

**1.0 Application Number:** 6/2019/0337

**Webpage:**

<https://planningsearch.purbeck-dc.gov.uk/Planning/Display/6/2019/0337>

**Site address:** Misty Cottage, Worth Matravers, BH19 3LQ

**Proposal:** Planning permission is sought to erect a single storey rear extension

**Applicant name:** Mr J Whiteoak & Mr B Wilson

**Case Officer:** Simon Burditt (Planning Officer)

**Ward Member(s):** Councillor Cherry Brooks

Comments received from Worth Matravers Parish Council are contrary to the officer recommendation and Dorset Councillors have requested that the application is referred to planning committee. The nominated officer has given careful consideration to all representations received and the planning merits of the application concluding that the application should be presented to the planning committee.

**2.0 Summary of recommendation:**

GRANT subject to conditions.

**3.0 Reason for the recommendation:** as set out in paragraph 16 at end of the report.

- The proposal is acceptable in terms of size, scale, design and general visual impact.
- There is not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity or privacy.
- The proposal would preserve the appearance of the Worth Matravers Conservation Area and not harm the setting of nearby listed buildings.
- There are no material planning considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

**4,0 Key planning issues**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
Principle of development	Acceptable, the site is located within the Worth Matravers settlement policy boundary.
Size, scale, design, impact on the character and appearance of the area and the wider Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	The proposed single storey rear extension is acceptable in terms of size, scale and design in respect of the property, the Worth Matravers

	Conservation Area and the wider Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
The impact of the proposals on the significance of the heritage asset, the Worth Matravers Conservation Area, the features of special architectural or historical interest and the preservation of the conservation area	The size, scale and design of the proposed single storey rear extension to the house is acceptable in terms of the preservation of the character and appearance of the Worth Matravers Conservation Area.
Impact upon the setting of nearby Grade II Listed Buildings	The size, scale and design of the proposed single storey rear extension to the house is acceptable in terms of the setting of nearby listed buildings.
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties	The proposed single storey rear extension would not result in any harmful loss of amenity due to a reduction in light or loss of privacy for any nearby properties or neighbours.

## 5.0 Description of Site

The site is located in the middle of Worth Matravers, within the Worth Matravers settlement policy boundary, the Worth Matravers Conservation Area and the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The property includes a detached house that dates from the 1960s and has walls constructed of Purbeck Stone. Along the west (side) elevation of the house there is a single storey extension that projects beyond the rear wall of the house by approximately 4.4m. To the front of the house there is an area of hard surfacing for the parking of vehicles. Immediately to the rear of the house there is a patio area and a substantially sized garden beyond. Along the east (side) elevation of the rear garden there is some established planting. In terms of land levels, Misty Cottage is set on a plot that is higher than Rose Cottage to the east, a property that includes a Grade II Listed Building with a single storey extension on the west (side) elevation, to the east of the boundary with the application site.

Misty Cottage is set amongst a collection of dwellings of various ages, to the west of the Mill Pond within the centre of the village.

## 6.0 Description of Development

Planning permission is sought to construct a single storey extension on the rear elevation of the house.

## 7.0 Relevant Planning History

310954 - In August 1965 planning permission was granted for the construction of the house.

313274 - In May 1968 planning permission was granted for the construction of a vehicular access.

6/1984/0024 - In March 1984 planning permission was granted for the construction of a single storey extension on the rear of the single storey element on the west (side) elevation of the house.

6/1986/0563 - In October 1986 planning permission was granted for the construction of a single storey extension in the form of a porch on the front of the single storey element on the west (side) elevation.

6/1989/1090 - In January 1990 planning permission was granted for the construction of a porch positioned centrally on the front elevation of the house.

## 8.0 List of Constraints

The site is within the Worth Matravers settlement policy boundary.

The site is within the parish of Worth Matravers.

The site is within the Worth Matravers Conservation Area. There is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The site is within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There is a statutory protection in order to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of such landscapes under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act of 2000.

Adjacent to the site is a Grade II Listed Building, Rose Cottage, also nearby is Cobblers Cottage another Grade II Listed Building. There is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

## 9.0 Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website.

- **Design and Conservation Officer**

The proposals have been reviewed carefully and in relation to the Worth Matravers Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted September 2009).

Despite the extensive views of the rear gardens of this group of properties, it is considered that the proposed rear extension does not harm this aspect any more than the existing extension.

The proposed rear extension is not contrary to guidance and not considered to be of poor design, indeed contrasting modern design is often the preferred

choice for heritage locations. The sensitive use of the palette of materials is how the sympathetic blend is achieved.

On this basis there is no objection to the proposed rear extension.

On further clarification, the Design and Conservation Officer has confirmed that the proposed rear extension does not harm the setting of either the Worth Matravers Conservation Area or adjacent listed building. He also confirms that the proposals would be an enhancement.

- **Worth Matravers Parish Council**

The Parish Council object to the proposals.

The historic and positive characteristics of the village are described and it is then confirmed that the proposals are not in accordance with the Worth Matravers Conservation Area Appraisal, further that they do not improve or enhance the conservation area or the setting of the two adjacent listed buildings.

Concerns are raised regarding the size and design of the proposed single storey rear extension in terms of the surroundings, impact upon nearby properties, views from Worth Green and the impact upon the Worth Matravers Conservation Area. Concern is raised in respect of light pollution from the rooflights within the proposed extension.

### **Representations received**

Many objections have been received from neighbours and nearby residents with some commenting more than once.

<b>Issue</b>
<p>Some comments have been received from the occupants of Rose Cottage, plus several sets of comments from a planning agent and a barrister on their behalf.</p> <p>Reference is made to Rose Cottage being more than 1.6 metres lower than Misty Cottage, therefore the extension would be approximately 5.0 metres above their garden, on the boundary and with a floor to roof window, albeit frosted, sited over the patio, garden and main access to Rose Cottage.</p> <p>It is stated that the proposed extension would result in a property that is out of keeping with neighbouring properties, the central position that the property occupies and the character of the Worth Matravers Conservation Area.</p> <p>Confirmation is given that the “..overbearing and harmful impact of this proposal on the character and setting of both these listed cottages needs to be taken into consideration, especially given the elevated position that it would</p>

command”.

Regarding the centre of the village and the Worth Matravers Conservation Area, concern is expressed that the proposed extension would change the view from the duck pond and that the proposed rooflights and sedum roof are out of keeping with the historic surroundings. Reference is also made to the proposed rooflights causing light pollution, to the bedrooms of Rose Cottage and the entire centre of the village from the elevated position.

The comments from the agent, SETPLAN, make the point that conservation areas and listed buildings are designated heritage assets and detail how they consider the proposed single storey extension varies from a single storey rear extension that may be constructed as ‘permitted development’, without the need for planning permission.

It is stated that because Misty Cottage adjoins Rose Cottage that it “forms a physical and visual part of the listed buildings setting”. It is also stated that “The modernistic forms, detailing and materials of the rear extension are not sympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or of the conservation area, forming a discordant element in the conservation area harmful to the setting of the adjoining listed building”.

The comments from the barrister make reference to the legal requirements under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building, the preservation or enhancement of the character and appearance of the conservation area and requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Mention is made that the proposals would be within the setting of the listed building (Rose Cottage) and that the comments of the Council’s Design and Conservation Officer accept or discount the harm, that in implicitly accepting the harm there is no consideration given to public benefits and that with the proposals being within the setting of the listed building no consideration has been given to public benefits.

It is stated that the application is not accompanied by a planning or heritage statement to deal with the impact of the proposal in terms of the conservation area or nearby listed buildings.

Finally it is suggested that another officer or external consultant be invited to consider the proposals on behalf of the Council “to avoid an appearance, or the reality, of pre-determination”.

Some comments have been received from an occupant of Cobblers Cottage, the property positioned slightly further to the east of the site.

Concerns are raised in respect of the size of the proposed extension, that it would be up to the boundary with Rose Cottage and dominate this eighteenth century building. Reference is made to the extension being higher than is necessary. Reference is made to Misty Cottage being overlooked from the village green and that the size and elevation of the proposed extension is such that it is adverse to the preservation and enhancement of the village. In the second letter reference is made to the opaque window being out of keeping, that the rooflights will result in light pollution and that due to the impact upon the setting of the listed building it would be contrary to Planning Policy Statement 6.

Two sets of comments have been received from the occupants of Orchard Cottage in Worth Matravers. Confirmation is given that they have no objection in principle to an extension, but consider that the extension is too large and will have an impact upon the neighbours and the view from the pond.

Some comments have been received from an occupant of Post Office Cottage. They confirm that such an extension may be acceptable elsewhere, however it would be out of place within the village and conservation area, further new plans should be submitted for what will be in view from the very public areas of the village.

Comments from an occupant of Pond View state that the proposals are out of character and unsympathetic to the surrounding dwellings, contravening the conservation area.

Two sets of comments have been received from an occupant of Wynderly. It is stated that the extension is quite large, would overlook the property next door and be visible from the village green. It is suggested that the extension could be set at a lower level and the planting replaced along the east side to mitigate some of the impact.

Some comments have been received from the occupants of number 1 London Row. Concern is expressed in respect of the impact upon the character of the area, plus the potential for overlooking of the rear gardens of the properties in London Row from the extension and terrace.

The occupants of Cressy confirm their objection to the size of the proposed extension within the conservation area.

Two sets of comments have been received from an occupant of The Croft in Winspit Road. It is stated that the existing extension to Misty Cottage is detailed as a negative element within the Worth Matravers Conservation Area Appraisal and that the proposed extension would have a major impact upon Rose Cottage and be unsympathetic to the neighbourhood and the principles of the Worth Matravers Conservation Area.

Two sets of comments have been received from some occupants of Cornerways, Winspit Road. It is stated that any extension is likely to be visible from the green and therefore needs to be in keeping with the surroundings, but that this extension would be large, out of character with the surrounding buildings and “damage the historic cottage feel of the heart of this beautiful village”. Within the second set of comments reference is made to the proposals being contrary to the Worth Matravers Conservation Area Appraisal.

Two sets of comments have been received from some people in Rudgwick (Horsham). The first comments refer to the size, scale, design and choice of materials and the negative impact the proposals would have upon the nearby dwellings, the village green and the conservation area. In the second comments concern is expressed regarding light pollution from the proposed rooflights within the conservation area.

Some comments have been received from someone in Yarnton (Kidlington). Concern is expressed regarding the impact of the proposed extension upon neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

Some comments have been received from an occupant of St Nicholas Court. These confirm that the proposals will have no impact upon their property.

## 10.0

### Relevant Policies

#### Purbeck Local Plan Part 1:

Policy LD: General location of development

Policy D: Design

Policy LHH: Landscape, historic environment and heritage.

#### Emerging Purbeck Local Plan

No relevant policies.

#### National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places

- Paragraph 127 (subsection c) - Achieving well-designed places

“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: ... are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change...”

Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

- Paragraph 184 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

- Paragraphs 190 and 192 (subsection c) – Proposals affecting heritage assets

“In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: ... the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness”.

- Paragraph 193 – Considering potential impacts

“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...”.

#### Other material considerations

Worth Matravers Conservation Area Appraisal (adopted September 2009)

Purbeck District Design Guide (supplementary planning document, adopted January 2014)

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide

### **11.0 Human rights**

Article 6 - Right to a fair trial.

Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life and home.

The first protocol of Article 1 Protection of property.

This recommendation is based on adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.

### **12.0 Public Sector Equalities Duty**

As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have “due regard” to this duty. There are 3 main aims:-

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people
- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove or minimise disadvantage and in

considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the Public Sector Equalities Duty.

The property includes a two storey dwelling and the proposal is a single storey rear extension to form additional accommodation for this dwelling.

### 13.0 Financial benefits

What	Amount / value
Material Considerations	
None	
Non Material Considerations	
None	

### 14.0 Climate Implications

The proposal is for a single storey extension on the rear elevation of an existing two storey dwelling. On this basis the proposal is not considered to have any significant climate implications.

### 15.0 Planning Assessment

#### Principle of development

The site is located within the Worth Matravers settlement policy boundary and includes an existing two storey dwelling. The proposal is for the construction of a single storey extension on the rear of the house, consequently there is no objection in principle to the proposed extension, subject to the consideration of all other material planning considerations.

#### Size, scale, design and impact on the character and appearance of the area and the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

The proposed rear extension is a single storey addition that would project beyond the rear wall of the house by approximately 4.4 metres, with a height of approximately 3.3 metres to the top of the flat roof and a height to the top of the rooflights of approximately 4.0 metres. Regarding the existing dwelling, this is a two storey house and the proposed extension is single storey with a roof that although of sedum, would be flat, thus ensuring that the size and scale of the proposed extension is not excessive in relation to the dwelling or the site.

The proposed single storey extension would have walls constructed of Purbeck stone, the same as the existing house and many of the properties nearby, therefore a material that would appear acceptable in terms of the character of the area. Regarding the roof of the proposed extension, this would be of sedum and although a different choice of material, would not appear intrusive in relation to

the site or the character of the area. Similarly although the proposed extension includes a collection of rooflights, these would not appear intrusive in relation to the site or the character of the area.

Within the proposed extension it is intended to include a circular window and some bi-fold doors within the rear (south) elevation and a vertical window within the east (side) elevation. These doors and windows would be constructed of timber and the circular window on the rear elevation would include some detailing around it. With the bi-fold doors and circular window at ground floor level and facing into the rear garden, this design approach would appear acceptable in terms of the property and the character of the area. Similarly the plain vertical timber window within the east (side) elevation would appear acceptable.

The size, scale and design of the proposed single storey rear extension is such that this would not have an impact upon the character of the wider Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

**The impact of the proposals on the significance of the heritage asset, the Worth Matravers Conservation Area, the features of special architectural or historical interest and the preservation of the conservation area**

The Council has a statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) to pay special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas when considering applications.

Misty Cottage is located within the centre of Worth Matravers, occupying a prominent position within the Worth Matravers Conservation Area and visible from the area of the Mill Pond, located to the East of the site. On this basis although Misty Cottage is comparatively modern compared to many of the nearby dwellings, most of which are listed buildings, the position of the application site is such that this is a sensitive location and careful consideration has been required in terms of the proposals.

There is an existing single storey extension on the western side of the property. This projects beyond the rear wall of the dwelling by approximately 4.4m. This existing extension has a pitched roof and is approximately 3.6m. The proposed extension is to project to the rear by approximately 4.3m and have a flat roof with a height of approximately 3.1m. The proposed extension would therefore be seen against the backdrop of the existing pitched roof extension, when viewed from public viewpoints to the east of the site in the area of the Mill Pond. As such the Design and Conservation Officer does not consider that the proposal would result in any harm to the Conservation Area, indeed it is considered to be an enhancement over and above the existing extension. As officers consider that the proposals would not result in any harm and preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, there is no requirement to assess the level

of harm or whether there are any public benefits as detailed under Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Due to topography, the land slopes down towards the South and Pikes Lane, vegetation and existing out buildings there are limited views from Pikes Lane. Similarly the site cannot be seen from the West.

The size and scale of the proposed single storey rear extension in relation to the two storey house and the size of the site is acceptable.

Regarding the design, the proposed extension would have walls constructed of Purbeck stone and in combination with the sedum roof and rooflights over, although of a contrasting modern design, the proposed extension on the rear of this house constructed around the 1960s would appear sufficiently sympathetic within the historic setting of the Worth Matravers Conservation Area. The proposed single storey rear extension would be visible from the Mill Pond, as is the extension on the western side of the property. However the choice of materials is such that in combination with the design the proposed extension would preserve the appearance of the Worth Matravers Conservation Area. Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework confirms that “Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments ... are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change...”. This is also confirmed within the Worth Matravers Conservation Appraisal, for this states in respect of conservation area designation “While bringing some added controls the object of designation is not to prohibit change or development but rather to manage its quality and contextual appropriateness”.

Regarding the potential for light pollution from the rooflights proposed to be inserted within the roof, the dwelling is a two storey house that includes glazing at ground floor and first floor, as such the inclusion of rooflights within a ground floor extension could not reasonably be discouraged on the basis of light pollution even within an area where there is no street lighting. Consequently there is no justification to secure a change to the proposals on this basis.

In conclusion, officers consider that the proposal is not harmful to the character or appearance of the Worth Matravers Conservation due to the proposed extension.

Therefore officers consider that the proposals comply with Policies LHH of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Impact upon the setting of nearby Grade II Listed Buildings**

The Council has a statutory duty under section 66 (1) (when considering whether or not to grant planning permission) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed buildings or its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Consideration has been given to the impact of the proposed single storey rear extension upon Rose Cottage and Cobblers Cottage. Rose Cottage and Cobblers Cottage are Grade II Listed Buildings, with Rose Cottage being located adjacent the application site, to the east and due to changes in land levels it is set at a lower level than the site, but within the centre of a village and developed area.

Due to Rose Cottage and Cobblers Cottage being set within a developed area and the nature of the alterations, the proposed single storey rear extension on this two storey dwelling, the Design and Conservation Officer considers that the proposal, would not have a detrimental impact, but preserve the setting of the Grade II Listed Buildings. Therefore officers consider that the proposals comply with Policies LHH of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Impact on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties**

Misty Cottage is a detached house. However due to the fact that land levels slope downwards from west to east, plus downwards from north to south, the application site is set higher than Rose Cottage, the property to the east. On this basis careful consideration has been required in respect of any impact of the proposed single storey rear extension on the property and occupants of Rose Cottage and other nearby properties. In order that the fullest consideration could be given to amenity and privacy issues for nearby properties, especially Rose Cottage, a visit was undertaken to this property on 28 June 2019.

Of the various properties near to the application site the main property and neighbours for consideration are at Rose Cottage. On the west (side) of Rose Cottage there is a single storey element, including an extension that dates from around the late 1970s. Within the single storey element on the west side there is a window within the west elevation, a window that is positioned at the northern end. The position of the window within this part of Rose Cottage is such that the proposed rear extension for Misty Cottage would not result in any loss of amenity due to a reduction in light or loss of privacy for this neighbouring property.

The proposed single storey rear extension would project beyond the rear of Rose Cottage. However on the basis that the proposed extension is a single storey

addition on the rear of the house, despite the fact that Misty Cottage is set on land that is higher than Rose Cottage, the proposed extension would not result in any harmful loss of amenity due to a reduction in light either for the dwelling due to the position of the glazing within Rose Cottage. Also the proposals would not result in a harmful loss of light to Rose Cottage's garden due to the open nature of the garden. Regarding privacy, the proposed window within the east (side) elevation is intended to be of obscure glass. In order to ensure the continued privacy of the property and neighbours at Rose Cottage, any grant of planning permission would include a condition to ensure the level of obscurity for the side glazing, that this window remains fixed shut and a condition to prevent the insertion of any further windows, doors or openings within the east (side) elevation of the rear extension. Additionally in terms of the existing context it is noted that there is a first floor window within the east (side) elevation of Misty Cottage.

In terms of the impact of the proposed single storey rear extension upon the path to the side and rear garden of Rose Cottage, although the position of the extension would be set at a higher level than Rose Cottage due to the higher ground levels, the size of the extension is such that this would not be over bearing and therefore would not justify a change to the proposals or refusal of the application. Regarding the glazing within the rear (south) elevation of the proposed extension, this would provide views that are predominantly of the rear garden of the application site, with more limited and oblique views of the gardens to either side.

Cobblers Cottage is set further away from the application site and as such the proposed rear extension would not result in any loss of amenity due to a reduction in light or loss of privacy for this property or the occupants. With regard to Orchard Cottage (Braemar) immediately to the west of the application site, the existing extension along the western side of Misty Cottage is such that the proposed extension would adjoin this in such a manner that it would not result in any loss of amenity due to a reduction in light or loss of privacy for this property or the occupants.

With regard to the properties to the south in London Row, although these are set at a lower level than the application site, there is an intervening distance of approximately 22 metres between the proposed single storey rear extension and the rear garden of the closest, number 1 London Row. Additionally there is a road between the rear garden of Misty Cottage and the rear garden of number 1 London Row.

Regarding the potential for light pollution from the rooflights proposed to be inserted within the roof, the dwelling is a two storey house that includes glazing at ground floor and first floor, as such the inclusion of rooflights within a ground

floor extension could not reasonably be discouraged on the basis of light spillage towards a neighbouring property.

## **16.0 Conclusion**

The proposed development is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, the wider views within the Conservation Area, the setting of listed buildings, or the amenity of the neighbouring residents. Therefore the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

## **17.0 Recommendation**

To grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out below.

1. The development must start within three years of the date of this permission.  
Reason: This is a mandatory condition imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to encourage development to take place at an early stage.
2. The development permitted must be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing number 17184.20, drawing number 17184.24, drawing number 17184.25, drawing number 17184.22, drawing number 17184.23, drawing number 17184.26, drawing number 17184.27 and drawing number 17184.21 submitted as part of the application, plus drawing number 17184.31 A, drawing number 17184.28 B and drawing number 17184.32 A received on 22 August 2019, plus drawing number 17184.30 B, drawing number 17184.29 A and drawing number 17184.33 B received on 29 August 2019.  
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. Before the single storey rear extension is brought into use, the glazing within the east (side) elevation must be glazed with obscure glass to a minimum Pilkington privacy level 3, or equivalent as agreed in writing with the Council and permanently fixed shut. This window / glazed element must be permanently maintained in that condition.  
Reason: To safeguard the amenity and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining residential property.
4. No further windows, doors or openings will be constructed or inserted within the east (side) elevation of the single storey rear extension.  
Reason: To safeguard the amenity and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining residential property.
5. Informative Note - Matching Plans.  
Please check that any plans approved under the building regulations match the plans approved in this planning permission. Do not start work until revisions are secured to either of the two approvals to ensure that the development has the required planning permission.

6. Statement of positive and proactive working:

In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council takes a positive and creative approach to development proposals focused on solutions. The Council works with applicants / agents in a positive and proactive manner by; offering a pre-application advice service, and as appropriate updating applicants / agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

For this application: the applicant / agent was updated of any issues after the initial site visit; the opportunity to submit amendments to the scheme / address issues was given which were found to be acceptable.