

## **Committee Report**

**Item No: 2**

**Reference:** DC/17/04484

**Case Officer:** Rebecca Biggs

**Ward:** Rickinghall & Walsham.

**Ward Member/s:** Cllr Jessica Fleming. Cllr Derek Osborne.

---

### **Description of Development**

Listed Building Application - Insertion of internal extraction equipment with external flue, internal sound proofing and fire-proofing partitions and new internal door.

### **Location**

The Newsagent Bell Hill Cottage, The Street, Rickinghall Inferior, IP22 1BN

**Parish:** Rickinghall Inferior

**Site Area:** 167 m<sup>2</sup>

**Conservation Area:** Rickinghall and Botesdale Conservation Area

**Listed Building:** Grade 2

**Received:** 01/09/2017

**Expiry Date:** 03/11/2017

---

**Application Type:** LBC- Listed Building Consent

**Development Type:** Listed Building Consent

**Environmental Impact Assessment:** N/A

**Applicant:** Mr Yusuf Karakus

**Agent:** Mrs Sarah Roberts

---

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION**

This decision refers to drawing number 01A received 01/09/2017 as the defined red line plan with the site shown edged red. Any other drawing showing land edged red whether as part of another document or as a separate plan/drawing has not been accepted or treated as the defined application site for the purposes of this decision.

The plans and documents recorded below are those upon which this decision has been reached:

Application Form - Received 01/09/2017

Planning Statement - Received 01/09/2017

Elevations - Existing 03 - Received 01/09/2017

Floor Plan - Existing 02 - Received 01/09/2017

Defined Red Line Plan 01 A - Received 01/09/2017

Block Plan - Existing 01 A - Received 01/09/2017

Plans - Proposed 04 - Received 01/09/2017

Listed Building Justification Statement- Received 01/12/17  
Ceiling additional information - Received 02/01/2018  
Fixing Points for Ceiling Lining 05 - Received 10/01/2018  
Details of Ceiling fixing- Specification sheet- Table 3: Diagram 2. - Received 10/01/2018

The application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online at [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk). Alternatively, a copy is available to view at the Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Council Offices.

---

## **PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

---

The application is referred to committee for the following reason/s:

- Member referral

---

## **PART TWO – APPLICATION BACKGROUND**

---

### **History**

The planning history relevant to the application site is listed below. A detailed assessment of the planning history including any material Planning Appeals will be carried out as needed in Part Three:

DC/17/04483	Planning Application - Part change of use to form A5 hot food takeaway with extraction equipment and flue.	To be determined
-------------	--	------------------

### **All Policies Identified As Relevant**

The proposal has been assessed with regard to adopted development plan policies, the National Planning Policy Framework, and all other material considerations. Highlighted local and national policies are listed below. Detailed assessment of policies in relation to the recommendation and issues highlighted in this case will be carried out within the assessment:

### **Summary of Policies**

FC01 - Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development  
FC01\_1 - Mid Suffolk Approach To Delivering Sustainable Development  
CS05 - Mid Suffolk's Environment  
HB01 - Protection of historic buildings  
HB03- Conversions and alterations to listed buildings  
NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

### **List of other relevant legislation**

- Human Rights Act 1998
- Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (any rural site)
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act
- Consideration has been given to the provisions of Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998, in the assessment of this application but the proposal does not raise any significant issues.

### **Details of Previous Committee / Resolutions and any member site visit**

The application was deferred from Development Committee on 03 January 2018. The application, prior to the meeting, was found to have the incorrect ownership certificate. Furthermore, representation had been received from a Neighbour's Solicitor which needed to be reviewed. The application was deferred to be reported back once correctly certificated and formalities reviewed. It was also recommended that a site visit be carried out on 24 January 3pm.

### **Details of any Pre-Application Advice**

Pre-application advice was sought. The change of use was generally supported by the officer and recommended that the use ceased at 9pm.

### **Consultations and Representations**

During the course of the application Consultation and Representations from third parties have been received. These are summarised below.

#### **A: Summary of Consultations**

##### **Initial consultation comments-**

##### **Rickingham Superior and Inferior Parish Clerk**

Rickingham Parish Council object-

The statement provided with the Listed building application is minimal and it is felt that the impact on the fabric of the building, the fire risk and the extraction system are given only superficial consideration. There is particular concern about the construction of a modern galvanised steel flue on the roof of the grade II Listed building. The part of the building in question is an extension to the later 17th century service wing of the original house built with in a similar style and materials. The roof of this wing is prominent in views of the listed building from the east along The Street where it forms a group with other historic buildings showing consistent use of traditional tiled roofs and brick chimneys. The proposed metal flue would contrast with this and so detract from the character of the building. As such it would harm the historic significance of the Listed building and Conservation Area in terms of the NPPF paragraph 132 and Rickingham Parish Council therefore objects to the application.

##### **Heritage Team**

The Heritage Team considers that the documentation submitted in support of this application falls below the requirements of paragraph 128 of the NPPF, as no assessment of the impact of the proposed work on the listed building has been made. The Heritage Team is not opposed to the change of use, however does have concerns regarding the necessity and justification of the proposed internal works through introduction of fire lining/suspended ceiling and the possible effect on the internal character of the Grade II Listed Bell Hill Cottage.

## **Re-consultation with Heritage following submission of Listed Building Justification Statement-**

### **Heritage Consultants- Place Services**

Acoustic solution will obscure the original internal wall which includes exposed timbers. This will cause some harm to the aesthetic value of the building.

The soundproofing of the ceiling has potential to cause harm. Not enough information has been provided by the applicant pertaining to the date of the ceiling fabric or the manner in which the proposed suspended ceiling would be attached. As such I am unable to assess the level of harm to the fabric.

The principal of the application and change of use is acceptable. I would however recommend investigations are undertaken to ascertain the age/significance of the ceiling fabric and also find if less intrusive acoustic/soundproofing solutions are available.

## **Re-consultation following additional information regarding ceiling, correct ownership certificate and representation from Bell Hill House.**

### **Heritage Team**

Response outstanding and will be provided as verbal update or late paper

### **Rickingham Parish Council**

Any representation will be provided as verbal update or late paper

### **Botesdale Parish Council**

Any representation will be provided as verbal update or late paper

## **B: Representations**

### **Initial representation received**

Two letters of objection-

- The proposed wall and ceiling liners/boards will not provide adequate soundproofing for the increase in noise associated with seven day opening until 10pm.
- Gysym Gyproc will not provide adequate noise insulation. The technical specification states it would provide acoustic upgrade not sound insulation. Gyproc SoundBloc would be more appropriate.
- Must retain access to soil pipe for en-suite bathroom.
- Request inspection is carried out by Fire Service to ensure that what is proposed is adequate for old timber framed building with living accommodation above
- Odours should not be allowed to interrupt the interesting, historic and attractive roofline
- The Flue would stand out disproportionately dramatically affecting the view and the is inappropriate for the Conservation Area.
- Unclear how high the flue will be
- Odour will filter into our roof space and house
- Unclear why this is submitted separately to the application for the change of use. Should be considered in conjunction with each other.
- Damage Listed Building and Conservation Area
- No benefits to the village
- Increase noise and nuisance and exacerbate overburdened parking
- Misleading and factually incorrect

## **Re-consultation following additional information regarding ceiling, correct ownership certificate and representation from Bell Hill House.**

Two objections received at the time of writing the report. Further summary of responses will be presented to members as late papers or verbal update.

- Not in keeping with the conservation area
- Damage to listed building
- High risk of fire and no way that the right level of fire protection could be achieved within damaging the fabric of the building. Please provide evidence of fire risk evaluation reports.
- The venting and flue arrangements proposed for this listed building contradict those in general planning, so are at odds with standard planning practice,
- Proposal does not preserve the nature and character of the building
- Danger to preserving the fabric of the building.
- This building is a local landmark, has been for hundreds of years and to think that the planning committee are even considering this use, with all of the damage and risk of damage is not acceptable.
- Rickinghall is a village and concern regarding viability given population
- Similar facilities very close to the site
- No car parking facility and limited on-street parking
- When this building was a newsagent's, there were problems with people parking on the footway.
- Concern regarding location of bins
- Concern regarding aesthetic appearance of companies shop, health risks, and fire safety
- Loss of needed post office

---

## **PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION**

---

From an assessment of relevant planning policy and guidance, representations received, the planning designations and other material issues the main planning considerations considered relevant to this case are set out including the reason/s for the decision, any alternative options considered and rejected. Where a decision is taken under a specific express authorisation, the names of any Member of the Council or local government body who has declared a conflict of interest are recorded.

### **1. The Site and Surroundings**

1.1. The site comprises a former Newsagents and Post Office with residential accommodation above, known as Bell Hill Cottage. The residential accommodation benefits from an enclosed rear garden. The existing shop and residential property do not benefit from any off-road parking. The site is situated along The Street which is a main route through Rickinghall and Botesdale. Bell Hill Cottage is attached to Bell Hill House, and together they form a Grade 2 Listed Building. The building retains its traditional shop front window with central door as detailed in the buildings listing description. The building has a modern rear extension erected in the 1980s which created an annex.

1.2. The site is located adjacent to the Bell Inn Public House and is separated by the vehicular access off the Street leading to the Pub car park which wraps around the rear of the building. This car park slopes away from the road. Opposite the site there is space for parking which is predominately utilised by residential properties.

1.3. Other than the pub, the site is surrounded by dwellings and is situated within the Rickinghall and Botesdale Conservation Area.

1.4. Rickinghall and Botesdale are designated as a Key Service Centre and benefits from a Co-op, pubs, fish and chip shop and Chinese takeaway.

## **2. The Proposal**

2.1. The application is for Listed Building Consent for internal and external alterations to facilitate the change of use the newsagents and part of the first-floor residential area to A5- hot food takeaway. The works include internal partitioning for sound and fire separation between the shop front and Bell Hill Cottage, false ceiling above shop front for sound and fire separation, and installation of extraction ducting internally and external flue. There are no other external works other than the flue. Signage to the building will be subject to a separate advertisement consent and listed building consent.

2.2. The internal wall lining will be independent lining not attached to the existing party wall. The works involved will not result in the loss of any historic fabric.

## **3. National Planning Policy Framework**

3.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) contains the Government's planning policies for England and sets out how these are expected to be applied. Planning law continues to require that applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The policies contained within the NPPF are a material consideration and should be considered for decision-making purposes.

## **4. Core Strategy**

4.1. Core Strategy 2008

CS5- Mid Suffolk Environment- All development will maintain and enhance the environment, including the historic environment, and retain the local distinctiveness of the area.

## **5. Neighbourhood Plan/Supplementary Planning Documents/Area Action Plan**

5.1. Botesdale and Rickinghall Parish Councils have agreed to work together to prepare a joint Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Mid Suffolk District Council confirmed the designated NDP Area on 11 May 2017. The area covers the parishes of Rickinghall Inferior, Rickinghall Superior, and the parish of Botesdale.

## **6. Saved Policies in the Local Plans**

6.1. Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998

\* HB1- Protection of Historic Buildings

\* HB3- Conversions and Alterations to Historic Buildings - Should not detract from the architectural or historic character of the existing building or its setting and the timber frame remains largely unaltered.

## **7. The Principle of Development**

7.1 Members will be aware that support for sustainable economic growth is a principle which underpins the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and which local planning authorities are urged to put at the heart of their decision making.

7.2. Policy HB3 states that listed building consent for alterations to Listed Buildings are acceptable provided the works do not detract from the architectural and historic character of the building and would not alter the structure of a timber framed building and its infill material.

7.3. Consideration must also be given to the provisions of the NPPF where works to a heritage must be justified and assessed as to their impact on the buildings significance.

## **8. Heritage Issues**

8.1. Both the NPPF and Core Strategy place significant emphasis on safeguarding heritage as an important component of sustainable development.

8.2. With reference to the treatment of the submitted application, the Council embraces its statutory duties and responsibilities in relation to listed buildings, notably the general duties under sections 16, 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires the local planning authority to have "special regard to the desirability of preserving [a] building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses".

8.3. Recent case law on the application of the statutory duty acknowledges that the consideration of the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset is a matter for its own planning judgement, but that the Local Planning Authority is required to give any such harm considerable importance and weight. However, where special regard to the desirability of preserving heritage assets has been paid and no harm is posed, the 'balancing' of harm (which should be given considerable weight as above) against public benefits as required by the NPPF, is not engaged.

8.4. Policy HB1 (Protection of Historic Buildings) places a high priority on the protection of the character and appearance of historic buildings, including their setting. Policy HB3 also details that conversion of listed buildings will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and will be required to meet high standards of design, detailing, material and construction. Listed Building Consent will be granted if the Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposal would not detract from the architectural or historic character of the existing building or its setting and for timber frame buildings, the structure of the frame including its infill material remains largely unaltered.

8.5. In paragraph 17 of the NPPF it makes it clear that development should "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations". Para 131 goes on to state that "In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of; the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness." Furthermore Para 132 states "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should

be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification."

8.6. The proposed development is to change the use of parts of the building to A5- Hot Food Takeaway. To implement this change of use internal works are proposed in the interest of neighbour amenity and fire safety. The works include internal partitioning for sound and fire separation between the shop front and Bell Hill House, false ceiling above shop front for sound and fire separation, and installation of extraction ducting internally and external flue. There are no other external works other than the flue. Signage to the building will be subject to separate advertisement consent and listed building consent.

8.7. The Heritage Team's initial response did not oppose the proposed change of use of the building from A1 to A5, however they did raise concerns regarding the internal work proposed. MSDC's Heritage Officer advised that the Heritage Statement submitted with this application is brief and did not include justification or mitigation for the proposed works, despite stating that the proposed works will affect the historic fabric or the character of the building. The Heritage Statement also failed to assess the significance of the listed building, and falls below the requirements of paragraph 128 of the NPPF. For example, whilst the building is timber framed, it is unclear whether the frame is expressed internally, whether the frame is lath and plastered, or if modern plasterboard has been installed on the walls or ceilings. This information should have been included in the Heritage Statement, and depending how the rooms are internally finished, the level of harm which the fire lining may cause to the character of the building may differ. This needed to be clarified.

8.8. A Listed Building Justification Statement ('Statement') was submitted on the 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017 to justify and clarify the extent of works to be undertaken.

8.9. Firstly, the Statement identifies that the existing shop and back office on the ground floor and the first-floor dressing room and en-suite bathroom on the first floor (part of Bell Hill House) are part of the historic building. The listing description describes this area as a 17<sup>th</sup> Century service addition with shop; ground floor early 19<sup>th</sup> Century bowed shop front with a central two-thirds glazed door, flanking 12-light windows, panelled jambs and a fascia board, first floor 2-light glazing bar casements, attached to rear a 1 storey C17 service outbuilding. This service addition is attached to the 16<sup>th</sup> Century core (Bell Hill House). The existing ground floor and first floor residential accommodation of Bell Hill Cottage is an annexe built in the 1980s. As such the extraction equipment and flue project through the floor and roof of the modern extension and will not remove any historic fabric.

8.10. On the first- floor level, secondary fire lining is to be affixed on to the external rear wall of the 17<sup>th</sup> Century service addition which forms an internal wall with the extension built in the 1980s and is used as residential storage. The Statement clarifies that there is no historic fabric visible as the facing material is modern plasterboard and skim. As such this has no negative impact on the historic building.

8.11. On the ground floor, the party wall with the neighbouring house is historic oak-framed, wattle and daub wall to the front Shop room. This offers sub-standard separation from one property to the next. It is proposed to upgrade this area with British Gypsum Gyproc independent lining – 30mm continuous cavity air gap; independent 47x89mm SW studs or Gyproc 70 metal stud system; 50mm Gypglass medium density lining batts between studs; 15mm Wallboard; all junctions sealed; gypsum plaster finish.



8.12. The historic wall will be retained, and the lining will not touch the original wall, as a gap to the existing wall is required to make the sound-proofing work. This lining will be fully reversible, this is deemed to be the most appropriate method, as it provides a better degree of separation with the adjacent residential dwelling.

8.13. It is also noted in the Statement that the shop fittings largely hid this original party wall. Photographs of the shop when it was in operation have been provided within the Statement.

8.14. It is also proposed to add an additional level of ceiling to provide sound insulation and fire separation to the shop area. This would be a Gypliner Universal metal stud system. This system would be reversible and if removed any fixing points on the ceiling can be filled and made good. The secondary ceiling can be installed to follow the existing contours of the historic ceiling, retaining the uneven appearance and the single beam which is visible within the ceiling will remain exposed. The plaster finish will mean no noticeable difference from the existing plastered ceiling, except it will be approximately 50-75mm below.

8.15. The purpose of the new stud wall and ceiling is to be able to retain the original fabric in situ. The historic building can be re-exposed at any point in the future whilst providing a suitably compliant building which would provide better sound-proofing to the adjacent residential use. The Statement states that the fixtures are something which would be required regardless of the type of occupant of the shop. It should be noted that for building regulations a shop and a hot food takeaway fall within the same use. Agreement for the change from the shop to hot food takeaway will not require agreement with Building Control. The change of use of the residential to the flue room and storage room will.

8.16. Further correspondence was received from the Council's Heritage Consultant; Tim Murphy following the submission of this information. Tim advised that the acoustic solution will obscure the original internal wall which includes exposed timbers. This will cause some harm to the aesthetic value of the building.

8.17. Given the extent of previous fittings in the shop, only a small section of timber which was painted white was expressed. Whilst the sound proofing will conceal this section of timber the level of impact is not considered to be a significant impact. Sound insulation by an independent lining is considered to be the most appropriate approach as it will ensure the commercial use of this unit will not cause an unacceptable impact on the adjoining neighbours in terms of noise disturbance but also does not remove or affix to the historic fabric. The benefit of bringing a vacant commercial unit into use outweighs this limited impact on the heritage asset and would not harm the significance of the heritage asset

8.18. The Heritage Consultant also advised that the soundproofing of the ceiling has potential to cause harm and that insufficient information has been provided by the applicant pertaining to the date of the ceiling fabric or the manner in which the proposed suspended ceiling would be attached. As such the Heritage Consultant is unable assess the level of harm to the fabric.

8.19. The Heritage Consultant advises that the principal of the application and change of use is acceptable. However, the Consultant recommends investigations are undertaken to ascertain the age/significance of the ceiling fabric and also find if less intrusive acoustic/soundproofing solutions are available.

8.20. Following this response from the Heritage Consultant, details were submitted by the applicant's agent on the 02 January 2018 providing details of the ceiling. The front section of the existing shop is lath and plaster which is likely to have been installed at the same time as the shop front (early Victorian). The insulating ceiling will be mounted on metal suspension system fixed through the lath and plaster onto timber joists.

8.21. Further information was received on the 10 January 2018 providing a plan of the ceiling system. This identifies 60 connections made through the existing ceiling into the joists above (refer to specification details in background papers- Table 3; Diagram 2). To reduce harm to the existing plaster pilot holes will be drilled first to prevent any damage to the historic ceiling, when the framing system is screwed through.

8.22. The sound proofing and insulation measures would impact on the historic fabric in terms of inserting 60 screws into the timber joist of the ceiling installed in the early Victorian century. Furthermore, the false ceiling will also conceal this historic ceiling which does contribute to the significance of the building in terms of its Victorian alterations and the insertion of the shopfront.

8.23. The proposed sound proofing and fire resistance does not require building regulations approval as, for the purposes of building regulations, a shop and hot food takeaway are classified as the same use. The application does not demonstrate that the scheme would have an acceptable impact in terms of noise on the adjoining neighbour without such sound proofing measures. The Planning Statement states that the sound proofing is to provide a better standard than currently experienced.

8.24. The application does not identify alternative methods of sound-proofing which may have less of an impact than the one proposed. Alternative methods would involve insulating between the joists of the ceiling and floor. To do this would either mean removing the ceiling which would result in the removal of all the historic fabric. Alternatively, insulation could be installed by lifting the original floorboards above. This would require the approval of the adjoining neighbour (Bell Hill House) who has a flying freehold above this part of the shop. The lifting of the original floorboards may in itself lead to damage and alteration in the floor above.

8.25. As such, the Planning Authority must determine the acceptability of the sound proofing measure proposed. The false ceiling to be installed will retain the bowed ceiling and will give the appearance of lath and plaster. The central exposed beam will remain exposed. As such, the visual alteration will be that the ceiling is lower by approximately 50-75mm. The false ceiling is therefore not deemed to detract from the architectural quality of the heritage asset and the timber frame will remain largely intact.

8.26. Given the extent of fixtures which obscured the original walls when the premises were occupied as a shop, that the internal works will allow for protection of the historic fabric, there will be no loss of historic fabric (other than the insertion of screws); and the works will ensure the adjacent residential amenity is protected; the internal works are not considered to harm the character of the historic building and its significance. The sloping ceiling and retained exposure of the beam will ensure the character of the shop is not significantly impacted. The works therefore would allow for the commercial use (all be it as an A5 use) to continue and would not impact the historic character or understanding of this building. The main features of the two bays with two first floor casements and front shop window will remain unaffected.

8.27. Officer's consider the information submitted addresses the Heritage concerns regarding the impact and significance of the building. The works are not deemed to harm the significance or importance of the historical building and are reversible.

8.28. The Heritage team does not oppose the introduction of the flue in the roof slope of the east elevation. The proposed flue would be installed in the 1980s addition to the listed building. The flue does not project far above the ridge and is of a modest scale. The building features a large central chimney, whilst the western elevation of the building features an external stack. Whilst the flue would read as a modern introduction, it is not considered that the flue would harm the character of Bell Hill Cottage, or the significance of the Conservation Area. Heritage recommend the flue is painted black to reduce its visual impact.

8.29. The Heritage Team have been consulted following the submission of the additional information in January 2018 and their response will be reported to Members as a Late Paper or verbal update at Committee.

### **9. Details Of Financial Benefits / Implications (S155 Housing and Planning Act 2016)**

9.1. The development will lead to;

- Business Rates and Council Tax payments

These considerations are not held to be material to the recommendation made on this application, nor its decision.

---

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

---

### **10. Statement Required By Article 35 Of The Town And Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.**

10.1. When determining planning applications, The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires Local Planning Authorities to explain how, in dealing with the application they have worked with the applicant to resolve any problems or issues arising.

10.2. In this case the Officer has liaised with the applicant's agents regarding Heritage, building regulations and noise issues. The Officer has also sought further guidance from SCC Highways.

### **11. Identification of any Legal Implications and/or Equality Implications (The Equalities Act 2012)**

11.1. There are no known legal implications derived from the determination of this application.

11.2. The application has been considered in respect of the current development plan policies and relevant planning legislation. Other legislation including the following has been considered in respect of the proposed development.

## **12. Planning Balance**

12.1. The proposed internal works to facilitate this change of use have been evaluated in terms of their impact on the heritage asset and its significance. The works allow for the protection and retention of historic fabric and are fully reversible. The works will ensure the use of the building does not significantly harm the historic fabric and protects the amenity of the adjacent residential uses.

12.4. The proposed development is considered to accord with the Development Plan and in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF, consent should be granted where development accords with the Development Plan.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That authority be delegated to Corporate Manager - Growth & Sustainable Planning to grant permission subject to the conditions as set out below:

- Time limit
- Approved Plans
- Implementation of sound proofing measures as per drawing 4
- Flue to be painted black
- Any other Heritage Conditions as agreed with the applicant