

To the Chair and Members  
of the  
CONSERVATION ADVISORY  
WORKING PARTY

Mr G Durham  
74222  
GD/EVB – R82/48

20 February 2009

Dear Sir/Madam

A meeting of the **CONSERVATION ADVISORY WORKING PARTY** will be held in **COMMITTEE ROOM 1, CIVIC OFFICES, MERRIAL STREET, NEWCASTLE** on **TUESDAY, 3 MARCH 2009 at 7pm.**

#### **AGENDA**

1. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members on items included in this agenda.
2. Minutes of meeting held on 10 February 2009 (copy attached for non-Council Members information).
3. To consider the attached reports at Appendix A and B (blue and salmon paper).
4. To consider any applications for financial assistance from the Conservation and Heritage Fund which may have been brought to this meeting by the Officer.
5. To consider any business which is urgent within the meaning of Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

Yours faithfully

**P W CLISBY**

Head of Central Services

DECISIONS OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL ON APPLICATIONS WHICH  
HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE WORKING PARTY

For reports on all committee decisions, please follow the minutes and agendas search on the Council's website or refer to your copy of the Planning agenda for the permitted date. Reports for delegated items are attached to the agenda (pink paper).

Reference	Location and Applicant	Development	Working Party Comments	Planning Decision and Comments made with regard to Conservation Areas
08/492/COU & 08/493/LBC	The Old Coach House, Old Springs Hall, Market Drayton. Mr L Price.	Change of use to residential and ground floor extension.	Recommend refusal. The proposed extension was out of keeping with the character of the existing building. Request for a more sympathetic design to retain the character of the main barn building. The proposal is also contrary to Policies B6 & B7 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan.	Applications Withdrawn.
08/639/FUL	Rethink. Grove Court, 100 Lancaster Road, Newcastle. Ms L Scott.	Rear conservatory.	No objections but regret the use of UPVC for the proposed conservatory at the same time recognising that this choice of material does match the windows in the building.	Permitted under Delegated powers 11/2/09.
08/779/FUL	6 Queen Street, Newcastle Charter Veterinary Surgeons.	Formation of parking following demolition of building.	No objection and welcome the retention of the gateway to the site that will maintain the character of the Streetscene in this part of Queen Street.	Permitted under Delegated powers 13/2/09.
08/961/FUL	The Old Wood, Betley Hall Gardens, Betley. Mr J Williams.	Construction of a one and a half two storey two bedroom lakeside guest annexe.	Members stood by their comments raised on 08/557/FUL (12/08/08). 'No objections. Members felt that the scheme fitted in with the existing building'.	Refused under Delegated powers 2/2/09.
08/967/FUL	Holiday Cottage 3, Maer Hall, Maer. Mr B Fradley.	Relocation of existing holiday unit from the hayloft to Bothy Cottage and use of the former hayloft as a dwelling without complying with Condition 1 of 06/723/FUL which restricts occupation to short term holiday accommodation.	No comment.	Permitted under Delegated powers 9/2/09.

Cont...

Reference	Location and Applicant	<u>Development</u>	Working Party Comments	Planning Decision and Comments made with regard to Conservation Areas
08/971/FUL	The Observatory, Keele University, Keele. University of Keele.	Extension to Observatory to provide new toilets, entrance, exhibition space and extension to existing lecture room.	The Working Party welcomed the long overdue renovation of the observatory building but strongly felt that the opportunity had been missed to create design quality in the proposal. Disappointment was expressed that the architectural composition of the proposal and of the lack of relationship between elements of the proposed works. Furthermore, it was considered that the proposed works were unsympathetic to this visually prominent site and the existing two domes that are principle elements in the development.	Permitted under Delegated powers 10/2/09.

**CONSERVATION ADVISORY WORKING PARTY**

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Location and Applicant</b>	<b>Development</b>	<b>Remarks</b>	<b>Ward Councillors</b>
09/33/FUL	Central Campus/Union Square, Keele University. University of Keele.	Upgrade to include new amphitheatre, landscaped areas, ramps and re-modelled car park.	The development affects the setting of a Listed Building	Councillor Mrs W Naylor Councillor R Studd
09/36/FUL	Holy Trinity Community Centre, London Road, Newcastle. Rev P Griffin.	Smoking shelter.	The development may affect the setting of a Listed building and the Newcastle Town Centre Conservation Area	Councillor D Clarke Councillor Mrs E Shenton
09/38/FUL	Fluid Café/Bar 97 High Street, Newcastle. Fluid/Café/Bar.	Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission 06/1157/FUL to allow continued extended opening hours.	The development is within the Newcastle Town Centre Conservation Area.	Councillor D Clarke Councillor Mrs E Shenton
09/40/FUL	Unit 1& 2 Barn Conversion, Lower Stoney Low Farm, Three Mile Lane, Madeley. Mr G & Mrs T Emery.	Two free standing 15kw wind turbines (Resubmission of 08/517/FUL).	The development may affect the setting of a Listed Building.	Councillor J Bannister Councillor Mrs H Morris
09/43/FUL	Land adjoining 1 Church Villas, The Butts, Betley. Mr P Robinson.	Erection of detached dwelling (amended scheme).	The development is within the Betley Conservation Area.	Councillor D Becket Councillor A Wemyss
09/61/COU	Unit 19a Roebuck Centre, High Street, Newcastle. North Staffs Primary Care Trust.	Change of use of Class A1 shop to Class D1 NHS walk in facility.	The development is within the Newcastle Town Centre Conservation Area.	Councillor D Clarke Councillor Mrs E Shenton
09/63/COU	First Floor 23 Bridge Street, Newcastle. Mr J Hamer.	Change of use from clothes shop to hot & cold food café/take away.	The development is within the Newcastle Town Centre Conservation Area.	Councillor D Clarke Councillor Mrs E Shenton
09/65/FUL	Brassingtons. 115 High Street, Newcastle. Brassingtons.	Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission 06/1136/COU to allow for continued extended opening hours.	The development is within the Newcastle Town Centre Conservation Area.	Councillor D Clarke Councillor Mrs E Shenton

## OFFICER REPORT ON DELEGATED ITEMS

**Applicant:** Mrs L Scott  
**Application No:** 08/00639/FUL  
**Location:** 100 Lancaster Road, Newcastle  
**Description:** Rear Conservatory

### **Policies and Proposals in the Development Plan Relevant to This Decision:**

#### Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Structure Plan 2011

Policy D2: The Design and Environmental Quality of Development  
Policy NC19: Conservation Areas

#### Newcastle Under Lyme Local Plan 2011

Policy H18: Design of residential extensions  
Policy B9: Prevention of harm to conservation areas  
Policy B10: Requirement to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area  
Policy B13: Design and development in conservation areas  
Policy B14: Development in or adjoining the boundary of conservation areas

### **Other Material Considerations**

#### **Relevant National Policy Guidance:**

PPS1  
PPG 15  
Companion Guide to PPS1 – ‘The Planning System : General Principles’

#### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

Space about Dwellings

#### **Planning History**

See history sheet on file

#### **Views of Consultees**

The Conservation Advisory Working Party no objection but regret the use of uPVC for the proposed conservatory at the same time recognising that this choice of material does match the windows in the building.

The Highway Authority ‘s Standard Advice applies – no highway safety issues to address.

#### **Representations**

None

#### **Applicants/Agents Submission**

A design and Access statement has been submitted with the application.

## **Key Issues**

This application is for full planning permission for the construction of a conservatory to the rear of the property. The property to which the application relates is in a residential care home that situated in a residential/ commercial area. The property is within Stubbs Walk Conservation Area.

The main issues for consideration in the determination of this application are visual amenity and impact of the Conservation Area and residential amenity.

### **Visual amenity and impact on the Conservation Area**

Whilst Policy H18 of the Local Plan relates to residential extensions given the residential nature of the property and the proposal it is considered as an appropriate starting point. The policy requires extensions to be of materials and a design to fit in with those of the dwelling to be extended and not to detract materially from the character of the original dwelling. In achieving this, the form, size and location of the extension should be subordinate to the design of the original dwelling. It is also required that an extension must not detract materially from the integrity of the original design of the group of dwellings that form the street scene or the setting.

This proposed conservatory at the rear of this semi detached large part three storey part two storey property. The property has replacement UPVC windows which would match the materials on the proposed conservatory.

The external appearance of the conservatory forms a standard design, featuring a pitched roof and constructed from the usual materials for this type of extensions, i.e. brickwork dwarfwalls, double glazed windows, UPVC frames and polycarbonate roofing. It is therefore considered that the form, size and location of the conservatory will be subordinate to the design of the original dwelling and it will not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of visual amenity in accordance with the policy guidance outlined above.

Given the siting of the conservatory at the rear of the property which would not be readily observed it is considered the proposal would not have an adverse impact or be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, to a condition requiring the omission of the roof decorative finials.

### **Residential amenity**

The proposal will not result in the overlooking or overshadowing of the principal habitable room windows of neighbouring dwellings in accordance with the SPG. Having taken this issue into account the proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of its impact upon the residential amenity of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings.

## **Reasons for the Grant of Planning Permission**

The proposal accords with provisions of the development plan for the locality indicated in the decision notice and there are no other material considerations which would justify a refusal of planning permission.

## **Recommendation**

Permit subject to:

1. The brick work used in the construction of the dwarf conservatory walls of the development hereby permitted shall match in all respects (size, texture and colour) those of the existing building.
- R1 To protect visual amenity in accordance with the requirements of policies B9, B10 and B13 of the Newcastle under Lyme Local Plan 2001

2. Notwithstanding the submitted details this permission does not give consent for the inclusion of the decorative roof finials, these shall be omitted from the conservatory to be constructed. The conservatory shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details in all other respects.
- R2 To clarify the permission and to protect visual amenity in accordance with the requirements of policies B9, B10 and B13 of the Newcastle under Lyme Local Plan 2001

**Note to Applicant**

N10 - Crime and Disorder note.

Performance Checks	Date		Date
Consultee/ Publicity Period	<b>06/02/09</b>	Decision Sent Out	
Case Officer Recommendation	11/02/09	8 Week Determination	<b>16/02/09</b>
Report Cleared by Process To GRB			
Management check	<b>Amended 13/2 ESM</b>		

## OFFICER REPORT ON DELEGATED ITEMS

**Applicant:** Charter Veterinary Surgeons  
**Application No:** 08/00779/FUL  
**Location:** 6 Queen Street, Newcastle  
**Description:** Formation of parking, following demolition of building

### **Policies and Proposals in the Approved Development Plan Relevant to This Decision:**

#### West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy

Policy QE3: Creating a high quality built environment for all

#### Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 1996 - 2011

Policy D1: Sustainable Development  
Policy D2: The Design and Environmental Quality of Development  
Policy NC18: Listed Buildings  
Policy NC19: Conservation Areas  
Policy T13: Local Roads  
Policy T16: Car Parking

#### Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011

Policy B5: Control of development affecting the setting of a listed building  
Policy B9: Prevention of harm to Conservation Areas  
Policy B10: The requirement to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a Conservation Area  
Policy B11: Demolition in Conservation Areas  
Policy B13: Design and Development in Conservation Areas

### **Other Material Considerations**

#### **Relevant National Policy Guidance:**

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)  
Companion Guide to PPS1 "The Planning System: General Principles"  
PPG 15: Planning and the Historic Environment  
PPG 13: Transport

#### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

Space Around Dwellings (July 2004)  
Town Centre SPD

#### **Planning History**

72/00007/NLB	Permitted - 14/2/1975 - Affixing of ceramic plaque to signify property is a listed building
83/00153/NLB	Permitted - 1/8/1983 - Internal and external repairs
83/12439/N	Permitted - 1/8/1983 - Extensions, alterations and renovations of existing buildings and conversion into office accommodation
85/00199/NLB	Permitted - 20/6/1985 - Alterations to existing buildings to form offices
85/14340/N	Permitted - 20/6/1985 - Alterations to existing buildings to form offices



92/00331/COU Permitted - 17/9/1992 - Change of use of ground floor of dwelling to  
veterinary surgery  
96/00017/FUL Permitted - 12/2/1996 - Extension forming storeroom

An application for conservation area consent for the demolition of the building is currently under consideration, reference 09/00027/CON. The application for conservation area consent cannot be determined until 28/2/09 and as such it is not possible to determine that application concurrently with the application which is the subject of this report without the decision on this application being determined beyond the decision target date.

### **Views of Consultees**

**Conservation Officer** – No Objections

**Highways Officer** – No objections, subject to conditions

**Environment Agency** – No comments received

**Conservation Advisory Working Party** – No Objections and welcome the retention of the gateway to the site that will maintain the character of the street scene in this part of Queen Street

### **Representations**

Nil

### **Applicants/Agents Submission**

A Design and Access Statement accompanies the application, which states the following:-

- The existing on site parking facilities are limited. It is possible to get four vehicles on the driveway and under the garage area as shown on the existing plan but with no space for turning vehicles. This is resulting in vehicles reversing off the site.
- Additionally, there is currently no provision for disabled parking space and there is no adjacent on-street parking for client use.
- To the rear of the surgery there is presently a four roomed building, which is unlisted, totally disused and surplus to operational requirements and of little architectural merit.
- This building is relatively obscured from Queen Street due to the gates and wall to the front of the present attached garage arrangement.
- Briefly the proposal is to remove the building and the flat roof, whilst retaining the existing gates to the front elevation onto Queen Street complementing the street scene. This allows the creation of client parking area, disabled parking space and turning area to allow vehicles to exit the site in a forward gear
- The total area of proposed parking and associated garden/ planted area is approximately 268 square metres.
- Layout – 5 car parking spaces are proposed, one of which is for disabled use, and needs therefore to be adjacent to the rear entrance of the surgery to allow staff to assist limited mobility clients
- Landscaping – Following the removal of the redundant building and adjoining flat roof, the parking/ garden area will be revised to include planting to the north and west boundary sides. Paved areas for vehicle and pedestrian use will be in mixed paving/ tarmacadam with discreet bay definition
- Appearance – Revisions to the proposed parking area are all at low level and will have no visual impact on the street scene and publicly accessible areas. Removal of the existing redundant building will provide better visual articulation of the principal elevation of No 6 Queen Street, by the removal of background clutter.

### **Key Issues**

Full planning permission is sought for the formation of a parking area to the rear of 6 Queen Street, Newcastle, following demolition of a two storey building to the south of the main veterinary building.

This application runs alongside an application for Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the two storey building and the formation of the car parking area, application number 09/00027/CON.

The main issues in the determination of the application are considered to be:-

- Impact on the Conservation Area (IT IS MY VIEW THAT THIS ISSUE IS THE MAIN FOR THIS APPLICATION AND THAT IT IS NOT THE CORRECT APPROACH TO LEAVE THIS LARGELY FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER THE APPLICATION FOR CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT – I HAVE THEREFORE REJIGGED AND AMENDED YOUR REPORT.
- Highways Issues and car parking
- visual amenity
- residential amenity

### **Impact on the Conservation Area**

There are two aspects to consider under this heading. Firstly whether the demolition of the building is acceptable, and secondly whether the use of the site for parking post demolition is acceptable.

Policy B11 of the Local Plan indicates that consent to demolish a building or any part of a building in a Conservation Area will not be granted unless it can be shown that each of the following is satisfied:

- i) The building is wholly beyond repair, incapable of reasonably beneficial use, of inappropriate design, or where its removal or replacement would benefit the appearance or character of the area.
- ii) Detailed plans for redevelopment are approved where appropriate.
- iii) An enforceable agreement or contract exists to ensure the construction of the replacement building where appropriate

The building to be demolished is not particularly visible and does not contribute to the street scene nor add value to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Both the main and rear building are early 20<sup>th</sup> Century buildings/ inter war buildings. The main gates to the driveway will be retained and the view from the road will appear very similar to the existing views. The buildings removal would not benefit the appearance or character of the area, however the view is held that the removal of this building would not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.

It is also important to ensure that the proposed demolition would not have an adverse impact on the setting of nearby Listed Buildings. As mentioned previously, to the north of the application site is the former Veterinary Surgery adjoining 6 and 8 Queen Street, which is a Grade II Listed Building, and to the south of the application site is 10 and 12 Queen Street, known as Brampton House, which is also Grade II Listed. The two storey building to be demolished is not attached to either of these Listed Buildings, and the loss of this building would not have negative consequences on the setting or appearance of these Listed Buildings.

In this case, the applicant is proposing a car parking area for clients to the Veterinary Surgery and therefore detailed plans for redevelopment have been submitted for approval satisfying part ii) of the relevant policy. As the loss of the building will not be harmful to the character or

appearance of the conservation area its replacement in this case is not appropriate or necessary and therefore the proposal does not conflict with iii) of Policy B11.

Overall it is therefore considered that the proposal is in accordance with the spirit of Policy B11.

PPG15 indicates that any application for conservation area consent and any associated planning application should be considered concurrently. It should be noted that the application for conservation area consent was submitted sometime after this application and the Local Planning Authority are not legally entitled to determine that application at this time. It is however considered that all the relevant matters that would need to be addressed in the determination of the application for conservation area consent can be fully addressed now, and as such it is concluded that in this case the determination of the planning application in advance of that for conservation area consent would not be harmful to the interests of the conservation area.

The parking area will be obscured from public views by the main building and will involve the retention of the gateway to the site, which is important to the character of the street scene in this part of Queen Street. The creation of the parking area will therefore not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and will satisfy Policies B9, B10 and B13 of the Local Plan.

The parking area does not have a close relationship with any nearby listed buildings, as indicated above, and as such it would not be harmful to their setting complying with Policy B5 of the Local Plan

#### Highways issues and car parking

The Local plan maximum car parking standards states that there should be a maximum of 5 car parking spaces per consulting room. The number of consulting rooms is unknown, however the provision of 4 normal sized bays and 1 disabled bay would help relieve the problem of car parking for visitors to the surgery, as there is little on street car parking within the vicinity.

The Highways Officer has been consulted on this application, and they raised no objections to the proposal.

#### Visual amenity

Paragraph 34 of PPS 1 states that “good design should contribute positively to making places better for people. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted.” Paragraph 36 goes on to state that Local Authorities should ensure that developments are “visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping

#### Residential amenity

In terms of residential amenity, the rear area of the veterinary surgery is surrounded by a 2 metre high boundary hedge and wall to the rear of the site (the East) and there is an outbuilding with a pitched roof to the northern side of the site. The building to be demolished is to the south of the site at the rear of the veterinary surgery. The properties surrounding the proposed car parking area are a mixture of commercial and residential, however it is not considered that the proposed car parking would cause a material loss of amenity enjoyed by the residential properties, due to the existence of similar rear car parking areas in the vicinity.

#### **Reasons for the Grant of Planning Permission**

The proposal accords with provisions of the development plan for the locality indicated in the decision notice and there are no other material considerations which would justify a refusal of planning permission.

## **Recommendation**

**Permit** subject to conditions:

1. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of the proposed landscaping of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following such approval, the landscaping of the site shall be completed within 12 months of the development hereby permitted being occupied and thereafter maintained for a period of 5 years
- R1: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, in accordance with Policy D2 of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 2011.
2. Prior to the development being brought into use the parking bays and dedicated turning area shall be surfaced and thereafter maintained in a porous, bound material, (the precise details of which shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority), with the parking bays clearly delineated, all in accordance with John K Carter Site Plan (as proposed) 1:200 details, and thereafter retained for the life of the development, for the approved purpose only.
- R2: In the interests of Highway safety, in accordance with policy T13 of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 2011.
3. Should the final surfacing levels fall towards the public highway then, the surfaced parking bays and dedicated turning areas shall be designed with adequate surface water collection facilities, to prevent any additional private water from being discharged onto the public highway as a result of the proposed development.
- R3: In the interest of Highway safety, in accordance with policy T13 of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 2011.

## **Note to the Applicant**

You are reminded of the need to comply with the conditions attached to the planning permission. (The fee involved with approval of conditions is £85 each or £85 if more than one or all of the conditions approval is sought at the same time)

Performance Checks	Date		Date
Consultee/ Publicity Period	<b>6/2/09</b>	Decision Sent Out	
Case Recommendation Officer	<b>13/2/09</b>	8 Week Determination	<b>18/2/09</b>
Management check	<b>Amended 16/2/09 ESM</b>		

## OFFICER REPORT ON DELEGATED ITEMS

**Applicant:** Mr Jim Williams  
**Application No:** 08/961/FUL  
**Location:** The Old Wood, Betley Hall Gardens  
**Description:** Construction of a one and a half two-storey two-bedroom lakeside guest annexe

### **Policies and Proposals in the Development Plan Relevant to This Decision:**

#### West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy

Policy QE1: Conserving and Enhancing the Environment  
Policy QE3: Creating a High Quality Built Environment for all  
Policy QE6: The Conservation, Enhancement and Restoration of the Region's Landscape

#### Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Structure Plan 2011

Policy D1: Sustainable Forms of Development  
Policy D2: The Design and Environmental Quality of Development  
Policy D4: Managing Change in Rural Areas  
Policy D5B: Development in the Green Belt  
Policy NC1: Protection of the Countryside: General Considerations  
Policy NC2: Landscape Protection and Restoration  
Policy NC19: Conservation Areas

#### Newcastle Under Lyme Local Plan 2011

Policy S3: Development in the Green Belt  
Policy N18: Areas of Active Landscape Conservation  
Policy B9: Prevention of Harm to Conservation Areas  
Policy B10: The Requirement to Preserve or Enhance the Character or Appearance of a Conservation Area  
Policy B13: Design and Development in Conservation Areas  
Policy B14: Development in or Adjoining the Boundary of Conservation Areas  
Policy B15: Trees and Landscape in Conservation Areas

### **Other Material Considerations**

#### **Relevant National Policy Guidance:**

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)  
PPG2: Green Belts (1995)  
PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2005)  
PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment (2004)

Companion Guide to PPS1 "The Planning System: General Principles"

#### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to the control of residential development

#### **Planning History**

02/556/FUL Extension - Approved

02/511/FUL	Rear dormer, balcony and alterations - Approved
01/610/FUL	Balcony to rear - Approved
N14054	Extensions and alterations - Approved
N13957	Garage - Approved
N13739	Playroom extensions and alterations - Approved

### **Views of Consultees**

The **Conservation Advisory Working Party** has no objections to the proposal and considers that the scheme fits in with the existing building.

The **Landscape Development Section** states that the site is included in Conservation Area C31/2 and is visible from the public footpath to the north as well as adjacent properties around the lake. This scheme would involve the removal of two category B trees, with the possible threat to a further two, and therefore objection is raised.

The **Environment Agency** notes that the supporting information states that foul water shall be disposed of via a connection to mains drainage, and therefore, has no objection to the development.

**Natural England** has no objection to the proposal on the grounds that it would not adversely affect Betley Mere SSSI and Ramsar site. The property is connected to the mains sewer which will avoid any nutrient enrichment of local water courses.

**Betley, Balterley & Wrinehill Parish Council** strongly opposes the application on the grounds that it is within the Green Belt and there are no very special circumstances to justify development. The application is not consistent with Policies B10, B11, B13 and B15 of the Local Plan in that there is an intent to demolish an existing structure and the application requires the removal of semi-mature trees. Neither is it consistent with Policy N18 in that its siting, form and materials fail to reflect the character or protect the appearance of the area.

In relation to the previous application (Ref. 08/00557/FUL), the **Environmental Health Division** had no objections subject to conditions regarding hours of construction and a report of unexpected contamination.

### **Representations**

Seven letters have been received. Objection is made on the following grounds:

- The property is within a Conservation Area and the proposal would be contrary to policies in the Betley Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals. In particular, it will impact on views from the nearby public footpath and will affect trees.
- The site is within a Special Landscape Area.
- The proposal would conflict with Policies B9, N18 and S3 of the Local Plan and is also within view of an area covered by Policy H7.
- The existing property has ample accommodation for normal domestic use.
- As the application is for an annexe, it should be subject to the volume limits for extensions.
- The design is totally out of context with its surroundings, the Lakeside location and the Old Wood itself. There are no comparable buildings within the Betley Conservation Area.
- An environmental impact assessment should have been carried out.
- The development would set a precedent for 12 or more other lakeside properties to build similar developments.
- Approval would be inconsistent with decisions on previous applications for house building on the opposite shore.

- Possible changes in water levels need to be considered.
- The lake and the lake edge are used by a large variety of wildlife and migratory birds.

### **Applicants/Agents Submission**

A Design and Access Statement has been submitted. A summary is as follows:

- The new outbuilding will function as ancillary guest accommodation.
- The site is well screened from other properties by trees and vegetation.
- It sits on an extensive plot, which is large enough to sustain further development.
- The building is split-level allowing it to follow the topography of the bank as it ‘tumbles down’ toward the edge of the water.
- It is single-storey in nature and split-level to keep as low profile as possible on the slope down to the lake. Surrounding trees and vegetation will provide a certain degree of screening. An arboricultural impact study has been submitted, showing that four category B trees would be affected. This would result in a ‘low impact on the wider landscape and public amenity’.
- The design approach was to create a modern and somewhat abstract structure which would be subservient to the massing of the house.

An Arboricultural Statement has also been submitted. Both documents are available for inspection at the Council’s offices and on [www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk](http://www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk).

### **Key Issues**

Full planning permission is sought for the construction of a lakeside guest annexe. The site is within the Green Belt and an Area of Active Landscape Conservation as designated on the Proposals Map of the Local Plan. The property is also within the Betley Conservation Area. Given this, the key issues are considered to be:

- Whether the development is appropriate or inappropriate in Green Belt terms.
- If inappropriate, whether very special circumstances exist to justify approval.
- Whether there would be any adverse impact on the character of the Betley Conservation Area.
- Any conflict with policies on the impact of development on the landscape.

### **Appropriate or inappropriate development within the Green Belt?**

PPG2 states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development within Green Belts and such development should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

PPG2 states that the construction of new buildings inside a Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of a number of purposes, including the limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings. It states that provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, the extension or alteration of dwellings is not inappropriate in the Green Belt. Similarly, Policy S3 of the Local Plan states that the well designed extension or alteration of an existing dwelling may be acceptable as long as it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling.

The proposed outbuilding would comprise ancillary guest accommodation for the main dwelling. Although the proposed building would not strictly be an extension to the dwelling, it would seem appropriate to assess the proposal as such. The principle of a detached outbuilding within the curtilage of the dwelling may be appropriate development therefore, provided it is not of a disproportionate scale and that it does not have any adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt or conflict with the purposes of including land within in.

The original dwelling has previously been extended with two small extensions at the rear and a large swimming pool extension to the north-west of the property. When compared to the original dwelling, the existing extensions constitute a 55% increase in volume and therefore it is considered that the proposed extension, which would be 10m x 17.7m in plan with a maximum height of 4.7m, would constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling.

The proposal would have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and therefore, the view is reached that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

As inappropriate development, do such very special circumstances exist as to justify approval?

Inappropriate development is not to be permitted unless the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other material considerations. It is the responsibility of an applicant to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist. No case has been advanced by the applicant. It is not considered therefore, that the very special circumstances exist to justify approval.

Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

Local and national planning policies seek to protect and enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas and development that is contrary to those aims will be resisted. There is a statutory duty upon the Local Planning Authority to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas in the exercise of planning functions.

Policy B9 of the Local Plan states that the Council will resist development that would harm the special architectural or historic character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Policy B10 states that permission will be granted to construct a building only if its proposed appearance will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. In particular, the form, scale, height and detailing shall respect the characteristics of the buildings in the area and important views within, into and out of the area shall be protected.

The proposed building would be contemporary in its design and would use heavy masonry spinal walls with lighter weight materials such as metal and timber cladding or render for the planes forming the floor and roof elements. The modern design would sit well in this lakeside location and the split-level approach would take advantage of the change in levels down to the lake. The main house is of no particular architectural merit and the proposed annexe would fit well with the existing modern swimming pool extension. The majority of the lake is privately owned and the only public view is from the public footpath on the north-western side of the lake. The application site is approximately 250m from the public footpath and given the amount of tree coverage, views of the building would be limited. No specific mention is made in the Betley Conservation Area Character Appraisal (December 2008) of the application property or its setting, especially in terms of views across the lake. The Conservation Advisory Working Party has no objections to the proposal and considers that the scheme fits in with the existing building.

There are a number of trees within the site and Policy B15 of the Local Plan states that trees and landscape features that contribute to the character and appearance and are part of a Conservation Area will be retained. Where consent is given to remove protected trees conditions will be imposed to require trees of the appropriate species and size to be planted and replaced if they die within 5 years. The Landscape Development Section has objected to the proposal on the grounds that the scheme would involve the removal of two Category B trees whose retention is considered desirable. The trees are part of a larger group and there is significant mature landscaping around the lake. The area is privately owned and views of the site from the public footpath would be limited. Although the retention of the trees would be desirable, on balance it is not considered that their loss would have such a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, to justify a refusal.



Any Conflict with Policies on the impact of development on the landscape?

Policies NC1 and NC2 of the Structure Plan seek to protect the countryside for its own sake and Policy NC2 sets out a list of criteria by which applications should be determined.

The site lies within an Area of Active Landscape Conservation. Policy N18 of the Local Plan states that development that will harm the quality and character of the landscape will not be permitted. Within these areas particular consideration will be given to the siting, design, scale, materials and landscaping of all development to ensure that it is appropriate to the character of the area.

The proposal would not affect any landscape features and it is not considered that the character or quality of the landscape would be harmed to a sufficient extent to justify refusal.

Representations have been received stating that the site is within view of an area covered by Policy H7 of the Local Plan. The H7 area covers Betley Hall Gardens on the opposite side of the lake. Given the distance from the application site, it is not considered that the development would be detrimental to the overall character of that area.

**Recommendation**

**Refuse for the following reason:**

The development represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and is harmful to the interests of that Green Belt, reduces its openness and is contrary to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the very special circumstances exist which clearly outweigh this harm and accordingly the development is contrary to the guidance within PPG2, Policy D5B of the adopted Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 1996-2011, and Policy S3 of the adopted Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011.

Performance Checks	Date		Date
Consultee/ Publicity Period	<b>16.1.09</b>	Decision Sent Out	
Case Officer Recommendation	<b>2.2.09</b>	8 Week Determination	<b>2.2.09</b>
Management check			

## OFFICER REPORT ON DELEGATED ITEMS

**Applicant:** Mr B Fradley

**Application No:** 08/00967/FUL

**Location:** Maer Hall Holiday Cottages

**Description:** Relocation of existing holiday unit from the hayloft (now known as Stable Cottage 3) to Bothy Cottage and use of the former hayloft as a dwelling without complying with condition 1 of 06/00723/FUL (which restricts occupation to short term holiday accommodation) and condition 3 of 06/00723/FUL which restricts occupation of Bothy Cottage to the manager of the holiday accommodation and any resident dependents.

### **Policies and proposals in the Development Plan relevant to this decision:**

#### West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy 2008

Policy R1: Rural Renaissance  
Policy CF2: Housing Beyond the Major Urban Areas  
Policy CF3: Levels and distribution of housing development  
Policy CF4: The reuse of land and buildings for housing

#### Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 1996 – 2011 :-

Policy D1: Sustainable Forms of Development  
Policy D2: The Design and Environmental Quality of Development  
Policy H2: Location, phasing and Density of Housing Development  
Policy H6: Conversions  
Policy T1A: Sustainable location  
Policy T13: Local Roads  
Policy T16: Car parking  
Policy T18A: Transport and Development

#### Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011:-

Policy H1: Residential Development: Sustainable Location and Protection of the Countryside  
Policy H3: Residential Development – Priority to Brownfield Sites  
Policy H9: Conversion of Rural Buildings for Living Accommodation  
Policy E12: The Conversion of Rural Buildings  
Policy T16: Development – General Parking Requirements

### **Other Material Considerations include:**

#### **National Planning Policy**

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)  
PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (2004)  
PPG3 Housing (2003)  
PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment (Sept 1994)  
Companion Guide to PPS1 “The Planning System: General Principles”

### **Planning History**

In November 2006 planning permission and listed building consent (06/723/FUL & 06/724/LBC) for the conversion of outbuildings at Maer Hall to form a reception and manager's flat (in former dovecote), two flats (in former tack room) and one flat (in former hayloft); and an overflow car park – this being in the vicinity of the proposal now being considered - was refused and subsequently allowed on appeal.

### **Views of Consultees**

**Maer and Aston Parish Council** has no objection to the 'swap' of a holiday unit and a residence. They also highlight their concern about the naming of the units (which they have taken up with the street naming section of the Council).

The **Highway Authority** recommend refusal for the following reasons;

- The traffic generated by the proposed development (COU of former Hayloft holiday unit), would be likely to result in an increase in highway danger owing to increased use of the existing access which affords restricted visibility for drivers emerging from the access.
- The proposed development (COU of former Hayloft holiday unit), will result in an increase in the likelihood of highway danger to road users owing to vehicles waiting on the public highway as a result of the access being geometrically inadequate to reasonably accommodate passing vehicles.

The Highway Authority is of the opinion that the Hayloft holiday unit has the potential to generate a maximum of 4, 2-way trips per day when in occupation, whereas a permanent residence has the potential to generate 6-8, 2 way trips per day. The proposed COU has the potential to double the movements in and out of an access which has substandard visibility and insufficient width to enable two cars to pass.

The **Environmental Health Division** has no objections to the proposal.

The **Conservation Advisory Working Party** makes no comment.

### **Representations**

None received.

### **Applicants/agents submission**

None received.

### **Key Issues**

Bothy Cottage was converted into a manager's flat following the granting of planning permission, at appeal, (reference 06/723/FUL). The former hayloft was permitted to be converted into holiday accommodation under the same planning consent. This proposal seeks to relocate the manager's dwelling, the occupation of which is restricted to the manager and any dependents, to the former hayloft and the holiday unit which would be displaced from the former hayloft would be relocated into Bothy Cottage (currently the manager's flat). This involves the variation of condition 1 of planning permission 06/723/FUL as imposed by the Planning Inspector which is worded as follows;

*1. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the two flats in the former tack room and the one flat in the former hayloft, hereby permitted, shall be*

*occupied as short term holiday accommodation and shall be occupied by any individual or group of people for no more than twenty-eight days in any calendar year.*

It would also require the variation of condition 3 of the same permission, worded as follows;

*3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the occupation of the manager's flat hereby permitted, in the former dovecote, shall be limited to a person solely or mainly working in the management of the holiday accommodation at 'Maer Hall' and to any resident dependents.*

The proposal would not result in an additional dwelling nor would it result in an additional holiday unit, the number of units would remain as existing, albeit provided in different locations in the overall complex than was initially permitted. As such the proposal does not breach any policies regarding location of residential development or conversion of buildings provided the above conditions are amended to ensure that the restrictions imposed on occupation apply to the relocated managers flat and holiday unit.

The conversion works has commenced and whilst not completed there remains a valid listed building consent in place for any necessary alterations to the listed buildings required to complete these works. The swapping of the two units does not raise any residential amenity concerns that were not addressed when planning permission was initially granted. As such it is considered that the main issue to address is highway safety.

#### Highway safety

The proposal would not result in any additional vehicular movements within the overall complex. Notwithstanding this the Highway Authority has objected to the proposal because of the new position of the dwelling, which is accessed via a courtyard. In their view the amount of vehicular movements an unrestricted dwelling would generate is double that of a holiday unit and given that the access to the courtyard is substandard they conclude that there is a highway safety concern.

It is accepted that there may be a difference in the vehicular movements associated with a holiday unit and that of a permanent dwelling, that the access is not wide enough to let two vehicles pass and has restricted visibility. It is not accepted, however, that the intensification in use of this access would result in highway safety concerns that would justify a refusal.

It is known that the owners of Maer Hall park their vehicles in this courtyard area without a problem. An increase in use of the access will increase the possibility that vehicles entering the courtyard will have to wait within the highway until a vehicle exits. It is considered, however, that this can be done safely given the limited vehicular use of the road through Maer village, and given that the waiting vehicle would be visible to other users of the highway. Also pertinent to the consideration of highway safety is that the dwelling is to be occupied by the manager of the holiday units on site, therefore the normal journey work would not take place for at least one of the occupiers of the unit, therefore the number of vehicular movements would be below that of an average dwelling.

On this basis the objections of the Highway Authority are not supported.

#### **Reasons for the grant of planning permission**

The proposal accords with provisions of the development plan for the locality indicated in the decision notice and there are no other material considerations which would justify a refusal of planning permission.

#### **Recommendation**

**Permit** subject to the following conditions;

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the two flats in the former tack room and the one flat, identified as Bothy Cottage on the submitted plan entitled Diagrammatic Location of Permanent Dwellings (P) and Holiday Cottages (H) Sheet 2, shall be occupied as short term holiday accommodation and shall be occupied by any individual or group of people for no more than twenty-eight days in any calendar year.
- R1 Having regard to the advice contained within PPS7 as to the contribution conversions for holiday use can make to the rural economy and the needs of the local rural economy, to enable monitoring of the occupation of the holiday accommodation to ensure compliance with this condition, and to comply with the requirements of Policy D4 of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 1996-2011 and Policies H9 and E12 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the occupation of the manager's flat, identified as Stable Cottage No. 3 on the submitted plan entitled Diagrammatic Location of Permanent Dwellings (P) and Holiday Cottages (H) Sheet 2, shall be limited to a person solely or mainly working in the management of the holiday accommodation at 'Maer Hall' and to any resident dependents.
- R2. Having regard to the advice contained within PPS7 as to the contribution conversions for holiday use can make to the rural economy and the needs of the local rural economy, to enable monitoring of the occupation of the holiday accommodation to ensure compliance with this condition, and to comply with the requirements of Policy D4 of the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Structure Plan 1996-2011 and Policies H9 and E12 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011.
3. This consent grants permission for the variation of conditions 1 and 3 of planning permission 06/00723/FUL. All other conditions of that permission shall apply.
- R3. For the avoidance of any doubt.

Performance Checks	Date		Date
Consultee/ Publicity Period	<b>06.02.09</b>	Decision Sent Out	
Case Officer Recommendation	<b>09.02.09 amended 16.02.09</b>	8 Week Determination	<b>16.02.09</b>
Management check	<b>GRB 16.2</b>		

## OFFICER REPORT ON DELEGATED ITEMS

**Applicant:** Keele University

**Application No:** 08/971/FUL

**Location:** The Observatory, Keele University

**Description:** Extension to the observatory to provide new toilets, entrance, exhibition space and extension to existing lecture room.

### **Policies and proposals in the Development Plan relevant to this decision:**

#### West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy

Policy PA4 Development related to H/FE and Research Establishments and Incubator Units  
Policy QE1 Conserving and Enhancing the Environment  
Policy QE2 Creating a High Quality Built Environment for All

#### Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Structure Plan 1996-2011

Policy D1 Sustainable forms of Development  
Policy D2 The Design and Environmental Quality of Development

#### Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011

Policy E8 Keele University and Keele Science Park

### **Other Material Considerations include:**

#### **National Planning Policy**

PPS1 Delivering sustainable development (2005)

Companion guide to PPS1: The Planning System: General Principles (2005)

#### **Planning History**

None relevant to this application.

#### **Views of Consultees**

**The Environmental Health Section** – No objection to the proposed development subject to the inclusion of the following conditions;

#### Report of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found that was not previously identified it shall be reported immediately to the Local Planning Authority and works must cease. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken, and where remediation is necessary a Remediation Strategy shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall be completed before work recommences unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

#### Construction Condition

Works of demolition and construction, including the use of associated plant and machinery, necessary for the implementation of this consent shall not take place between 18:00 and

07:00 hours on any day and not at any time on Sundays, Bank Holidays or after 13:00 hours on any Saturday.

They have also included an advisory note on the importation of soil/material.

**Keele Parish Council** – ‘Welcome the university’s proposals to renovate the observatory and expand its activities however finds the design quality of the proposed works disappointing and mediocre, especially given the prominent site of the building, and feels that this is a missed opportunity to create a structure worthy of its position’

**Garden History Society** – No representations received

**Conservation Advisory Working Party** welcomed the long overdue renovation of the observatory building but strongly felt that the opportunity had been missed to create design quality in the proposal. Disappointment was expressed at the architectural composition of the proposal and of the lack of relationship between the elements of the proposed works. Furthermore, it was considered that the proposed works were unsympathetic to this visually prominent site and the existing two domes that are principle elements in the development

### **Representations**

The application was advertised by way of a site notice posted on a sty adjacent to the site. The site notice expired on the 9/2/09.

No written representations were received.

### **Applicants/agents submission**

The requisite application forms were submitted along with a design and access statement.

### **Key Issues**

The proposal seeks planning permission to extend the observatory to provide new toilets, entrance, exhibition space and extension to existing lecture room.

The main issues to address are the

- Design
- Extension
- Residential amenity

### **Design**

The proposed design of the extension to the observatory would provide an aesthetically pleasing frontage to the current dilapidated building whilst retaining the original building’s simple design. Issues have been raised regarding the mediocre design and amount and type of windows in the front elevation of the building however observatories by their very nature are quite modest and simple buildings and need to be very dark to function. Based upon examples of other observatories (see photos on file) the lack of windows appears to be a common design feature. This is reinforced by the fact that the existing windows on the property are currently obscured by curtains which have a more detrimental appearance on the building than minimalistic fenestration design would.

The proposed extension at the front of the building incorporating the new ramp, steps and retaining wall would create a much more attractive frontage to the building and would provide a clear focal point for the building which is currently lacking. The proposed signage would require separate advertisement consent however from a design point of view, its location at the new entrance to the building and sited on a structural feature is to be welcomed.

The proposed scale of the extension and the new shallow pitched roof would not detract from the low key modernist style of the existing building. When viewed from the front, the building would still appear to have a flat roof however the shallow pitch would provide a more sustainable structure with greater longevity than the existing flat roof. The shallow pitched roof only 0.3m above the existing roof would not detract from the most distinguishable features (the telescope domes) of the observatory which would be refurbished as part of the scheme. The proposed overhanging element of the roof cladding on the front elevation is shown to have projecting solar panels which would have a beneficial impact upon the environment with a sustainable energy benefit. These do not appear as though they would have an adverse impact upon the building however, to ensure their design and projection was appropriate, a condition would be included requesting details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of this element.

A small GRP heliostat dome is also shown above the extended lecture room. This is only indicative at this stage as the university is not sure of the exact dimensions yet, however it has been included as part of the application to allow its impact to be assessed on the building as a whole. This feature would not have an adverse impact upon the character of the existing features of the building and would not hamper the operational efficiency of the existing domes. A condition would be included requesting specific details of the dome to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of this element.

The type of materials to be utilised in this development appear well chosen and would not appear incongruous however to ensure this is the case a condition would be included specifying that the materials be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to development commencing.

The development and movement of internal walls within the building would not require formal planning permission and would be dealt with as part of a building regulations submission.

The proposed footpath around the perimeter of the building would improve the accessibility of the building for all people and would also work well with the accessible parking bay being created as part of the scheme.

Overall, notwithstanding the comments of the Parish Council and the Conservation Advisory Working Party it is considered that the development is acceptable with respect to its design and would not be harmful to interests of acknowledged importance that would warrant its refusal.

#### Extension

The proposed extension to provide a larger lecture room and exhibition space as well as improved ancillary space accords with the principles of policy E8 of the adopted local plan as well as relevant national planning policy.

#### Residential Amenity

Due to the isolated nature of the site some distance from the nearest residential properties, the proposed construction condition is not felt necessary in this instance.

#### **Reasons for the grant of planning permission**

The proposal accords with provisions of the development plan for the locality indicated in the decision notice and there are no other material considerations which would justify a refusal of planning permission.

#### **Recommendation**

##### **Approve subject to the following conditions;**

1. Development shall not begin until details of the colour, type and texture of materials to be used in the external elevations have been submitted to and approved in writing by



the local planning authority. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the approved external facing materials.

- R1 To safeguard the visual amenities of the area in accordance with policy D2 of the Staffordshire and Stoke Structure Plan.
2. In the event that contamination is found that was not previously identified it shall be reported immediately to the Local Planning Authority and works must cease. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken, and where remediation is necessary a Remediation Strategy shall be submitted and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall be completed before work recommences unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- R2 To ensure the development assimilates with the wider industrial estate to accord with policy D2 of the Staffordshire and Stoke Structure Plan.
3. Development of the GRP heliostat dome shall not begin until full details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority unless otherwise agreed in writing. The GRP heliostat dome shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
- R3 To safeguard the visual amenities of the area in accordance with policy D2 of the Staffordshire and Stoke Structure Plan.
4. Development of the projecting solar panels shall not begin until full details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority unless otherwise agreed in writing. The solar panels shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
- R4 To safeguard the visual amenities of the area in accordance with policy D2 of the Staffordshire and Stoke Structure Plan.

Performance Checks	Date		Date
Consultee/ Publicity Period	<b>09.02.09</b>	Decision Sent Out	
Case Officer Recommendation	<b>10.02.09</b>	8 Week Determination	<b>11.02.09</b>
Report checked by Back Office			
Management check	<b>Amended 11/2/09 ESM</b>		