

LAND OFF WATERMILLS ROAD, CHESTERTON
CARDEN DEVELOPMENTS

13/00974/OUT

The application is for outline planning permission for the erection of up to 65 dwellings. Only details of the means of vehicular access to the highway network are for consideration as part of this application, with all other matters reserved for subsequent consideration. The site in total extends to some 1.42 hectares.

The site as shown on the Local Development Framework Proposals Map lies within the Newcastle Urban Neighbourhood in an area covered by Policy E9 (Renewal of Planning Permissions for Employment Development) of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan.

Access is proposed off Watermills Road which is an unclassified road.

The 13-week period for the determination of this application expires on 4 April 2014.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1. In the context of the shortage of employment land in the Borough and in the absence of any convincing evidence to demonstrate that it is unlikely that the site will be developed for employment, the loss of this good quality employment site would have an adverse impact upon the economic growth of the Borough. This adverse impact would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the contribution to housing supply.**
- 2. In the absence of a secured planning obligation the development fails to make an appropriate contribution to the Newcastle (urban) Transport and Development Strategy (NTADS) which seeks to improve local accessibility and promote the most sustainable modes of travel.**
- 3. In the absence of a secured planning obligation and having regard to the likely additional pupils arising from a development of this scale and the capacity of existing educational provision in the area, the development fails to make an appropriate contribution towards primary school provision.**
- 4. In the absence of a secured planning obligation the development fails to make an appropriate contribution towards the provision of affordable housing which is required to provide a balanced and well functioning housing market.**
- 5. In the absence of a secured planning obligation the development would not make an appropriate financial contribution towards the development, improvement and maintenance of off-site public open space.**

Reason for Recommendation

Notwithstanding the Council's inability to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, in the context of the shortage of employment land in the Borough and in the absence of any convincing evidence to demonstrate that it is unlikely that the site will be developed for employment, it is considered that the adverse impact of the loss of this employment site and the adverse impact upon the economic growth of the Borough would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the contribution to housing supply.

The proposed development of this vacant site introduces additional trips on the highway network and in the absence of a contribution to NTADS appropriate improvements to local accessibility would not be secured nor would sustainable modes of transport be promoted. Additionally the development would result in additional pressure on limited primary school places of the schools whose catchment area it is located and would place pressure on off-site public open space and in the absence of a financial contribution such adverse impacts would not be appropriately mitigated against. A planning

obligation is also required to secure affordable housing within this development in accordance with policy.

Statement as to how the Local Planning Authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner in dealing with this application

The Local Planning Authority worked in a positive and proactive manner in dealing with this application, advising of issues of concern and the need to provide additional supporting information, however it is considered that the applicant has been unable to overcome the principal concern arising from the proposal.

Policies and Proposals in the approved Development Plan relevant to the decision-

Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Minerals Local Plan 1994-2006

Policy 5: Conservation of Minerals (Mineral Consultation Areas)

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy 2006-2026 (adopted 2009) (CSS)

Policy SP1: Spatial Principles of Targeted Regeneration
Policy SP2: Spatial Principles of Economic Development
Policy SP3: Spatial Principles of Movement and Access
Policy ASP5: Newcastle and Kidsgrove Urban Neighbourhoods Area Spatial Policy
Policy CSP3: Sustainability and Climate Change
Policy CSP4: Natural Assets
Policy CSP6: Affordable Housing
Policy CSP10: Planning Obligations

Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan 2011 (NLP)

Policy H1: Residential Development: Sustainable Location and Protection of the Countryside
Policy E9: Renewal of Planning Permissions for Employment Development
Policy E11: Development of Employment Land for Other Uses
Policy T16: Development - General Parking Requirements
Policy C4: Open Space in New Housing Areas
Policy IM1: Provision of Essential Supporting Infrastructure and Community Facilities

Other material considerations include:-

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March 2012) and its Technical Guidance

National Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014)

Circular 11/95 – the use of conditions in planning permissions

Developer Contributions SPD (September 2007)

Affordable Housing SPD (2009)

Space Around Dwellings Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) (July 2004)

Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Newcastle-under-Lyme BC and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Employment Land Review (July 2011)

Newcastle (urban) Transport and Development Strategy (NTADS)

Waste Management and Recycling Planning Practice Guidance Note (January 2011)

Relevant Planning History

06/00374/OUT Business/industrial units (B1, B2 and B8 uses) on Phase 1 - approved 25th June 2007 following completion of a Section 106 agreement securing a financial contribution of £10,500 towards monitoring of a Travel Plan

06/00375/OUT Business/industrial units (B1, B2 and B8 uses) on Phase 2 - approved 25th June 2007 following completion of the above Section 106 agreement

06/00374/EXTN Extension to time limit to implement 06/00374/OUT (Phase 1) Approved 29th October 2010 following completion of a revised Section 106 agreement securing a financial contribution of £10,500 towards monitoring of a Travel Plan and £88,893 towards NTADS

06/00375/EXTN Extension to time limit to implement 06/00375/OUT (Phase 2) -approved 29th October 2010 following completion of the above Section 106 agreement

Views of Consultees

The County Council as the **Education Authority** advises that the development falls within the catchments of Chesterton Community Sports College and Crackley Bank Primary School. A development of 65 dwellings could add 10 High School and 14 Primary School pupils. The schools in this area are projected to be full for the foreseeable future or to have limited spaces. The Local Authority is currently in discussions with local schools to agree how and where additional capacity will be provided to accommodate children currently living in the area. Any further residential developments in this area will require additional school places to be provided. Chesterton Community High School is projected to have limited vacancies based on the current and projected pupil numbers available at this time. Although the development will put additional pressure on school places, current pupil demographics indicate that the school should be able to accommodate the likely demand from pupils generated by the development. Crackley Bank Primary School is projected to be full for the foreseeable future. Therefore a contribution is requested towards Primary School provision only. A contribution of £154,434 for 14 Primary School places (14 x £11,031 = £154,434) is sought for the development.

The **Highway Authority** recommends that the application should be refused. There is insufficient information provided for the Highway Authority to provide an objective response as the submitted application does not provide any TRICS traffic data covering the am and pm peak periods. An NTADS contribution of £40,079 is required.

The **Environmental Health Division** has no objections to the proposal subject to conditions regarding hours of construction, a construction management plan, dust mitigation during construction, internal and external dwelling noise levels, waste storage and collection arrangements and contaminated land.

The **Environment Agency** has no objections to the proposal. It states that although the site is located in Flood Zone 1 (an area of land with a low probability of flooding), it is over 1ha in size and as such a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted. Consultation with the Council's Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and/or Local Land Drainage section is recommended to provide information to support the review of FRAs where surface water flooding is/may be an issue. Best practice advice is provided regarding sustainable surface water management.

Regarding groundwater and contamination, conditions are recommended requiring a remediation strategy and a verification report and requiring no infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground without the consent of the Local Planning Authority (because of the potential for contamination to be present on the site).

The **Landscape Development Section** raises no objections subject to tree retention, tree protection and full landscaping proposals being dealt with by reserved matters. A contribution of £2,943 per dwelling is required for off site Public Open Space and will be used for improvements to facilities at nearby Audley Road Playground/Crackley Recreation Ground. The provision of a maintenance agreement would be required for the future maintenance of any open space provided on site.

The **Economic Regeneration Section** of the Council recommends refusal for the following reasons:-

- The Borough is very short of employment land and the Waterhayes site remains one of the few immediately available sites.
- This is the most attractive plot remaining of the Rowhurst development site for employment purposes and if this entrance plot were developed for housing, then it would impair the prospects of the remaining part of the Rowhurst site for future employment development.
- The site faces the vehicular entrance to Chesterton Brickworks and its development for residential purposes would impair the operation of that business and any development plans it may have in the future due to the need to consider the new householders' residential amenity.
- The fact that the site owners have unsuccessfully marketed the site for employment development to date does not alter the above comments and it is better that the site remains undeveloped until the economy picks up.

Staffordshire County Council **Flood Risk Team** has no objection to the proposed development subject to a condition which requires the applicant to provide detailed drainage layouts and associated calculations at a later stage to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk to the site or any neighbouring areas including infrastructure.

No comments have been received from the **Greater Chesterton Locality Action Partnership, Housing Services**, or Staffordshire County Council as **Public Rights of Way Authority**. Given that the date for the receipt of comments has passed, it must be assumed that they have no observations to make.

The comments of **Severn Trent Water** and the **Waste Management Service** are awaited.

Representations

No representations have been received.

Applicant's/agent's submission

The application is accompanied by the following documents:

- Design, Access & Planning Statement
- Drainage and Flood Risk Assessment
- Preliminary Ground Risk Assessment
- Ecological Assessment
- Highways Access & Transport Statement
- Marketing Information

All of these documents are available for inspection at the Guildhall and on www.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/planning/watermillsroad

KEY ISSUES

1.1 The application is for outline planning permission for the erection of up to 65 dwellings. Only details of the means of vehicular access to the highway network are for consideration as part of this application, with all other matters reserved for subsequent consideration. Applicants for outline planning permission are required to include information on the amount of development proposed for each use referred to in the application. In the absence of any condition to the contrary any reserved matter would need to comply with and can refer to and draw support from the Design and Access Statement submitted with an application. Where an applicant indicates that the proposal is for up to a certain number of dwellings, in the event of outline planning permission being granted, unless a 'floor' or minimum number of units is imposed by a condition a reserved matters application seeking approval for any number of units up to the specified upper number would be in accordance with the outline planning permission. However if the Authority were to conclude that only a lesser number of dwellings would be appropriate, the appropriate course of action would be to refuse the application detailing the basis for this conclusion.

1.2 The site, of approximately 1.42 hectares in extent, lies within the Newcastle Urban Neighbourhood in an area covered by Policy E9 (Renewal of Planning Permissions for Employment Development) of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan.

1.3 The main issues for consideration in the determination of this application are as follows:-

- Is the principle of development acceptable both in terms of the loss of employment land and the proposed nature of the residential development?
- Would the development be acceptable in terms of the impact on the form and character of the area?
- Would the proposed development have any adverse impact upon highway safety, does the development promote sustainable transport choices and, if so, how does this need to be secured?
- What impact would the development have upon the local schools in terms of additional pupil numbers and how could this matter be addressed?
- Is affordable housing required and if so, how should it be delivered?
- Will appropriate open space provision be made?
- Would there be any adverse impact upon minerals extraction?
- Would there be any impact upon any protected species?
- Would the development provide appropriate standards of residential amenity for the occupiers of the proposed dwellings?

2. Is the principle of development acceptable both in terms of the loss of employment land and the proposed nature of the residential development?

2.1 The NPPF states that the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.

2.2 The site is within an area covered by Policy E9 of the Local Plan which relates to the renewal of planning permissions for employment development. That policy states that on a number of sites (including Rowhurst), for which planning permission has already been granted for employment development, it is the Council's policy that permission would be renewed during the plan period, broadly in the same terms as currently given, unless new factors or other material considerations indicate otherwise. Policy E9 also states that in the case of Rowhurst any viable reserves of Etruria Marl underlying the site should be proved and provision made for their extraction prior to development occurring in accordance with Mineral Local Plan policies 4 & 5. A nature conservation study will be required.

2.3 Policy E11 of the Local Plan refers to the development of employment land for other uses. It states that development that would lead to the loss of good quality business and general industrial land and buildings will be resisted where this would limit the range and quality of sites and premises available. The policy outlines the criteria for considering what constitutes 'good quality' including accessibility, size, condition, location and relationship to adjoining uses. The supporting text to the policy states that the overriding priority is to preserve the stock of land and buildings attractive to Class B users, so that opportunities for inward investment and for the modernisation of existing local businesses can be maximised. CSS Policy SP2 states that the spatial principles of economic development include improvement in the levels of productivity, modernisation and competitiveness of existing economic activities, whilst attracting new functions to the conurbation, especially in terms of service-based industries. These policies are considered to be consistent with the NPPF.

2.4 Paragraph 22 of the NPPF states that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.

2.5 In relation to residential development, CSS Policy ASP5 sets a requirement for at least 4,800 net additional dwellings in the urban area of Newcastle-under-Lyme by 2026 and a target of at least 3,200 dwellings within Newcastle Urban Central (which includes Chesterton).

2.6 CSS Policy SP1 states that new housing in the Borough will be primarily directed towards sites within Newcastle Town Centre, neighbourhoods within General Renewal Areas and Areas of Major Intervention and within the identified 'significant urban centres'. It also states that new development will be prioritised in favour of previously developed land where it can support sustainable patterns of development and provides access to services and service centres by foot, public transport and cycling. The site here does not lie within a General Renewal Area and Area of Major Intervention as identified by the former regeneration body RENEW, although it is close to one of the former..

2.7 Importantly, the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land. The NPPF states that where Local Planning Authorities cannot demonstrate an up-to-date 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date. Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.

2.8 In terms of sustainability, the site is located within 500m of the District Centre of Chesterton which has a number of shops and services, and bus stops are located at the junction of Audley Road and Watermills Road. Chesterton has a number of public transport links to the major urban areas beyond. It is considered that this site represents a sustainable location therefore.

2.9 There is a shortage of well located employment land in the borough particularly for B1c (light industrial) and B2 (general industrial) development, as evidenced by the Employment Land Review. The Review predicted that the employment land requirements for the borough were 150 hectares from 2011 to 2026 and identified a shortage in the supply of sites to meet the demand forecast. In terms of the quality of the application site as an employment site, although it is located away from the A34 and the A500 (i.e. the 'Primary Route Network'), access from those routes is relatively direct and easy. The site is located on the edge of but at the entrance to an industrial estate, the land has no buildings upon it and therefore in good condition, reasonably level and it has an appropriate relationship with neighbouring uses. It is relatively small in size however (at just 1.42ha). Overall, whilst the site is not considered to be one of the best employment sites in the borough, it is of reasonable quality relative to other sites available.

2.10 Various marketing information has been submitted to attempt to substantiate the applicant's claim that the site has not been desirable as industrial land for some time. The details indicate that the site has been marketed since October 2008 as a commercial development site, but that there has been very little interest. No view has been offered as to why there may have been little interest and although commercial agents have stated that the site is not attractive for industrial and commercial use, they have not suggested reasons why this may be the case. Importantly, no attempt appears to have been made to make the site more attractive to potential purchasers. In 2010, when applications were made to effectively renew the original planning permissions for the site, concerns were initially expressed by the applicant regarding additional financial contributions that were requested. The applicant subsequently agreed to the required contributions but no case has been made at any time to the Local Planning Authority since the previous consent was granted (October 2010), to suggest that the disposal of the site has been affected by the additional financial contributions required. It is also pertinent to note that the planning permission for the site lapsed in October 2013 and therefore since that time any marketing has been carried out without the benefit of an extant planning consent.

2.11 The Borough Council owns 89 commercial properties of varying sizes and all are occupied with the exception of one small unit at Newcastle Business Centre. The County Council owns 52 offices and workshop units within the Borough and they are all currently occupied. It appears therefore, that there is demand for commercial units and no argument can be made that there is a surplus elsewhere.

2.12 The NPPF states that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Although this site has been marketed since 2008, your Officer has some concerns regarding the robustness of the marketing methodology and for the reasons detailed above, remains unconvinced that there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment use.

2.13 In conclusion, notwithstanding the Council's inability to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, in the context of the shortage of employment land in the Borough and in the absence of any convincing evidence to suggest that it is unlikely that the site will be developed for employment, it is considered that the adverse impact of the loss of this employment site and the adverse impact upon the economic growth of the Borough would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the contribution it could make to the area's housing supply.

3. Would the development be acceptable in terms of the impact on the form and character of the area?

3.1 CSS Policy CSP1 states that new development should be well designed to respect the character, identity and context of Newcastle and Stoke-on-Trent's unique townscape and landscape and in particular, the built heritage, its historic environment, its rural setting and the settlement pattern created by the hierarchy of centres. It states that new development should contribute positively to an area's identity and heritage (both natural and built) in terms of scale, density, layout, use of appropriate vernacular materials for buildings and surfaces and access. This policy is considered to be consistent with the NPPF.

3.2 Layout, scale and appearance are all matters reserved for subsequent approval. A zoning plan has been submitted showing areas of high and medium density housing and land to be retained as open space. A maximum of 65 dwellings are proposed and based on the developable site area, this would give a density of approximately 60 dwellings per hectare. There is a mix of dwelling size and style in the area and the density proposed appropriately reflects the character of the locality. It is considered that the number of dwellings indicated could be accommodated within the site satisfactorily.

3.3 Although much of the site is generally flat, there is a bund along the south-western boundary of the site which is proposed to be retained and enhanced as open space. This would provide an attractive edge to the site in views from Apedale Country Park to the south-west. There is also a substantial bund with dense planting to the north which screens the site from the dwellings on Audley Road.

3.4 The Design and Access Statement appears to be a reasonable basis upon which applications for reserved matters approval could be made, subject to any more detailed conditions overriding it in the event of any conflict.

4. Would the proposed development have any adverse impact upon highway safety, does the development promote sustainable transport choices and, if so, how does this need to be secured?

4.1 The application is accompanied by a Transport Statement which concludes that traffic generated by this development will have no significant impact upon the highway network. It also states that it is likely that there will be less reliance upon every day use of the motor car with the close proximity of the site to services and public transport.

4.2 The Highway Authority has objected to the proposal on the grounds that there is insufficient information provided for them to provide an objective response as the submitted application does not provide any TRICS traffic data covering the a.m. and p.m. peak periods (TRICS is a database system that provides potential levels of trip generation for all types of development).

4.3 The Highway Authority has indicated verbally that the proposed access is acceptable and they have advised that subject to the receipt of an acceptable revised Transport Statement, they are likely to withdraw their objection to the proposal. A revised Transport Statement is expected shortly and the matter will be addressed in a supplementary report to Members.

4.4 As referred to above, the site is located within walking distance of the shops and services of Chesterton, and bus stops are located at the junction of Audley Road and Watermills Road. It is considered that this site represents a sustainable location therefore. An NTADS contribution of £40,079 is required. This requirement is considered to meet the three tests set out in Section 122 of the CIL Regulations (i.e. it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development). This could be secured through a planning obligation secured by agreement or undertaking, but given the concern of principle raised above in the discussion of the first Key Issue it needs to be noted that there is no such obligation currently “on the table”.

5. What impact would the development have upon the local schools in terms of additional pupil numbers and how could this matter be addressed?

5.1 The development falls within the catchments of Chesterton Community Sports College and Crackley Bank Primary School. Staffordshire County Council as the Education Authority advises that Crackley Bank Primary School is projected to be full for the foreseeable future and therefore requests an education contribution of £154,434.

5.2 Your Officer is satisfied that the education contribution sought is one which meets the three tests set out in Section 122 of the CIL Regulations (i.e. it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development). Again this could be secured by agreement (the use of a unilateral undertaking would be inappropriate given that the LPA should be seeking counter obligations requiring the County Council to spend the money on the agreed purpose and within an agreed time). Given the concern of principle raised above in the discussion of the first key issue it needs to be noted that there is no such obligation currently “on the table”.

6. Is affordable housing required and if so, how should it be delivered?

6.1 Policy CSP6 of the CSS states that for new residential development within the urban area, on sites or parts of sites proposed to, or capable of, accommodating 15 or more dwellings will be required to contribute towards affordable housing at a rate equivalent to a target of 25% of the total dwellings to be provided.

6.2 The applicant has confirmed that such a requirement is acceptable in principle. Again this could be secured by agreement (the use of a unilateral undertaking would be inappropriate). Given the concern of principle raised above in the discussion of the first key issue it needs to be noted that there is no such obligation currently “on the table”.

7. Will appropriate open space provision be made?

7.1 LP Policy C4 states that appropriate amounts of publicly accessible open space must be provided in areas of new housing, where it should be located and what issues should be taken into account in its design. It also indicates that its maintenance must be secured.

7.2 Policy CSP5 of the CSS states that the plan area’s open space, sports and leisure assets will be enhanced, maintained and protected by a number of measures.

7.3 The applicant’s Planning Statement advises that it is proposed to provide public open space within the site, measuring 0.33ha. A ‘linear coppice walk’ is proposed along with a small village green.

7.4 The Landscape Development Section (LDS) advises that a contribution for off-site public open space is required. They state that although open space is proposed within the site, the area allocated as such is steep and is not centrally located. The financial contribution would be used for improvements to facilities at nearby Audley Road Playground (approximately 670m away) and Crackley Recreation Ground (approximately 460m away). This requirement is considered to meet the three tests set out in Section 122 of the CIL Regulations (i.e. it is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development). Again this could be secured by agreement (the use of a unilateral

undertaking would be inappropriate). Given the concern of principle raised above in the discussion of the first key issue it needs to be noted that there is no such obligation currently “on the table”

8. Would there be any adverse impact upon minerals extraction?

8.1 One of the considerations of LP Policy E9 is that any viable reserves of Etruria Marl should be proved and provision made for their extraction prior to development occurring, in accordance with Mineral Local Plan Policies 4 and 5. Only Policy 5 has been saved and therefore remains relevant. During consideration of the previous applications for this site, the Council's Property Section confirmed that there were no remaining clay deposits as they were extracted at the time of the reclamation of the land and therefore the conclusion reached then was that there was no conflict with Policy E9 in this regard. It is not considered that there is any reason to reconsider this issue now.

9. Would there be any significant impact upon any protected species?

9.1 An Ecological Assessment accompanies the application, comprising a Desk Study, an Extended Phase One Habitat Survey, an Initial Bat Survey and a Great Crested Newt Assessment. It concludes that there are no records of protected flora or fauna directly on the site and therefore it concludes that the development of the site would not have any negative impact on any protected species. There are records of protected flora and fauna within 1km of the site however and therefore mitigation measures are recommended. These should be secured via an appropriate condition.

10. Would the development provide appropriate standards of residential amenity for the occupiers of the proposed dwellings?

10.1 One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is to always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

10.2 The site lies at the entrance to the Rowhurst Close industrial estate directly opposite a substantial brickworks. The Environmental Health Division raises no objections to the proposal subject to a condition requiring the submission of a noise assessment and the incorporation of suitable design measures into the construction of the development to ensure appropriate noise levels.

10.3 Although the site is opposite the brickworks, the land is raised up significantly above it. The boundary of the site with the road is approximately 65m from the nearest point of the buildings on the brickworks site and the extensive yard appears to be used primarily for the storage of bricks. It is notable that the existing dwellings to the north-east of Audley Road are only approximately 35m from the brickworks. Subject to the imposition of a condition as recommended by the Environmental Health Division, it is not considered that the impact of the brickworks on the amenity of the future occupiers of the dwellings would be so significant in terms of outlook, noise, dust or general disturbance to justify a refusal.

Background Papers

Planning files referred to
Planning Documents referred to

Date report prepared

17th March 2014