|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Signed:** | **Officer:** | **KH** | | | | **Date:** | **26/04/24** | **Manager:** | | **LH** | **Date:** | **26/4/24** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Application Ref:** | | | 3/2022/1143 | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Date Inspected:** | | | 05/01/23 | | | | | |
| **Publicity Expired** | | | 02/02/23 | | | | | |
| **Officer:** | | | KH | | | | | |
| **DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:** | | | | | | | | | **APPROVAL** | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Development Description:** | | | | | Proposed external and internal alterations including the replacement of a conservatory with a new extension. Resubmission of 3/2022/0839. | | | | | | | |
| **Site Address/Location:** | | | | | Waddington Hall, Clitheroe Road, Waddington BB7 3HP | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Parish/Town Council** | | | | | | | |
| No response. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies** | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Highways:** | | | | |  | | | | | | | |
| No objections. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **LCC Archaeology:** Some of the documentation appears to be the same as the previous submission.  The potential impact on buried remains appears to be limited to a site which has already been disturbed by the erection of the extant 1990’s conservatory. As such it is not considered that any formal archaeological intervention will be necessary.  The majority of the works proposed appear to have only minor impacts on the architectural and heritage significance of the standing building. It is notable, however, that a full plan and elevations showing the locations of all the proposed works, including a key to the proposed window and door works, has not been provided. No details of the proposed works to the rear north east facing gable windows has been provided nor is it clear what date the existing window surrounds are. These omissions should be made good prior any decision.  We would recommend that the existing internal entrance hall door and its frame are inspected in some detail to try and confirm the suggestion in the Heritage Statement that this door is of c.1900 date. If the door or the associated opening is considered to pre-date the 1900 refurbishment/rebuilding of the hall, then the impact of its replacement on the structure and appearance of the building will need to be considered.  Where the proposed secondary glazing panels will be placed across the pre-1900 windows, it is recommended that he frames are not let into any dressed stonework and that as far as possible all fixing are made with non-corrosive materials (e.g. stainless steel) set into existing joints. The detailed design of the glazing units should seek to avoid causing any deterioration of internal faces of historic stonework due to changes in temperatures or moisture levels in the gap between the extant windows and new units.  The proposed use of mirrored glass in black metal ‘Critall’ framed doors and windows to the garage/car port will not directly impact historic fabric but has potential to make a significant adverse impact on the visual appearance and setting of the northern and western sides when viewed from the adjacent public highway, as well as to impact the appearance of the Conservation Area. It is recommended that this detail is reconsidered.  The Heritage Statement includes a section on mitigation Some further details will need to be provided and agreed as part of any mitigation strategy. Some building recording is suggested and whilst we have no objection to this, it might be in the applicant’s interest to have a full Level 3 record of the historic (1900 and earlier) section of the building, to inform the management and maintenance of the structure and any future development proposals.  A copy of any record should be submitted to the LPA and to the Lancashire Historic Environment Record. The recording work should be undertaken prior to site works commencing and may be required by planning condition. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CONSULTATIONS:** | | | | | **Additional Representations.** | | | | | | | |
| Cadent Gas – No objection, informative note required. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No public responses received. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ribble Valley Core Strategy:**  Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy  Key Statement DS2 – Sustainable Development  Key Statement EN5 - Heritage Assets  Policy DMG1 – General Considerations  Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations  Policy DME2 – Landscape & Townscape Protection  Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets  National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  Waddington Conservation Area Appraisal 2005  Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Relevant Planning History:**  3/2022/1144 – LBC Proposed external and internal alterations including the replacement of a conservatory with a new extension. Resubmission of 3/2022/0889 – Pending.  3/2022/0889 – LBC Proposed external and internal alterations including the replacement of a conservatory with a new extension – Withdrawn.  3/2022/0839 – PP Proposed external and internal alterations including the replacement of a conservatory with a new extension – Withdrawn.  3/1997/0508 – PP Conversion of old service courtyard into indoor swimming pool (Modification to approved plans 3/96/0010) – Approved.  3/1997/0509 – LBC Conversion of old service courtyard into indoor swimming pool (Modification to approved plans 3/96/0011) – Approved.  3/1996/0010 – PP Convert existing outbuilding into swimming pool with changing room, steam room etc – Approved.  3/1996/0011 – LBC Change of use from domestic garages into swimming pool, changing rooms etc – Approved.  There have also been various applications for tree works. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**  The application relates to Waddington Hall which is Grade II Listed and prominently sited within Waddington Conservation Area, and also lies within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty).  The Hall has two-storeys with attic rooms faced in sandstone rubble with stone slate roof. The former stables and outbuildings sited to the western side are currently used for ancillary accommodation and a leisure pool.  The site entrance is to the west of the building with access driveway, parking and courtyard with the main residential curtilage being to the side (south) and rear (east) elevations.  The site is accessed from Clitheroe Road immediately adjacent to the site to the west with public footpath 3-43-FP 24 sited to the south and runs immediately adjacent to the southern boundary of the site.  There are residential properties and Waddington Arms located to the north, open fields to the east, residential properties to the south and St Helen’s Church (Grade II\* Listed) to the west across Waddington Brook and the highway. Waddington War Memorial also Grade II listed sited to the south west. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposed Development for which consent is sought:**  The application seeks to carry out a number of interventions in the building, which include the following.     * The installation of secondary glazing to 13 windows with bronze casement windows with double-glazed units. * Replacement of ground floor entrance hall / porch door with a new bronze glazed door. * Alterations to the existing modern garage to form garage and home gym. * Conversion of the entrance porch leading from the external courtyard to the modern pool building into a shower room. * Demolition of existing modern conservatory and erection of a new single storey garden room extension. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Principle of Development:**  The building is located within the defined settlement of Waddington.  Whilst the principle of the development for a single storey extension on a domestic property would be acceptable subject to design and materials, the potential impact on the listed building and conservation area would need to be considered in terms of size, siting, design and materials and fully accord with local development strategy for the borough and the National Planning Policy Framework. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact Upon Residential Amenity:**  The internal alterations proposed would not result in any due impacts on nearest properties.  The nearest residential property is Wadda Cottage which lies c24m from the nearest elevation of the Hall to the north and 52 West View which is sited c25m from the nearest elevation to the south. No.’s 20 and 22 Waddow Grove are located to the south and have front elevations looking towards the southern (side) boundary of the site.  The proposed rear extension would replace one of a similar size and would in any respect be sufficient distance away at over 50m from the nearest properties, with extensive grounds and boundary treatments as well as other built form in between, and therefore would not result in any undue impacts upon residential amenity.  As such, it is considered that the proposal does not conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy in this respect. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Visual Amenity/External Appearance:**  The proposed single storey rear extension would replace the existing modern conservatory and in terms of footprint would be similar in size to the existing. The proposed extension would measure 8.875m x 4.396m with the height now reduced to 2.95m.  Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy states that all development must ‘*be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing and style’* and *‘not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area’.*  Taking account of the above, it is considered that the proposal would be appropriate in terms of footprint and would not be overly prominent from public viewpoints. There would be some views of the property from the Public Footpath 24 to the south, this would be at a distance of approximately 40m and therefore would not result in any undue harm to the visual amenities of the area.  The installation of the secondary glazing to 13 windows would be visually acceptable subject to appropriate conditions relating to materials and methodology.  The replacement front/porch door is considered to be acceptable as it appears to have been a later replacement subject to the details of the materials and design being submitted as a glazed replacement is unlikely to be acceptable.  The alteration to the garage from a home gym, entrance porch to shower room and proposed glazing to those elements have been proposed with Crittall frames to the glazed elements (thin steel usually of a dark colour) within a grid frame. These elements are acceptable subject to non-reflective glass installed and thin black/dark grey Crittall steel. This can be controlled by an appropriate condition.  The removal of the render to the c.1900 extension and the installation of stone jambs, heads and cills to the first floor has been removed from the scheme with the render now being retained. This is acceptable and reduces the potential harm.  The scheme, as amended, now address the aims and objectives of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy together with Paragraph 135 of the NPPF in terms of visual impact. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Impact on Heritage Assets:**  The application property is Grade II Listed (List Entry 1072159) with the listing details reading as follows:  *House, possibly early C17th remains, rebuilt C1900. Sandstone rubble with stone slate roof. H-plan. At the west the cross-wings project forward to form a courtyard. Both have gables with copings and the 3 walls facing the courtyard are topped by a balustrade with square balusters. The right hand cross-wing has buttresses. On the ground floor is a 2-light mullioned window with inner hallow chamfer and out chamfer. On the 1st floor is an early C18th cross window with an inner chamfer and an outer cyma-moulded surround. Above is a 2-light mullioned attic window of c,1900. All the windows of the left hand cross- wing appear to be of c.1900. On the ground floor is a 5-light mullioned window with Tudor-arched heads to the lights. On the first floor is a 10-light mullioned and transomed window. The attic has a 2-light mullioned window. The central section has a 2-light mullioned window with inner ovolo and outer rebate. To its right is a one-light window with moulded surround. On the first floor are 2 2-light double-chamfered mullioned windows, re-tolled and with cinquefoiled ogee heads to the lights. These are probably re-used from elsewhere. Across the angle with then right-hand cross-wing is a moulded doorway with Tudor-arched head. Above is a carved coat of arms under a shaped coping. At the rear all the windows appear to be of c.1900, in keeping. The south cross-wing has a 2-storey canted bay window. The south wall of this cross-wing has a C17th mullioned window of 4 lights within inner ovolo and outer chamfer. Interior not fully inspected, but rear of hall has wooden doorway with ogee head, probably C17th.*  Given the proposal relates to a Grade II Designated Heritage Asset, special regard must also be given to the statutory duties imposed on the authority, pursuant to national legislation, particularly in respect of the preservation and enhancement of such assets.  The principle statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by s.58B (1) of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023) is to preserve or enhance the special character of heritage assets, including their setting. As such, in determining applications that affect designated heritage assets, the authority must consider the duties contained within the principle Act which states the following;  **Listed Buildings – Section 66(1) (as amended by s.58B of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023):**  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 or enhancing the building or its setting. Under s.58B (2) this includes preserving or enhancing any feature, quality or characteristic of the asset or setting that contributes to the significance of the asset.  **Listed buildings - Section 16 (2) (as amended by s.58B of Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023):**  In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works to a listed building the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the building. Under s.58B (2) this includes preserving or enhancing any feature, quality or characteristic of the asset or setting that contributes to the significance of the asset.  The site is also within Waddington Conservation Area as such Section 72 of the above legislation is also relevant.  The National planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out further duties in respect of determining proposals that affect heritage assets stating that ‘i*n determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation’.*  The Framework sets out further duties in respect of considering potential impacts upon designated heritage assets with Paragraphs 205 – 214.  Significance, as defined by the NPPF, is the value of a heritage asset which derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. The setting of a heritage asset is the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced.  The works proposed include internal works to provide secondary glazing to some of the windows and replacement and new doors as well as replacing the existing conservatory extension to the rear with a single storey extension.  The building has been in use since the early Medieval period and has architectural and historical values that make it a significant building of national importance. Therefore an archaeological recording of the whole site would be appropriate.   The installation of secondary glazing throughout the house   It was noted which windows are being considered to receive secondary glazing with a window schedule and sample images having been submitted. From the information submitted the windows are those in the Drawing Room, Main Reception Hall, and Morning Room on the ground floor, and the Garden Room, Kings Room, and Master Suite on the first floor of the earlier part of the building, as well as the Guest Suite in the early 20th century extension. These windows are in the southwest and northeast elevations of the building. All except one are mullion windows and two of these (W5 and W6) have modern internal shutters.  The submitted Heritage Statement refers to improving “*thermal and energy efficiency of the windows, which are often the least efficient elements of a building and will contribute to the improved comfort of the internal living environment*”.    Secondary glazing, when designed appropriately and in a way that respects the character and appearance of a historic building, is beneficial for achieving an energy-efficient building. In order to not cause any harm to the significance of the building, secondary glazing should be plain, and if with sub-divisions, these should follow existing lines. They often do not require LBC. In its current state, however, further information on how the windows will be fitted into the window reveals especially with two of the windows having shutters. Details including highlighting these windows on a plan of the whole building as well as elevation drawings, window profiles and cross-sections showing how the secondary glazing will be fitted has now been provided. This will ensure that the secondary glazing design does not cause any damage to the fabric of the historic building, cause visual harm and prevent any future problems.  The submitted drawings show that secondary glazing (double-glazed) will be fitted into the window reveals with no internal glazing bars. The width of the secondary glazing window frames will match the width of the existing mullions and there will be no glazing bars. The appearance of this solution is acceptable because they will not be visible from the exterior of the building and will not cause irreversible damage to the fabric of the building.  Therefore, subject to a condition requiring further details of the installation of the secondary glazing for the two shuttered windows and conditions relating to the submitted design, materials and methodology this would be acceptable.    In relation to the thermal performance/energy efficiency of the building, a more holistic (whole house) approach should be sought that considers the building in its entirety and takes into account all the factors affecting energy use. This is also Historic England’s advice, which refers to it as an all-encompassing and integrated “*whole building approach*”, which “…*seeks the best balance between saving energy, maintaining a healthy indoor environment and sustaining heritage significance, all by understanding the building in its context*” (Energy Efficiency and Traditional Homes: Historic England Advice Note 14, p.8). Implementing a single option, in this case secondary glazing, may not be fully beneficial for thermal efficiency if other factors causing thermal loss are not being considered at the same time.   Replacement of an internal door   This is an internal door, which has batons the same as a door in another room in the property. According to a report provided by an antiques dealer, the handles, locks and hinges on these doors are original and date to the early 20th century. The report states that the door and its casing date to the early 20th century. This would correspond to when the building was extensively altered in that period. This suggests that this particular door was in this location when the building was listed in 1954 and therefore forms part of the historic fabric of the building. The door is in good condition so the intervention appears to be for cosmetic purposes. Whilst replacing the door is harmful to the significance of the building, the harm its impact on the significance on the building as whole as being on a negligible scale. Whilst not ideal this can be justified subject to an appropriate replacement being agreed by condition. The proposed finish would not be acceptable as it would be too shiny and therefore a more restrained finish would be appropriate and can be conditioned in this case.   Alterations to the existing modern garage to form garage and home gym   The existing garage building is modern, inserted in the 1990s. The proposal seeks to repurpose the northern bay to the garage as a home gym, which will require this bay to be separated from the other two bays of the garage (these will continue to be in use as a garage). The garage openings were proposed to be infilled with black, *Crittall* framed doors with mirrored glass for privacy/security purposes. The existing opening which would form part of the gym will also be infilled with fixed *Crittall* framed windows, also with mirrored glass.    Whilst there is no objection to the use of one bay as a home gym and to the infill of the bays with *Crittall* framed windows. The thickness of the frames in the garage bays was quite prominent and slightly interfered with the appearance of the building. More importantly the use of mirrored glass would be a modern insertion which alters the appearance of this part of the historic building, particularly as these elevations are visible from the public highway. This intervention would have been harmful to the character and appearance of the building. The harm has been mitigated by the use of plain glass and slim frames which is now acceptable subject to appropriate conditions.   Conversion of entrance porch leading from the external courtyard to the modern pool building into a shower room   The proposal seeks to internally close the existing external door from the north courtyard leading into the swimming pool and to repurpose the porch as a shower room. The external door is to be retained. As the door and the doorway will remain in place there are no objections to this intervention.   Conversion of existing plant room to form plant room and wine store   The proposal sought to divide the existing boiler room, which is in the c.1900 extension, into a plant room and wine store. This is to be achieved by opening a door within the southern wall of the utility room, removing the majority of the northwestern wall of the boiler room and replacing it with a glazed wall and door. During the site visit it was possible to see that the walls of this room, along with the rest of this corridor, are of brick and are rendered in such a way that they form curved corners along the doorways. As it was not possible to see other parts of the house, it was not possible to tell whether this style is repeated elsewhere in the building but within this space, it is considered as a noteworthy architectural feature. The proposed intervention would remove one such door and replace it with a glazed wall and door. Whilst there would be no objections to opening a door in the wall separating the utility room and the boiler room, the proposed intervention to insert a glass wall and door is not justified here.  This element has now been removed from the scheme which is acceptable. Demolition of existing modern conservatory and erection of new single storey garden room extension   The proposal seeks to replace the existing conservatory with a new extension that is “in the style of an orangery of a loose Georgian appearance”, which will serve as a garden room. The extension will be faced with cut ashlar stonework with carved string course to the parapet roof. The roof will be flat and will have a roof lantern. The windows and doors are to be *Crittall-framed* with double glazed units. The 8.8m x 4.4m extension would have a proposed height of 3.2m to the top of the parapet and 3.8m to the top of the roof lantern. The northern elevation will be fitted with an ashlar stone chimney that serves as the internal fireplace.    The existing conservatory is a green-coloured timber frame over a masonry wall with a canted front. It is a modern construct with a pitched roof that is level with the lower edge of the first floor window in the Guest Suite and is level with the pitched roof of the adjacent stone building (c.1900 extension used as the boiler and utility room) and the glazed walls of the existing conservatory are at a lower level. These aspects of the extension enable it to be obviously modern without cluttering or hindering the appreciation of the historic building.    There is no objection to replacing the existing conservatory, as it is not a historic feature (does not appear on historic maps) and does not have any architectural or historic value. Any replacement extension should be subsidiary and secondary to the main building. The footprint of the proposed extension does not present an issue as it is almost identical to the existing conservatory. The main issue was that, due to the introduction of a flat roof, the height of the proposed building would be level with the gable end of the adjoining c.1900 extension. The top of the roof lantern would be level with the adjoining pitch roof, however, because the proposed extension itself is flat-roofed, it would appear more prominent than the existing conservatory and would then compete with the historic building. Therefore the proposed extension would cause some degree of harm to the significance of the listed building. Whilst this harm as being at the low end of the *less than substantial* range.  The revised proposal retains the proposed flat roof but lowers the height of the building by 25cm (the parapet level down from 3.20m to 2.95m), levelling the top of the parapet with the top of the kneeler of the adjacent building. The adjusted height also lowers the level of the roof lantern and puts it at a lower level than the first-floor window, directly above, as well as the pitched roof of the adjacent building. Whilst I still feel that the design is rather cumbersome compared with the existing garden room, I do acknowledge that these changes are an improvement on the earlier proposal and any harm, in this respect, caused by this new extension would be negligible in scale.  As the harm has been mitigated by lowering the height of the parapet and roof lantern which results in a proposal which minimises its visual impact on the historic building and is now acceptable subject to appropriate conditions relating to the design, materials and methodology. Removal of render wall finishes to the c.1900 extension   The proposal sought to remove the existing render wall finish to the c.1900 extension and to expose the presumed stone walling below. The render finish is at the rear, on the ground floor (inside the existing conservatory) and on the first floor of the extension and matches those on the northwest elevation of the building. The submitted documents do not provide any information regarding to the date of the render. Without evidence to the contrary, I am inclined to consider that the wall was rendered when the building was listed; therefore, it forms part of the historic fabric of the building. I am not supportive of an intervention that would remove part of the historic fabric of a building purely for what appears to be cosmetic grounds, which is not a valid justification. In its current state, I would consider that this intervention would cause *less than substantial* (low end) to the significance of the building.  This element has now been removed from the scheme with the render to be retained. This is acceptable.   Installation of new stone jambs, heads and cills to the first-floor windows to the rear north east facing gable   The proposal sought to replace two timber frame, leaded casement windows of the dressing room and ensuite of the guest suite on the first-floor of the c.1900 extension. The purpose of the intervention is to have windows matching those elsewhere in the earlier building, which involves introducing stone heads, jambs and cills. The proposal does not provide information regarding the period of the windows in question. Without evidence to the contrary, I am inclined to consider them in place when the building was listed; therefore, they form part of the historic fabric of the building. During the site visit, it was possible to see that the timber frames showed slight signs of disrepair. In principle, we could not support an intervention that seeks to replace existing windows in order to match windows in other parts of the building. At present, this intervention would cause *less than substantial harm* to the significance of the building. These windows should be retained and appropriately repaired.  This element has now been removed with the render to be retained and the windows to be repaired which is acceptable.    Summary  In summary, parts of this proposal relate to creating a uniform look across the historic building. This is contrary to universal conservation principles particularly because different phases of historic buildings have values that contribute to the overall significance of a building. In this respect, interventions such as removing the render wall finish of the early 20th-century extension and installing stone jambs etc. to the first-floor window in the Guest Suite would not acceptable interventions. As these elements have now been removed, the scheme overall is acceptable and subject to appropriate conditions can be supported.    In this respect and taking account the proposed alterations, it is considered that the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the character and visual amenities of the Listed Building and that of the character of the designated Waddington Conservation Area.  The proposal can be balanced against any public benefit arising from the scheme and whilst this proposal is for an extension to a private residential dwelling there would be some benefits in work for local contractors as well as repairs to the building and more thermal efficiency measures which would be sufficient to outweigh the potential impacts and therefore the proposal accords with policies EN5 and DME4 as well as the NPPF including paragraphs 202 and 205. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:**  The duty imposed by the P(LBCA) Act 1990 has been given considerable weight.    I consider the current proposal would meet the statutory test ‘to preserve’ and whilst there would cause harm (identified as being at the low end of the *less than substantial* range – NPPF test) to the significance of the listed building this can be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme and as such, the proposal meets the objectives of the NPPF and accords with Policy DMG1 (General Consideration), Policy DME4 (Protecting Heritage Assets) and Key Statement Policy EN5 (Heritage Assets) of the Core Strategy.  As such, the proposal is considered to represent an appropriate form of development that would not result in undue harm to the character and visual amenities of the Grade II listed building and Waddington Conservation Area and therefore accords with Key Statement EN5 and policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 – 2028.  It is for the above reasons and having regard to all material considerations and matters raised that the application is recommended for approval. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECOMMENDATION**: | | | | That Planning Permission be approved subject to appropriate conditions. | | | | | | | | |