

Agenda Item	A7
Application Number	23/01409/FUL
Proposal	Demolition of existing service area single storey accommodation unit, erection of two storey extension to provide new service area and 2 replacement carehome bedrooms, new supported living unit comprising of 10 dwellings and associated communal space, alterations to car park and access
Application site	Cove House Cove Road Silverdale Carnforth
Applicant	Mrs C Humphreys
Agent	HPA Chartered Architects
Case Officer	Mr Patrick Hopwood
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval, subject to conditions

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 The site to which this application relates is Cove House residential care home in Silverdale. The main Victorian building, Cove House, is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). To the North of Cove House is Cove Orchard, an extra care (sheltered) housing development completed in 2013, for over 65s. The site is located within the Arnside & Silverdale National Landscape (formerly known as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, AONB).

1.2 The trees to the north of the site, around Cove Orchard, are covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The coastal strip of woodland immediately to the west is a Biological Heritage Site and Priority Habitat. The Morecambe Bay designated sites (SSSI, Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar) are approx. 40m to the west. The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 This application seeks planning permission for:

- demolition of existing service area/single storey accommodation unit;
- erection of two storey extension to provide:
 - new service area,
 - two replacement care home bedrooms (Use Class C2),
 - new supported living unit comprising of 10 dwellings (Use Class C3b) and
 - associated communal space; and,
- alterations to car park and access.

2.2 The proposed extension measures approx. 33m in length, 11.5m in width, 4.2m in height to the main eaves, and 7.8m maximum height. The supported housing block will comprise limestone-faced walls

under a slate mansard roof, with feature gables overlooking the lawn. This will be connected to Cove House by a glazed link extension with standing seam metal detailing, and this link extension will house the communal facilities. Cove House will also be extended to the northwest, in materiality and design to match the existing building, and this element will accommodate two care home bedrooms and replacement service areas.

3.0 Site History

3.1 A number of relevant applications relating to this site have previously been received by the Local Planning Authority. These include:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
08/01154/FUL	Erection of extra care housing comprising 14 no dwellings with car parking	Approved
22/00849/PRETWO	Pre application advice for the demolition of existing service area and bungalow and construction of new extension to provide 10 new bedrooms, living space and new service facilities with associated landscaping.	Advice Provided
24/00453/EIR	Screening opinion for demolition of existing service area single storey accommodation unit, erection of two storey extension to provide new service area and 2 replacement carehome bedrooms, new supported living unit comprising of 10 dwellings and associated communal space, alterations to car park and access	Environmental Statement Not Required

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 At the time of writing this report, the following responses have been received from statutory and internal consultees:

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	Supports with concerns. Concerns with architectural style and design, use of garden space, foul drainage, and additional traffic.
County Highways	No objection. The utilisation of the existing access point and proposed internal layout including parking provision and turning is acceptable.
Environmental Health	Recommends conditions for a contamination land watching brief and radon protection measures.
Natural England	No objection , subject to appropriate mitigation being secured.
Arnside & Silverdale National Landscape Partnership	Comments. The proposal does not comply with policy principles set out in the Arnside and Silverdale AONB regarding heritage and design. No objection to increase in care accommodation.
Lead Local Flood Authority	No objection , subject to conditions for final surface water sustainable drainage strategy and verification report.
Environment Agency	No objection , advice provided.
Conservation Officer	Cannot support the application. High level of harm to the significance of the building (NDHA), particularly through siting, form, and character of the proposal.
Arboricultural Officer	Objection. Development positioned close to mature trees, increased pressure on the trees. Drainage not considered within AIA.
Strategic Housing	Support and comments. The scheme will make a positive contribution to meeting local needs for specialist housing with care for an ageing population.
Commissioning Manager	Comments. The proposed units would help meet local housing needs demands for older people.
Planning Policy Officer (Landscape)	Comments. Main considerations are design and potential impact on landscape character and heritage. Only partial LVIA provided, and additional viewpoint required.
Engineering Team	No response received.
Waste & Recycling	No response received.
NHS	Comments. Financial contribution requested.

- 4.2 Three letters of objection have been received from members of the public, raising the following main points in relation to the application proposal:
- Location
 - Highway safety, transport and parking
 - Construction phase impacts
 - Loss of privacy
 - Loss of view
 - Design
 - Costs and level of staffing
 - Safety and security
 - Bin storage

5.0 Analysis

5.1 The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- Principle of Development and Housing Needs
- Design and Heritage
- Landscape Impacts
- Biodiversity and Trees
- Residential Amenity
- Drainage
- Highways
- Sustainability

5.2 Principle of Development and Housing Needs (NPPF Section 5; Policies AS03, DM1 and DM8)

5.2.1 Paragraph 63 of the NPPF requires local plans to reflect housing need for older people including those who require retirement housing, housing-with-care, and care homes. Policy AS03 encourages development proposals that provided for specific societal groups such as older or disabled people. Policy DM8 states that the Council will support the development of residential accommodation for older people subject to the relevant criteria being satisfied, which relate to housing needs, location, accessibility, support from County Council, car parking, and garden space. The adopted Homes Strategy 2020-2025 and last Housing Needs Study 2017 make it clear that the council needs to plan positively for an ageing population and wherever possible, seek to increase the housing with care and support offer in Lancaster district.

5.2.2 The Strategic Integrated Commissioning and Contracts Service Manager (Housing Specialist) at Lancashire County Council has confirmed that the proposal would help meet local housing needs demands for older people. The County Council's data shows that there were 783 people aged 65 or over living in Silverdale at the 2021 Census, 234 people aged 65 and over who are classed as disabled or who have had very bad health and 167 people aged over 65 living alone. The overarching Needs Assessment 2022 demonstrates a need for an additional 237 units of extra care in Lancaster and Morecambe Districts by 2028, these proposed additional units would help meet this demand.

5.2.3 The proposal is also supported by the City Council's Principal Housing Strategy Officer. Cove House is run by the Abbeyfield Silverdale Society, which forms part of the larger Abbeyfield federated Charity which provides housing, support and residential and dementia care to older people across the UK. Abbeyfield's offer is more bespoke and unique in contrast to other forms of sheltered and retirement housing in Lancaster district and provides a higher level of direct support to its residents by providing meals, cleaning and laundry services.

5.2.4 The proposed supported housing would provide an innovative form of housing for older people who would benefit from living in a supportive environment with well-staffed background support 7 days a week and with an on-call alarm service overnight but one which provides a higher support offer through the provision of meals and additional services. The units would be entirely tenure (rental) at an affordable level below market rate. Meals and living would be communal with catering from the Cove House kitchen, but with basic kitchenette facilities in each room for residents to use

independently and/or with support. Whilst the 10 new units proposed are not seeking to provide fully self-contained accommodation, the proposal would allow older persons to live semi-independently with support for as long as possible, and prevent early admission to a residential care setting.

5.2.5 Whilst Silverdale does contain shops, a doctors surgery and other community facilities, parts of the village lack pavement provision, and the site is over a 1km walk away from the village centre. The 51 bus route (Carnforth-Silverdale) passes the site entrance, however there is no traffic-free walking route to the nearest official bus stop at Holgates Caravan Park. These shortfalls are noted, however the principle of residential care and accommodation for older people at this site is well established. Criteria in Policy DM8 relating to housing standards, accessibility, garden space and highways will be assessed in later sections of this report.

5.2.6 In order to ensure that the proposal meets a genuine local housing need, a planning condition is required for the submission and approval of an occupancy and allocations scheme, which would expect priority to be given to older people in housing need and additional priority to those with a local connection to Silverdale and then surrounding rural parishes.

5.2.7 Furthermore, in relation to demolition and replacement of existing accommodation and ancillary buildings, these are no longer fit for purpose and the modern replacement facilities for the main care home will result in an improvement which is supported by the Local Plan and the relevant national guidance.

5.2.8 In summary, it is recognised that there is demand for supported housing with care locally, and the proposal would clearly help meet this need. As such, the proposal is supported in principle, subject to other material planning considerations being satisfactorily addressed.

5.3 Design and Heritage (NPPF Sections 12 and 16; Policies AS07, AS08, DM29, DM41 and SP7)

5.3.1 Cove House has been identified by the Council as an NDHA, retaining many original features. Its special interest is as follows:

Eclectic mix of Italianate and Gothic detailing. Rusticated stone with quoins, grey slated roof with terracotta ridge tiles. Point pitched gables with wooden vergeboards and double height canted bay window (in a three-light italianate style). Gothic stone arched main doorway to front. Square sash windows and two-light italianate windows to ground and first floor with thick stone surrounds. Long distance views of Morecambe Bay from the landscaped garden. Cove House appears on the 1845 OS map, but was largely extended and altered in the mid-to late-19th century. Cove House was owned by Rev. Carus Wilson, who set up Casterton School (which was attended by the Bronte sisters). The house eventually passed to the wealthy Boddington family of Manchester brewing fame. It was the Boddingtons who funded the building of St John's Church in Silverdale.

5.3.2 The proposal for demolition of the late 20th century single-story unit and services areas is welcomed, as this would better reveal the significance of the NDHA through removal of inappropriately modern development of low quality design, from the setting of the NDHA.

5.3.3 The application follows a pre-application (pre-app) advice enquiry, and Officers raised concerns at pre-app stage in relation to some aspects of the positioning, scale and design of the proposed extension. Although the extension was angled so not to interrupt most views between the lawn and the main building, it was considered that this positioning was not fully justified and that it would harm the significance of the NDHA through impact on the setting between the shore and the building. Since the pre-app, the Applicant has explored alternative options for siting of a new extension, and reconfiguration of the existing building. Unfortunately, alternative options are not possible due to mature trees, land levels, impact on existing residents, and various other operational reasons. That said, the application scheme has taken on elements of the pre-app advice and improved the design and massing.

5.3.4 The scale of the extension is dictated by the need to accommodate replacement facilities and make a meaningful and viable contribution towards housing demand. The extension is set at a lower level than the car park level, at the level of the lawn, which results in the extension ridge height being lower than that of Cove Orchard. First floor accommodation is set partly within the roof space which assists in reducing the height. The height cannot be lowered any further as this would conflict with

space for overhead hoists. The link extension, with its flat roof, assists in breaking up the scale of the overall extension.

5.3.5 The use of limestone facing and slates reflects local materiality, and replicates what has been used on the Cove Orchard development. The use of a mansard roof, however, is not typical of local vernacular. Officers have discussed using a conventional pitched roof with the Agent; however, this results in a significant increase in eaves and ridge height due to the need to allow space for hoists and the width of the extension. Therefore, the mansard roof option is more favourable in this regard, and this will be subject to conditions for details of high quality materials.

5.3.6 There is merit in the link extension featuring vast glazing and a contemporary, albeit complementary, design to visually break up the massing of the overall development and provide a focal entrance point. The green colour proposed for the metal work would match that used on Cove Orchard. The proposal includes a bin store and the Applicant is satisfied that this provides ample space. An increase to collection frequencies or further storage could be explored if later found necessary.

5.3.7 Overall there is a degree of harm to the significance of the NDHA arising from the design, scale and siting of the proposed extension. The Conservation Team commented on the original plans on this basis. However, all alternative options have been exhausted, and amended plans with subtle, but collectively acceptable improvements, have since been submitted. The benefits of removing unsightly and ad-hoc structures and consolidating services is also acknowledged. Officers are now content with the amended scheme, subject to planning conditions for final details of external materials.

5.4 Landscape Impacts (NPPF Section 15; Policies AS01, AS02, DM46 and EN2)

5.4.1 The site is visually contained within the private grounds of an existing residential care home. The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment does not include any viewpoint from the beach. However, onlookers would have to be far out in order to see the development due to the intervening cliff face, and the sands of Morecambe Bay are notoriously dangerous. Even if the sands were safe enough to allow views from such a position, the view would be so long range and interrupted by the coastal woodland strip that the proposed development would be barely discernible from this location. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development can be accommodated within the site and the wider landscape without any significant detrimental change upon the overall landscape of Arnsdale & Silverdale, when viewed from the identified publicly accessible locations

5.4.2 The AONB Landscape Character Assessment sets out that historic buildings of varying age are contributing features of the landscape. Therefore, whilst views of the proposed development would be limited within the wider landscape, for the reasons described in Section 5.3 of this report, the proposal would nevertheless cause some harm to the setting of a traditional house and its gardens, which contributes positively to the qualities of the protected landscape. For this reason, the proposed development would cause some limited minor harm to the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Landscape.

5.5 Biodiversity and Trees (NPPF Section 15; Policies AS04, DM29, DM44, DM45, SP8 and EN7)

5.5.1 Policy AS04 states that development proposals must protect and contribute to the appropriate enhancement of the extent, value and/or integrity of) any priority habitat, and that exceptions will only be made where:

(VII) there is an overriding public need for the development; and

(VIII) the development cannot be located elsewhere; and

(IX) mitigation is provided, or, where mitigation is not possible, compensatory measures are provided before the development's completion that result in enhancement (net gain) of the habitat's extent and value.

5.5.2 The proposal will not result in the loss of the priority habitat, but will be located close to it and does not allow space for buffer planting. However, as set out earlier in this report there is a strong local need for the development and alternative siting options are unfortunately not possible. Mitigation/compensatory and sustainable management measures can be secured through planning condition to enhance the overall condition of the woodland, with buffer planting provided elsewhere on site. As such, it is considered that the proposal complies with the relevant parts of Policy AS04

referenced above.

- 5.5.3 The trees which surround Cove House including the coastal woodland strip were considered worthy of protection by the City Council Tree Protection Officer in 2008, but excluded from TPO 443(2008) by Members of the Council's Appeals Committee as it was deemed that there was no threat at the time. The tree population is diverse in terms of species and age classification and there are important individual trees within the site as well as collectively being an important component of the AONB in which the site sits. The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) sets out that the proposal will not require the removal of any significant individual trees or notable groups, and all the coastal woodland can be retained. A set of tree protection measures have been proposed.
- 5.5.4 The Arboricultural Officer objected to the original application, on the basis that the development is positioned close to mature trees, and there would be increased management pressure on these trees. The consultee also notes that drainage is not considered within the AIA. Amended plans have since been submitted with the escape staircase reconfigured to bring the development wholly outside of the root protection areas of the coastal woodland trees. Despite Officer requests, unfortunately the Applicant has not been able to move the development any further away from the trees. The soakaway would be located outside of the RPAs. Although new foul drainage pipework to serve the development would be required to pass through RPA zones, subject to appropriate working methods and tree protection being secured through planning condition, any harm could be minimised.
- 5.5.5 A bat survey has been submitted with the application. The survey found no indications of use of the site by bats and concluded that a Protected Species Mitigation Licence will not be required. However, as a precautionary approach, a set of working guidelines has been prepared and should be followed during the works. This can be covered through a planning condition. A further planning condition is recommended for a scheme of general biodiversity enhancements, which may form part of the planting scheme.
- 5.5.6 The site falls within the 3.5km buffer for the Morecambe Bay designated sites, at approx. 40m from the coast. Any new residential units within this buffer have the potential to increase recreational pressure on the coastal designated sites. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been completed, which concludes that the proposed development does have potential to have likely significant effects on the designated sites through recreational disturbance and pollution impacts.
- 5.5.7 The potential impacts from increased recreational pressure are considered to be limited by the nature of the proposed development and the likelihood of residents to use the care home grounds for recreation purposes. However, to mitigate any potential increase in recreational pressures caused by the development, a homeowner/occupier information pack can be provided to the units. To mitigate pollution impacts, submission of a site-specific Construction Environment Management Plan and appropriate drainage details can be controlled by planning conditions.
- 5.5.8 With the implementation of the mitigation outlined above, it is considered that the proposed development will have no adverse effects on the integrity of the designated sites, their designation features or their conservation objectives, through either direct or indirect impacts either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The mitigation measures can be adequately covered by a condition attached to any planning consent, and Natural England concur with this assessment.
- 5.5.9 Subject to the conditions recommended above being satisfied, a reason for refusal relating to trees would be difficult to justify. Overall, and on balance, the proposal is acceptable in terms of the natural environment
- 5.6 Residential Amenity (NPPF Section 12; Policies DM2 and DM29)
- 5.6.1 The development has been designed to comply with the relevant industry standards for disabled people and the type of accommodation proposed. All rooms feature a good level of natural light and outlook, with low window cill levels to allow views when sitting in a chair. The proposal includes ramped access to the entrance and level access throughout, with a lift and wide circulation spaces. Residents would have access to existing landscaped and wooded grounds for recreation and exercise.

5.6.2 The main part of the new support living block would be located approx. 26.7m from Cove Orchard at its nearest point (window to window). The care home bedrooms extension would be located approx. 18.0m from Cove Orchard at its nearest point (window to blank wall), and approx. 21.0m between windows. These measurements comply with the distances stipulated in Policy DM29 to prevent impact on outlook and loss of privacy. Views of the lawn area may be impacted for Cove Orchard residents, however loss of views is not a material planning consideration. Moreover, due to the aforementioned separation distances and land level differences, there would be no undue harm to residential amenity for existing occupiers.

5.6.3 There may be some disturbance during construction phase, however these can be mitigated against to some extent through good construction management and will be relatively short lived in any case. It is in the Applicant's best interests to carefully manage timings and methods of working given the existing residents on site. There is no evidence before Officers to suggest that safety and security of existing residents would be unduly compromised by the proposal. Overall, the proposal is acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

5.6.4 Radon protection is covered under Building Regulations legislation, so a planning condition is not necessary for this particular consideration. However, a condition relating to other unexpected land contamination issues is proposed, as requested by Environmental Health Services

5.7 Drainage (NPPF Sections 14 and 15; Policies AS12, DM29, DM33, DM34 and DM35)

5.7.1 The site lies within Flood Zone 1, and the underlying geology is limestone bedrock. Surface water is to be directed to a new soakaway under the lawn, with silt traps to prevent sediments and other pollutants from entering the soakaway and ultimately the underlying limestone. Based on the infiltration testing results submitted, Officers are confident that the site can be drained by way of infiltration. The Lead Local Flood Authority have assessed the submitted application, and also have no objection in terms of surface water drainage subject to conditions for the final details surface water strategy including maintenance regime, and verification report.

5.7.2 Silverdale has no mains sewers so Policy AS12 takes a strong approach to foul drainage and requires full details of the proposed sewage systems for development proposals, to ensure that there will be no adverse impact on the environment. It also sets out that proposals increasing flows on existing systems will only be approved if the condition and capacity of the existing infrastructure can be shown to be adequate to receive the increased flows. The site has two existing package sewage treatment plants (PSTPs), one serving Cove House and the other Cove Orchard, both subject to regular inspections for environmental safety. The PSTP serving Cove House has capacity for 65 residents. Cove House and the proposed development combined will total 60 users including full-time equivalent staff. Therefore, the existing PSTP for Cove House is adequately sized, although a more frequent servicing regime has been recommended by the Applicant's advisors. Final details of wastewater drainage connections and servicing/maintenance can be secured through a planning condition.

5.7.3 Overall, and subject to conditions, the site can be adequately drained in terms of both surface and foul water drainage, with no adverse harm to the environment.

5.8 Highways (NPPF Section 9; Policies AS10, DM29, DM60, DM61 and DM62)

5.8.1 The site is served from an existing access point off Cove Road, and features existing parking areas. The submitted block plans detail the existing and proposed parking provision, as tabulated below:

	Existing Spaces	Proposed Spaces
Cove House	32	05
Cove Orchard	14	14
New Supported Living Unit	-	04
Overflow	-	22
Totals	46	45

5.8.2 Due to the nature of the accommodation proposed, occupiers are unlikely to own or use cars, but there is likely to be an uplift in vehicle trips from visitors, care staff and servicing/deliveries. County Highways have no objection to the proposal on highways grounds, and consider that the use of the existing access point, proposed internal layout and proposed parking layout is acceptable for the

size and nature of the development. In particular, a high level of unused parking spaces across the site were observed during site visits, capable of accommodating any additional parking demands, despite the net loss of one space. 20 of the total proposed spaces will be accessible parking spaces.

- 5.8.3 The Manual for Streets characterises walkable neighbourhoods as having services within 10 minutes/800m of residential development. At approx. 1.3km from Silverdale village centre (along made roads), the site is not within a reasonable walkable distance, particularly when the age and likely mobility of the occupiers is taken into account. Furthermore, parts of this route lack pavement provision and include narrow pinch points where there is potential for greater conflict between road users. An alternative route of approx. 1.0km can be followed via the public footpath over The Lots. However, this route is unmade, uneven and crosses pastureland which is unlikely to provide a firm, dry surface all year round. For these reasons, walking to local services is likely to be unsafe, impractical and unattractive for most occupiers.
- 5.8.4 The 51 bus route passes the site entrance, although there is no pavement provision to the nearest timetabled bus stop at Holgates Caravan Park. The 2008 permission was subject to a Section 106 agreement for shuttle bus and highway improvement contributions. However, records show that these monies could not be collected because County Highways would not commit to spending the contributions in line with the agreed terms due to implementation difficulties. County Highways have confirmed that they will not be seeking any contributions on this occasion. Officers agree that contributions are not necessary in this instance, given the scale and nature of the development proposed, and the inability by County Highways to spend contributions previously.
- 5.8.5 Despite the poor walkability and distant bus stop location, due to the nature of the development and likely occupiers, residents would be unlikely to regularly visit services on their own and would generally be looked after by staff and visitors on site. In the event of residents needing to access services off-site, appropriate transport and assistance would be arranged. A covered buggy store is proposed for residents' mobility scooters. Bicycle stands (with electric bike charging points) are proposed to encourage sustainable travel for staff and visitors. Overall, having had regard to the parking provision and nature of the proposed use, the proposal is acceptable in terms of highways and parking matters.
- 5.9 Sustainability (NPPF Section 14; Policies AS13 and DM30)
- 5.9.1 The submitted energy statement indicates use of solar photovoltaic panels and air source heat pumps, for renewable energy and low-carbon heating sources. Consideration has also been given to insulation, solar gain, Passivhaus standards and energy use. The development would also be constructed to the latest Building Regulations for energy performance. The generator is as existing, and its retention is required due to importance of a back-up for the residential care in case of power cuts. Overall, the proposed details are an acceptable level of commitment to sustainable design in this instance. Final details of the solar panels and ASHPs can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 The provision of much needed supported living accommodation to meet identified local housing needs and improved care home facilities is given significant positive weight in favour of the proposal. The NPPF affords great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within National Landscapes, and although the landscape harm identified is limited in this instance this still results in great weight against the proposal. Whilst there remains a varying degrees of harm to the NDHA, localised landscape character and trees, positive engagement at pre-application stage and during determination has resulted in some reductions in harm, and improvements in benefits delivered by the proposal. Importantly, and ultimately, the harm does not cumulatively, significantly and demonstrably outweigh the identified benefits, which is the key balance when considering such proposals that deliver contributions to addressing identified local housing needs. As such, the development complies with the relevant local and national planning policies when read as a whole, and is therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out below.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Standard Timescale	Standard
2	Approved Plans	Standard
3	Occupancy and Allocations Scheme	Pre-commencement
4	Construction Environment Management Plan	Pre-commencement
5	Surface Water Drainage Strategy	Pre-commencement
6	Foul Drainage Strategy	Pre-commencement
7	Tree Protection and Methodology	Pre-commencement
8	Priority Habitat Mitigation/Compensation Scheme	Pre-commencement
9	Hard and Soft Landscaping and Biodiversity Scheme	Pre-Commencement
10	Details of External Materials	Prior to Installation
11	Details of Solar Panels/ASHPs	Prior to Installation
12	Details of External Lighting	Prior to Installation
13	Surface Water Drainage Verification Report	Prior to Occupation
14	Occupier Information Packs	Prior to Occupation
15	Bin Storage	Prior to Occupation
16	Parking	Prior to Occupation
17	Protected Species Mitigation	Control
18	Unforeseen Contamination	Control

Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

In accordance with the above legislation, Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been made having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance.

Background Papers

N/A