tollhouse.

The proposal seeks to construct a replacement garage outbuilding in place of three existing structures. The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted on the proposed plans and raised concerns regarding the excessive height, scale, massing of the outbuilding and the material palette. Consequently, the applicant has made amendments to reduce the height and depth of the outbuilding by 0.55m and 1.5m respectively. It is considered the overall reduction in the scale and massing of the outbuilding would be sufficient insofar as to not appear as an overly dominant building which would visually compete with the listed building. Amendments have also been accepted to omit the use of render to the side and rear elevation wall in lieu of natural stone which would be sympathetic to the stonework of the listed building.

Whilst it is acknowledged the height of the outbuilding would remain taller than the existing structures, by virtue of its reduced footprint, consolidated built form and orderly appearance, the proposal garage would respond more positively to the setting of the listed building and would constitute an acceptable visual relationship with the designated heritage asset.

Taken as a whole, the proposed garage outbuilding would constitute a subordinate and sympathetic addition which would not detract from the significance of the listed building and would facilitate in the removal of existing harmful structures within its setting. Subject to conditions requiring details of materials, doors, windows and rainwater goods, the proposed development would have a neutral impact to the significance of Stormer Hill Bar as a listed building. The design of the proposal would therefore be acceptable in accordance with Policy P2 of the adopted CS, Policy JP-P2 of the adopted PfE and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which states development proposals should ensure they *"do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy."*

Considering the isolated location of the application site, no harm has been identified in relation to impacts to residential amenity. The proposed garage would occupy the footprint of the existing structures and would be sited circa 15m from the host dwelling and away from any habitable room windows. As such, no concerns are had with regard to the occupier's amenity. The proposal would therefore be acceptable in accordance with Policy DM1 of the adopted CS, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking

Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to *"provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location."*

The proposed development is unlikely to impact upon the adopted highway and would retain the existing off-street parking space to the rear of the host dwelling. The Council's Highways Officer was also consulted and raised no objections. The proposal is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policies T2 and DM1 of the adopted CS.

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The permission relates to the following plans:

- ☐ Location Plan – Drawing no. TS530-4D Rev. D received 30/09/2024
- ☐ Existing Site Plan – Drawing no. TS530-3D Rev. D received 30/09/2024
- ☐ Proposed Site Plan – Drawing no. TS530-2D Rev. D received 30/09/2024
- ☐ Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. TS530-5 received 03/06/2024
- ☐ Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations – Drawing no. TS530-1D Rev. D received 30/09/2024
- ☐ Existing and Proposed Cross Section – Drawing no. TS530-6D Rev. D received 30/09/2024

and the development shall be carried out in accordance with these drawings hereby approved.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specifications of materials to be used externally on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials and, where stonework is proposed, a one metre square freestanding panel of stonework showing the type of natural stone, coursing, jointing and mortar mix and finish. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the significance of the Grade-II listed building, in compliance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the

adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no above ground construction works shall take place until samples and / or full specification of materials of the proposed doors, windows, soffits, eaves, verges and ridge have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include detailed elevation and cross-section drawings at a scale of no less than 1:50, and the type, colour and texture of the materials. For the avoidance of doubt, the windows shall be of timber construction. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the significance of the Grade-II listed building, in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Notwithstanding any details hereby approved, no above ground works shall take place until full details of all rainwater goods including materials, method of support, design and surface finish have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt, the rainwater goods shall be of metal construction. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the significance of the Grade-II listed building, in accordance with Policies P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure Statement

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition.

Report Author Sam Yuen