

Case Officer: Chris Wright
Tel. No: (01246) 345787
Ctte Date: 6th January 2020

File No: CHE/19/00606/FUL
Plot No: 2/1732 2344

ITEM 1

Change of Use from hotel (use class C1) to a house in multiple occupation involving shared accommodation, associated alterations and provision of parking spaces at 85-87 Newbold Road, Newbold, Chesterfield

Local Plan: Unallocated
Ward: St Helens

1.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

Ward Members	No representations
Strategy Planning Team	Consider the proposal to have an under provision of parking numbers, but the principle is acceptable.
Environmental Services	No comments.
Economic Development	No comments
Private Housing Services	No objection, and the proposal will be subject to a HMO License
Derbyshire Constabulary	No objections
DCC Highways	No objection
Chesterfield Cycle Campaign	No comments
Urban Design Officer	No comments.
Neighbours/Site Notice	11 Comments from 9 addressed neighbours, with one neighbour writing in

twice and another not providing their address.

The proposal was advertised by a site notice and neighbour letters.

2.0 **THE SITE**

- 2.1 This application concerns a building which is sited to the northern side of Newbold Road. The building is on the Local Heritage List (no.126) and is described as a:
“3 storey semi-detached dwellings now (converted) to a hotel and restaurant. Constructed of brick (now painted) and slate roof. Key characteristics include bays terminating in pitched gables decorated with finials (one has retained an original bulls eye window); bay windows with pagoda style roofs; arched hoods over windows/doors; and brick chimney stack with stone banding and pediments.”
Its reason for nomination is stated as an:
“Attractive and distinctive building which makes a positive contribution to the wider street scene. Has some group value with the adjacent Central Pentecostal Church (which was probably built at around the same time and shares an architectural aesthetic).”
- 2.2 The site was previously utilised as a bed and breakfast hotel with some capacity for a restaurant. It has a church to the west and residential dwellings to the east and north. To the south there is a primary school and nursery on one site and a building that was previously utilised as a residential care home.
- 2.3 The previous hotel on site had 10 rooms, as well as a flat in the basement for the business owners. The restaurant was not a traditional restaurant with multiple tables and a varied menu, instead it offered a specialised service where all diners sat at one table and were offered the same menu.
- 2.4 The site has parking for 4 vehicles to the front of the site. It currently stores its bins off-site, to the front of the neighbouring church to the west.

- 2.5 There is a rear garden area which previously had a pond and some smaller outbuildings however these had been removed on the officer's site visit. The existing building also had a covered outside area, which was sited below the conservatory.
- 2.6 The area surrounding the site has very limited parking provision with the majority of the surrounding roads either permit parking zones or double yellow lined.



3.0 **RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

- 3.1 CHE/1088/0820 – Change of Use from flats to guest house was approved on 16th January 1989 subject to a condition which required the use only to take place whilst parking was available at The Industry Inn on Queen Street.
- 3.2 CHE/0389/0247 – Renewal of Consent for use as a guest house was conditionally approved on 14th June 1989 subject to a condition requiring 7 parking spaces at the Industry Inn being available at all times for guests.
- 3.3 CHE/0500/0317 – A Certificate of lawfulness was granted on the basis that parking spaces had been constructed to the frontage of the guest house in 1989, the Industry Inn had been sold in October 1991 and guests had never parked at the Industry Inn – Conditional Permission – 22/06/00

3.4 CHE/05/00335/FUL - Conservatory/terrace/access to garden
– Conditional Permission – 20/06/05

4.0 **THE PROPOSAL**

4.1 The proposal is for the change of use from a hotel to a house in multiple occupancy (HIMO). No significant changes to the front elevation of the building are proposed. The car parking spaces to the front of site will be increased from 4 to 5, as well as provision of 4 cycle parking spaces.

4.2. The proposal is for 16 bedrooms and has internal alterations that include kitchens, dining rooms and lounge space. At basement level an open area has been changed to be included as dining space.

4.3 At basement floor level this would accommodate 2 laundry rooms, kitchen, living/dining room, a TV room, lounge, 2 store rooms, a W.C., a dining room and 2 bedrooms.

Schedule of bedroom sizes:

Basement

B5 18.87m²

B6 18.87m²

Ground

G1 17.77m²

G2 21.12m²

G3 26.65m²

G5 28.4m²

First

1.1 15.17m²

1.2 19.57m²

1.5 20.4m²

1.6 20.4m²

1.7 19.57m²

1.8 15.17m²

Second

2.3 14.09m²

2.4 19.99m²

2.9 12.58m²

2.10 19.74m²

4.6 Bedrooms 2.3 and 2.9 are the smallest rooms in floor space terms and they include en-suite bathrooms and some space below 1.8m in height and also rely on velux windows for natural light and a view. The Council's Private Housing Team standards require 6.5 square metres floorspace for the living room (excluding bathroom) and these two rooms fall below this standard.

4.7 The proposal was amended since the original submission to reduce the bedroom numbers from 18 to 16, with the creation of more communal space in the basement. The original scheme also included basic kitchen facilities in each room however these were removed.

5.0 **CONSIDERATIONS**

The Development Plan

5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'. The relevant Development Plan for the area comprises of the saved policies of the Replacement Chesterfield Local Plan adopted June 2006 (RCLP) and the adopted Chesterfield Local Plan Core Strategy due.

Replacement Chesterfield Borough Local Plan Policies ('RCBLP')

5.2 There are no relevant policies.

Chesterfield Local Plan: Core Strategy 2011 -2031 ('Core Stategy')

5.3

- CS1 Spatial Strategy
- CS2 Principles for Location of Development
- CS3 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- CS4 Infrastructure Delivery

- CS6 Sustainable Design and Construction
- CS7 Managing the Water Cycle
- CS8 Environmental Quality
- CS9 Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
- CS10 Phasing of Housing Delivery
- CS11 Range of Housing
- CS18 Design
- CS19 Historic Environment
- CS20 Influencing the Demand for Travel

National Planning Policies

5.4 The Sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) considered relevant to the decision are;

- 2. Achieving Sustainable Development
- 5. Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes
- 8. Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities
- 9. Promoting sustainable transport
- 12. Achieving Well designed Places
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 16. Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.

5.5 Supplementary Planning Documents relevant to the decision are;

SPD 'Designing Out Crime' (adopted June 2007)

SPD 'Successful Places' A guide to sustainable housing layout and design' (adopted 24th July 2013).

5.6 Other relevant documents include;

Manual for Streets 2 (DfT March 2007)

Housing Act 2004

5.7 **Principle of Development:**

5.7.1 The application site is not allocated for any specific land use of policy constraint on either the adopted or emerging Local Plans. The main policies applying to the principle of the

development are therefore policies CS1 and CS2. These seek to direct new development to locations within walking and cycling distance of centres. In addition, policy CS20 seeks to maximise the use of walking, cycling and public transport through the location of development.

- 5.7.2 The Council's residential SPD describes a 'walkable' development as one that has access to a good range of facilities within typically a 10-minute walking distance via a safe, convenient route. The application site is within walking distance of Chesterfield Town Centre (and the Chesterfield Co-op as a source of convenience retail) and closer still to the Newbold Local Centre, which includes a Spar store. In addition, Newbold Road is a frequent bus route (with services to Chesterfield Town Centre approximately every 12 minutes on weekdays). The site is previously developed land and benefits from good access to a range of services. On balance the proposal is in line with policies CS1 and CS2 (and the locational aspects of CS20) and supports the council's overall spatial strategy in terms of locations for new development.
- 5.7.3 The Local Plan does not set out any specific parking standards in its policies, although those in Appendix G can be used to give an indication of expectations. This gives a figure of 1 space per 2 units for Houses in Multiple Occupation. For the proposed development (which proposes 16 single rooms) this would be eight spaces. A total of five spaces are proposed. The under provision will need to be balanced against the proposed development being in a sustainable location with a range of facilities within walking and/or public transport distance and the lack of an objection from the Highway Authority.
- 5.7.4 As an HIMO of this scale would be a Sui Generis use, it would not be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
- 5.7.5 The application site was an existing bed and breakfast and it is proposed to change this to a HMO, which is a sui generis use. It would be close to the town centre and re-uses an existing building. It would be within reasonable walking distance of existing services, facilities, employment, public

transport and public open space. This meets the requirements of the Spatial Strategy.

- 5.7.6 The proposed development is considered acceptable in principle against policies CS1, CS2 and CS18 of the Core Strategy and the wider objectives of the revised NPPF, however an assessment of the detailed impacts are required under policy CS2 and CS18 as referred to below. With regards to policy CS20 the highways impact of the proposal are assessed in the highways section below.

5.8 Design and Visual Amenity

- 5.8.1 With regards to the design of the existing building the proposal will not significantly alter the frontage of the existing building and whereas there are some changes to the rear of the building, such as the removal of the exit platform and staircase, they are not highly visible to surrounding neighbours or the streetscene, and it is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

5.9 Residential Amenity

- 5.9.1 Comments have been received from neighbouring residents regarding overlooking issues. The proposal does not add additional windows to the building or increase the height of the land within the garden or reduce the boundary treatments to the side and rear. The proposal is however likely to lead to the intensification of the use of site with residents of the HMO permanently based on site in independent rooms, rather than the occasional use of rooms from hotel residents. The likely use of the garden area from HMO residents is unknown in comparison to the hotel but subject to insignificant changes to ground levels or boundary treatment it is not considered that the proposal should lead to a negative impact to surrounding residents. If anti-social behaviour arises from future residents of the building, as suggested by objectors this will be a matter for the Police and would not be a significant material planning consideration.
- 5.9.2 Local residents have commented that the proposal could lead to an increase in noise and disturbance. It is considered

that there are examples of HiMOs where there are increased levels of anti-social behaviour and noise and disturbance to surrounding residents. The existing site is a hotel which would have had staff permanently on site to manage any inconsiderate behaviour by guests however the proposal would have no full time management on site, instead any issues would need to be relayed to the landlord and/or the local Police to be dealt with by them. It is considered instances of excessive noise by residents can be a management issue and that careful picking of residents of the house and clear expectations of the behaviour standards of residents can help to ensure that there are less likely to be issues related to residents of the site. In planning terms the proposal has to be treated in a comparable manner to other residential dwellings, in that some people are more considerate than others and only because this is HiMO doesn't necessarily significantly increase the certainty that the residents will be more or less considerate.

5.9.3 The proposed type of accommodation can give rise to neighbours having fears over the occupiers being more likely to commit anti-social behaviour or crime than might be the case with different types of accommodation. There is no evidence to support such fears given that the proposal is for private occupation and is not a hostel use for a specific clientele. The Derbyshire Constabulary has been consulted and they have raised no issues. Subject to conditions controlling the design and proposals for boundary treatments, the proposal would not be likely to adversely affect community safety nor inclusive access. In these respects the proposal would not conflict with the Council's SPD 'Successful Places', Core Strategy policies CS2 and CS18 and the NPPF.

5.10 **Accommodation Provision**

5.10.1 The development includes en-suite bathrooms with all bedrooms, which is not a traditional situation for HMOs. The Council's Private Housing Standards for HMOs requires that all single bedrooms are at least 6.51 sqm in floor space. Of the 16 bedrooms 14 include rooms that are significantly above the 6.5 sqm as recommended by these standards. Two of these bedrooms (2.3 and 2.9) are below the required

standards, but when considering these rooms in the context of the additional personal bathroom space and the shared spaces on the lower floors the proposed bedrooms are not significantly deficient to lead a refusal.

- 5.10.2 The proposal has been amended to include increased shared space in the building, although this is mostly below ground level and has variable natural light levels however this space is considered to be acceptable for shared space.
- 5.10.3 The rear garden area would also be used by the residents as amenity space and/or as drying space for clothes.
- 5.10.4 Overall it is considered that the development proposals are acceptable. It is considered to comply with the provisions of policy CS2 and CS18 of the Core Strategy and the wider NPPF, subject to condition in relation to resident numbers.

5.11 **Private Housing Services**

- 5.11.1 The Private Housing Team was consulted on the scheme and they have provided the following comments:
The individual bedrooms are all well above both the mandatory minimum size for single people in a licensed HMO and relevant guidance used by the Council. They are also likely to meet the minimum size for two persons in both situations though from our point of view discussions with the applicant indicate that occupation will be restricted to single persons. This is partly based on the ability to provide adequate kitchen/dining space.

In terms of amenities there is no issue with bathroom facilities as all rooms incorporate en-suite facilities.

In terms of Kitchen facilities the plans confirm on site discussions and the overall provision is considered adequate for the intended numbers of occupiers. The kitchens provide some sitting/dining space in addition to the actual facilities and there is an additional lounge space on the lower ground floor that is accessible to all. Taking into account the totality of provision this is considered to be adequate.

It is understood that all works carried out will comply with building regulations with particular regard to fire safety/automatic fire detection provision and advice and guidance on this issue have been provided to the applicant.

The property will, if permission is granted and works completed, be a HIMO that is mandatorily licensable under the Housing Act 2004 and relevant application documentation will be provided on request.

5.11.2 The applicant will need to ensure that the proposal adheres to the relevant housing standards to gain a licence from the Council to operate a HIMO.

5.12 **Drainage**

5.12.1 The building has existing drainage on site and the proposal does not significantly alter the existing situation.

5.13 **Highways Issues**

5.13.1 The proposed site would be changed from a hotel and restaurant to a house in multiple occupation. It previously had 10 rooms for the hotel, a flat for the owners and a non-traditional restaurant space available for non-guests. The site had 4 parking spaces to the front, as well as the availability of utilising a local residents parking permit scheme on streets to the north of the site. Within the vicinity of the site there are many restrictions on parking via a mix of parking permit zones and double yellow lines.

5.13.2 The proposal would have rooms for 16 separate residents and would offer 5 parking spaces to the front of the site. Residents would also be able to apply for parking permits in the local area if they chose to. There is a limited amount of free unrestricted on-street parking within the local area, but there is some availability for on-street parking which is within 200m of the site north of the junction with Highfield Road and New Queen Street.

5.13.3 The Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposals however the strategic planning team has commented on the scheme that the parking standards for a HIMO are 0.5 per unit, as stated in Appendix G of the 2013

Local Plan. As the site is for 16 separate units this would mean that 8 spaces are required for the scheme.

- 5.13.4 Within Appendix G of the Council's 2013 Local Plan it also states that the below considerations should be considered when assessing parking standards, these are:
- *The size of the dwellings proposed.*
 - *The type, mix and use of the development.*
 - *The accessibility of the development including proximity of facilities such as schools, shops or employment areas.*
 - *The availability of and capacity for safe on-street and public car parking in the area.*
 - *Proximity to and availability of public transport and other sustainable transport options.*
 - *The likelihood that any existing on-street parking problems will be made worse.*
 - *Local car ownership levels*
 - *Local air quality and the overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles*
- 5.13.5 The site is within 800m of Chesterfield Town Centre, next door to Newbold Local Centre (which includes a public house, shops, a school and a nursery) and is sited on a main road with a regular bus route. These characteristics of the area will influence the demand for regular vehicular use by the residents of the site. As the site includes 5 off-street parking spaces it is considered that residents will seek to utilise these and which will be used and taken up on a first come, first served basis, which will mean that residents who do not get a space will be required to park elsewhere in the area. As the area is strictly controlled with residential parking permits and double yellow lines this will mean that residents will find the nearest possible free parking in the short term or in the longer term pay for a parking permit.
- 5.13.6 The parking standards for a house in multiple occupation are low. 16 residents could have 16 cars, plus visitors and maintenance vehicles, but also the limited parking availability may put off potential residents and attract residents who don't own vehicles. It is considered that it is unlikely that the landlord will not accept any potential resident who owns a car, for this reason alone. The previous use on site as a hotel had a requirement for 1 space per room for guests and 1

space per room for staff, which is a requirement of 11. Some capacity for the restaurant would also have been required, but this was considered to have offered a distinct type of service not related to a daily sitting or large number of covers. Also, this is likely to have been used by local people who would have been aware of the restricted parking on site and in the area, which means customers could have utilised taxis, buses or walked to the premises. It is considered that previous owners could have had a parking permit for themselves to enable customers to park on site, but it still would have been undersupplying parking spaces during busy periods.

- 5.13.7 Local objections from residents have commented that the proposed use has insufficient parking spaces, residential parking permit system in the area doesn't function very well and isn't managed appropriately. The scheme could also lead to a negative impact on highway safety in the local area. The residents also considered that 2 people may live in some of the units, which could double the parking requirements on site. It is considered that this would be a matter of Private Housing Licensing.
- 5.13.8 In the vicinity of the site a different application for a pizzeria restaurant (CHE/18/00772/FUL) was refused on highways grounds and the application was appealed and dismissed by an inspector. This site had no off-street parking and the customers for the business would not have had parking permits so this would have put pressure on any additional local capacity. This case is considered to be different in character to the one proposed here.
- 5.13.9 It is considered that the existing site had an insufficient number of spaces for its requirements, as stated in the Local Plan's standards, but that also any impact from the hotel's visitors would have been different to this one e.g. infrequent use and method of transport for guests. The proposal would increase the daily pressure put on the site as 16 residents will deliver a different pressure to that which currently exists. Although the previous use may have had similar impacts on the local area in terms of highway safety, this would have varied on a daily and seasonal basis and the proposed use is unlikely to vary so much.

5.13.10 The Council's parking standards recommend 8 spaces for 16 units and the proposal can offer 5 off-street spaces. Residents could purchase residential parking permits for the local area, with 3 required to adhere to parking standards. There is free on street parking with 200m of the site, which is considered to be a reasonable distance for residents to walk. In terms of the parking of vehicles in the permit area without a permit or on double yellow lines this is a matter for the parking enforcement team and not a planning issue; although it is accepted that permitting a particular type of use can lead to this kind of behaviour becoming more likely. The site has good access to a local centre, is on a main route for buses and is walkable/cyclable from/to Chesterfield town centre.

5.13.11 Whilst it is accepted that the scheme is below the recommended parking standards it is in a considered to be in a sustainable location. The residents may have some problems parking at the facility and the scheme may lead to some increase to demand in parking permit spaces in the area, but this is not considered to be a significantly negative issue, such that a refusal would not be reasonable. The impacts are unlikely to be severe. Provided that the parking provision is secured by condition the proposal would not conflict with Core Strategy policies CS2, CS18 and CS20 and the NPPF in respect of highway safety and traffic flow.

6.0 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

6.1 Having regards to the nature of the application proposals the development comprises the creation of a Sui Generis Use Class and the development is therefore not CIL Liable.

7.0 **REPRESENTATIONS**

7.1 As a result of neighbour notification, 11 comments from 9 addressed neighbours were received, with one neighbour writing in twice and another not providing their address. Their objections concern traffic impact, inadequate parking provision, noise, impact on residential amenity and privacy, inappropriate use of site, waste storage and collection, increased criminality and overuse of site. Comments were received from the residents of 4, 5 and 7 Princess Street, 2,

11 and 37 New Queen Street, 14 Highfield Road and 81 and 83 Newbold Road.

- 7.2 The resident of 4 Princess Street stated that they object on the grounds of traffic generation, highway safety, inappropriate use of location, adequacy of parking, noise and disturbance resulting from use and loss of privacy. Specifically the area has problems with permit and non-permit parking and the scheme will increase traffic flow in the area. Noise from the garden area and building of the proposed residents could impact surrounding dwellings. The scheme could also lead to overlooking into surrounding residents and could generally impact their amenity.
- 7.3 The resident of 5 Princess Street stated that the proposal may lead to 2 residents occupying each room and that if half of these residents had cars that could have a significant impact on parking in the local area. If these residents requested parking permits in the local area this could cause issues for local residents who currently have permits.
- 7.4 The resident of 7 Princess Street stated that the area has limited parking in the local area and the scheme will negatively impact this.
- 7.5 The resident of 2 New Queen Street stated that they object on the grounds of an impact on noise, residential amenity and traffic. Specifically they don't consider that the site has enough parking for its proposed requirements.
- 7.6 The resident of 11 New Queen Street stated that they object to the scheme as it will have a significant negative impact on the surrounding area in terms of the limited parking availability in the surrounding area and highway safety in the local area.
- 7.7 The resident of 37 New Queen Street stated that they objected to the scheme due to its impact on highway safety and inadequate parking in the local area.
- 7.8 The resident of 14 Highfield Road stated that they objected to the scheme because of its impact to highway safety in the locality and its insufficient levels of parking.

- 7.9 The resident of 81 Newbold Road objected to the scheme, they stated that the proposed waste would be sited off-site to the front of the church and this is not within the owner's grounds. Also, the location would not adhere to Chesterfield Borough Council's standards for locations for bins. If the bins would be stored to the front of the site this would block access for 5 vehicle parking spaces to the front. They do not consider that there is enough space to the front of the site for 5 vehicles. The resident also considers that it is not possible to limit the number of residents and that there may be 2 residents per room. This could lead to 20 vehicles being associated to the site plus visitors and contract cleaners and maintenance workers; as there is a low level of parking in the area the development would lead to an unacceptable impact on the surrounding area. They also consider the applicant has overstated the number of people previously on site, as they consider that the hotel was rarely at capacity, and that the use of the site by hotel and restaurant guests is very different to how HIMO guests would use the site.
- 7.10 The resident of 83 Newbold Road provided two separate comments, in the first comment they stated that they objected on potential noise and residential amenity, specifically anti-social noise and privacy loss in adjacent gardens. In the second comment they stated that the area is over-saturated with HIMOs and the development could lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour from the new residents and an increase in crime levels for the surrounding area, as well as the site may attract increased levels of criminality.
- 7.11 A local person who has provided their name but not their address has stated that there is a strain on parking spaces in the area and that a previous application for a café in the area was refused due to its impact on highways. They question how the number of residents could be limited and that 2 residents may use each room, which would further exacerbate the impact on parking in the surrounding area. The proposal would also impact highway safety in the local area and impact air quality levels, as well as the potential for people parking on double yellow lines. The scheme would also increase noise and disturbance in the local area.

7.5 Comments – The issues raised have been responded to in the considerations section of the report.

8.0 **HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998**

8.1 Under the Human Rights Act 1998, which came into force on 2nd October 2000, an authority must be in a position to show:

- Its action is in accordance with clearly established law
- The objective is sufficiently important to justify the action taken
- The decisions taken are objective and not irrational or arbitrary
- The methods used are no more than are necessary to accomplish the legitimate objective
- The interference impairs as little as possible the right or freedom

8.2 It is considered that the recommendation is objective and in accordance with clearly established law.

8.3 The recommended conditions are considered to be no more than necessary to control details of the development in the interests of amenity and public safety and which interfere as little as possible with the rights of the applicant.

8.4 Whilst, in the opinion of the objectors, the development affects their amenities, it is not considered that this is harmful in planning terms, such that any additional control to satisfy those concerns would go beyond that necessary to accomplish satisfactory planning control

9.0 **STATEMENT OF POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE WORKING WITH APPLICANT**

9.1 The following is a statement on how the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has adhered to the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012 in respect of decision making in line with paragraph 38 of the February 2019 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

9.2 Given that the proposed development would not conflict with the revised NPPF (February 2019) and with 'up-to-date' Development Plan policies, it is considered to be 'sustainable development' and there is a presumption on the LPA to seek to approve the application. The LPA has been sufficiently proactive and positive in proportion to the nature and scale of the development applied for.

10.0 **CONCLUSION**

10.1 The site is a sustainable location where such a development would not be inappropriate and development would not have an unacceptable detrimental or severe impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents or highway safety. As such, the proposal accords with the requirements of policies CS2, and CS13 of the **Core** Strategy and the wider National Planning Policy Framework.

11.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

11.1 That the application be **GRANTED PERMISSION** subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason - The condition is imposed in accordance with section 51 of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004.

2. All external dimensions and elevational treatments shall be as shown on the approved plans / documents (listed below) with the exception of any approved non material amendment.

- Drawing Numbers Bck.01 rev B; Bck.10 rev L; Bck.11 rev J; Bck.12; Bck.13 rev A; Bck.14;
- Planning and Sustainability Statement rev B

Reason - In order to clarify the extent of the planning permission in the light of guidance set out in "Greater

Flexibility for planning permissions" by CLG November 2009.

3. The proposed frontage car parking and cycle parking within the application site boundary shall be available for the use hereby approved and shall be maintained and be available for parking for the life of the development.

Reason – In the interests of highway safety.

4. The 16 No units shall each be occupied only by 1 person.

Reason – To ensure acceptable standards of accommodation are provided and that increased demand on parking provision in the local area does not arise.

Notes

01. If work is carried out other than in complete accordance with the approved plans, the whole development may be rendered unauthorised, as it will not have the benefit of the original planning permission. Any proposed amendments to that which is approved will require the submission of a further application.