

Case Officer: Sophie Browne

Applicant: Mr Rajinder Parshad

Proposal: RETROSPECTIVE - First floor extension over an existing garage with eaves height increment to accommodate new windows

Ward: Kidlington West

Councillors: Councillor Walker, Councillor Conway and Councillor McLean

Reason for Referral: Called in by Councillor Walker for the following reasons: Second retrospective application for a development that was previously refused by the Planning Committee; inaccuracies in the application details; adverse impact of the development on the host building, which is a non-designated heritage asset.

Expiry Date: 13 February 2025 **Committee Date:** 15 May 2025

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

MAIN REPORT

1. APPLICATION SITE AND LOCALITY

- 1.1. The application site comprises a two storey dwellinghouse and small garden located near the centre of Kidlington. The dwellinghouse is sited at one end of a terrace of three cottages, which are understood to have been converted from an historic barn. The row is set some 30m back from the High Street to the south, from which it is separated by gardens and parking areas as well as no.75 High Street, which is located approximately 5m from the southern elevation of no.73 and immediately adjacent to the southern site boundary.
- 1.2. The four dwellinghouses are surrounded by highways on three sides – High Street to the south, Forester’s Way to the west, and Home Close to the east – with Tesco’s car park abutting the northern elevation of nos.73 and 77. A Tesco superstore occupies a large brick building of a functional, commercial character immediately across Forester’s Way from the application site, from which it is approximately 9m distant. Tesco marks the start of the commercial stretch of the High Street, which continues to the west.
- 1.3. The site is surrounded by residential development to the east and south of varied character. Development along the southern side of High Street dates primarily from the inter- and post-war periods according to historic mapping, with Home Close developed in the early 1960s. Older development runs along the northern side of High Street to the east of the application site.
- 1.4. The row made up of nos.73, 77, and 79 comprises a linear, gable-ended building with a dual-pitched roof oriented parallel to High Street. It is constructed of rubble stone with a concrete-tiled roof, although the southern elevation of the centre dwellinghouse (no.77) has been covered with white render. The dwellinghouses all have modern windows and the openings to no.73 have red brick surrounds. A number of rooflights have been inserted to both roofslopes of no.79 and a chimney stack constructed rising

from the centre of the ridge of no.77. To the rear, there is a central, two storey, gabled protrusion from no.77, with a largely red brick northern elevation and concrete-tiled roof. A catslide lean-to of rubble stone extends to the east of this, with the subject extension to no.77 adjoining it to the west.

- 1.5. The front elevation of no.73, insofar as this is where the front door is located, is the western gable end, which fronts directly onto Forester's Way. The northern elevation of the building fronts directly onto Tesco car park, which previously comprised the side elevation of a lean-to garage with doors to the western elevation. The works that are the subject of this retrospective application altered and extended this single-storey lean-to upwards and are detailed in Section 3 of this report.

2. CONSTRAINTS

- 2.1. The application site is within an archaeological alert area related to Kidlington's historic core. It is located approximately 55m west of Kidlington High Street Conservation Area and some 67m west of the Grade II listed no.85 High Street, which is located within the Kidlington High Street Conservation Area. By virtue of its age and historic interest as a surviving – albeit converted – agricultural building associated with the rural history of the settlement, the three-dwelling terrace encompassing the application site is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 3.1. The application is retrospective and seeks to retain a first-floor extension to the existing lean-to garage. There has been no change to the footprint of the original extension. The works to erect the first-floor extension include raising the western eaves from approximately 3m to approximately 4.3m in height and the construction of a dual-pitched roof with a ridge height of approximately 7.2m, creating a north-facing gable. The eastern roofslope is slightly truncated to accommodate the insertion of a gutter between the subject extension and the adjoining construction at no.77, resulting in the eastern eaves standing at approximately 4.5m.
- 3.2. The extension is constructed in materials to match the existing lower floor extension and host dwellinghouse. It has three lower floor and three upper floor windows to the northern gable and the garage door to the eastern elevation has been infilled in matching rubble stone with the brick detailing retained. The infilling of the garage door and insertion of ground floor windows facilitates the conversion of the garage to living accommodation, which could be achieved under permitted development rights.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1. The following planning history is considered relevant to the current proposal:

23/01073/F 'Proposed roof extension with associated internal and external works'. Permitted 19.6.2023.

23/03368/F 'First floor extension with associated internal and external work (follow-up to 23/01073/F)'. Refused 19.7.2024.

- 4.2. On 11.7.2024, Planning Committee resolved to refuse application 23/03368/F for the following reason:

"The extension, by virtue of its size, scale and form, has an adverse impact on the character, appearance and significance of the application property, which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The proposal therefore runs contrary to Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, Policies C28

and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, The Kidlington Masterplan 2016 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.”

5. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

- 5.1. No pre-application discussions have taken place with regard to this proposal.

6. RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

- 6.1. This application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed near the site and by letters sent to all properties immediately adjoining the application site that the Council has been able to identify from its records. The final date for comments was **20 March 2025**.

- 6.2. Four objections have been received from third parties, three of which are from the same individual, and are summarised as follows:

- Colour of the roof tiles (to extension and main roof) of no.73 does not match the remainder of the terrace, eroding the character of the area.
- Impact on a non-designated heritage asset dating from 1733 (incongruous form that does not accord with the CDC ‘Guide for the conversion of farm buildings’; loss of historic fabric to create internal connection to the main house).
- The development was refused by the Planning Committee on 11.7.2024, there is no material difference between that application and the current application, and no additional information has been submitted to indicate why a departure should be made from that decision to refuse.
- The comments from the Conservation Officer do not provide any new information that was not previously available to the Planning Committee.
- Failure to accord with local and national policy and guidance and The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (revised May 21st 2024), particularly in relation to barn conversions.
- Inaccuracies in the submitted details.
- Concerns regarding procedural issues including the late serving of the Article 13 Notice to the owner of the adjoining property, the LPA having publicised the application and then accepting amended plans (contrary to guidance requiring the LPA to be satisfied that the description of the development is accurate prior to publicising it), that this is a second retrospective application, and an enforcement notice has been issued

- 6.3. The comments received can be viewed in full on the Council’s website, via the online Planning Register.

7. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

- 7.1. Below is a summary of the consultation responses received at the time of writing this report. Responses are available to view in full on the Council’s website, via the online Planning Register.

- 7.2. KIDLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL: **Objects** on the grounds that: this is a second retrospective application; CDC's Conservation Officer has not been consulted.
- 7.3. WARD MEMBER: Cllr Walker **objects** on the grounds that: this is a second retrospective application; there are inaccuracies in the submission documents; the development is a "non-permitted extension" on a non-designated heritage asset that is visually prominent on the High Street, contributes to its historic character, and is adjacent to the High Street Conservation Area; that the development fails to comply with local and national policies, the Council's supplementary planning guidance, and The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (revised May 21st 2024). Further comments additionally note that the Conservation Officer's comments do not include any new factual information, were not sought until a late stage after substantial work had been completed, and that the previous permission was to raise the height of the garage, not to construct a single storey extension. Cllr Walker's second set of comments also contends that much of the diminution of the character of the original barn referred to by the Conservation Officer arises from the subject development, queries why a second retrospective application has been accepted, and notes that the Conservation Officer's comments do not refer to either the Kidlington High Street Conservation Area Appraisal or the Council's design guide for the conversion of historic barns, neither of which the development adheres to.
- 7.4. CONSERVATION OFFICER: **No objection**, comments as follows:

***"Significance:** The building that is the subject of this application is not a Listed Building and is not located within Kidlington Conservation Area. The building is now three dwellings, but the historic maps suggest that historically this was part of a larger barn likely associated with the property known as The Laurels, both of which were possibly part of the larger Manor Farm complex. The Main house that appears on historic maps and so potentially associated with Manor Farm (now believed to be 85 High Street) is late 17th century in origin and the application building has a date stone of 1733, indicating that despite extensive alterations some historic fabric may still remain.*

The building can therefore be considered as a non-designated heritage asset taking into account the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

***Appraisal:** It is accepted that the building contains some historic fabric, and from historic maps it is indicated that this building was potentially part of a larger barn, however the building has been altered substantially and converted to three dwellings probably in the 1930's (prior to the 1947 planning Act and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990). This has resulted in much of the character of the building as an agricultural building being notably diminished. Furthermore the surroundings which include the car park, large supermarket building and housing development have resulted in the erosion of the context of the building and its relationship with surrounding properties including the Listed Building (formerly the farmhouse).*

In terms of the extension it is accepted that the two-storey gable extension is larger than the small lean to that previously existed and the previously approved single storey extension. However this does not mean that it is harmful to the character of the historic building. The design, siting and materials are considered to be complementary to the building and do not detract from or reduce the legibility of the building further. In short, the extension retains the character of the building as it appears now, which is in the form of three cottages. When considering the potential historic fabric that was removed to accommodate the new extension it is considered that this does not constitute a loss of significant fabric and as the building is not a Listed Building there

is limited controls on the demolition of a small part of the building. Overall the works are not considered to be harmful to the non-designated heritage asset.

Because of the distances involved the application site is not considered to be within the setting of the designated heritage assets. Therefore extending this building to the rear does not result in harm to the significance of the Listed Building or conservation area.”

8. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

- 8.1. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 8.2. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 - Part 1 was formally adopted by Cherwell District Council on 20th July 2015 and provides the strategic planning policy framework for the District to 2031. The Local Plan 2011-2031 – Part 1 replaced a number of the ‘saved’ policies of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 though many of its policies are retained and remain part of the development plan. The relevant planning policies of Cherwell District’s statutory Development Plan are set out below:

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 2011-2031 PART 1 (CLP 2015)

- PSD1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- ESD15 - The Character of the Built and Historic Environment

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 1996 SAVED POLICIES (CLP 1996)

- C28 – Layout, design and external appearance of new development
- C30 – Design control

- 8.3. Other Material Planning Considerations
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
 - Cherwell Design Guide (2018)
 - Cherwell Home Extensions and Alterations Design Guide (2007)
 - Kidlington Framework Masterplan (2016)
 - Oxfordshire Parking Standards for New Developments (2022)

9. APPRAISAL

- 9.1. The key issues for consideration in this case are:
- Design and impact on heritage assets
 - Residential amenity
 - Highway impacts
 - Other matters

Design and impact on heritage assets

- 9.2. CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 seeks to secure high quality design that complements and enhances its setting. Amongst other things, it states that “*proposals for development that affect non-designated heritage assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage assets as set out in the NPPF and NPPG*”.
- 9.3. CLP 1996 Policies C28 and C30 exercise design control over new development including residential extensions, seeking to ensure that layout, design and external appearances, including the choice of external materials, are sympathetic to the

context of the development, and that proposals for extensions are compatible with the scale of the existing dwelling, its curtilage, and the character of the street scene.

- 9.4. The Kidlington Framework Masterplan supports these aims. Theme 1 of the Framework seeks to 'reveal Kidlington's distinctive identity by, *inter alia*, establishing an attractive townscape character through high quality design of new buildings and public spaces. CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 and the Cherwell District Design Guide are referenced in relation to securing high quality design across all new development.
- 9.5. Section 16 of the NPPF relates to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Specifically, paragraph 208 requires the LPA to "*identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal...taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise*" and taking this into account in consideration of the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset. Paragraph 216 states that: "*The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.*"
- 9.6. Notwithstanding comments received from interested third parties, the application site is considered not to affect the setting of either Kidlington High Street Conservation Area or any nearby listed buildings by virtue of its degree of separation from these heritage assets and the presence of existing intervening development. It is over 50m from the edge of the conservation area, from which it is separated by the twentieth century development along Home Close. Given this, the Kidlington High Street Conservation Area Appraisal is considered not to be of relevance to the assessment of the proposal.
- 9.7. As set out in section 1 of this report, the site context is one of modern development with the twentieth century residential development to the east and south of the site and commercial development to the west and north. The extension proposed for retention is experienced primarily in the context of the large Tesco building located some 9m to the west and the associated car park that abuts the northern elevation of the extension. The site context is therefore of very limited sensitivity in terms of aesthetic merit or heritage interest.
- 9.8. As acknowledged by the Conservation Officer, the host building supporting the extension can be regarded as a non-designated heritage asset by virtue of its age and historic interest in association with the farming history of the area, although it is noted that it is not identified as a locally listed buildings in the Kidlington Framework Masterplan. However, the original building appears to have been converted to housing prior to the introduction of The Town and Country Planning Act 1947, which first brought about the planning system in England as we know it today, and subsequent interventions have severely diminished its character and appearance such that it is no longer readily legible as a converted agricultural building.
- 9.9. Concerns that the subject development does not adhere to the Council's 'Design Guide for the Conversion of Farm Buildings' (2002) and its advice in relation to extensions are noted, however this guidance is considered to be of limited relevance given the degree to which the existing alterations contravene this guidance document, including the following interventions that are not related to the subject development: the building has been sub-divided into three dwellings, with associated internal divisions that are not supported in relation to the conversion of agricultural buildings; numerous new openings have been introduced with distinctly domestic, in appearance, windows fitted; the domesticating feature of a chimney stack has been introduced; render has been applied to the central dwellinghouse; the roof covering

has been replaced; and the grounds of the building have been sub-divided to the detriment of its setting and legibility. Third party comments regarding the retention of the planform of the original agricultural building are noted, however historic mapping indicates that this is less clear-cut than the T-shaped form that is asserted, with some records appearing to indicate an historic structure on a similar footprint as the works proposed for retention.

- 9.10. It is noted that an objection has been raised relating to the loss of historic fabric in the form of part of a wall that is believed to form part of the original building. Non-designated heritage assets are not afforded the same protections in relation to demolition or the loss of historic fabric as are listed buildings, and the PPG states the following:

“What permissions/prior approvals are required for demolition outside conservation areas?”

The position of the demolition of statues, memorials and monuments is set out in paragraph 125.

The demolition of any other building, apart from a pub, wine-bar or other drinking establishment, outside conservation areas is permitted development under Part 11 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended. No planning application is required because planning permission for the demolition is granted by the Order, subject to conditions set out in Part 11. For example, the prior approval of the local planning authority may be required as to the method of demolition and the proposed restoration of the site.”

- 9.9 Whilst the Council is required to undertake a balanced judgement in relation to the impacts of a development proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, it is noted that in this instance the demolition of the building in its entirety could be achieved under permitted development rights. Given this, the formation of two new doorways within an existing wall is considered not to result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. It is also noted that a number of the elements of the works that interested parties have expressed concerns over could also be achieved under permitted development rights, including the replacement of the roofing materials over the whole property, the replacement of the front door, the insertion of opaque glass to the front windows, the conversion of the garage to living accommodation, and the installation of additional ground floor windows
- 9.10 Whilst the two-storey gable extension is larger than either the previously existing or permitted extensions, this increase in size does not automatically result in harm to the character of the building. As noted above, the building no longer retains its original agricultural character and instead has the character and appearance of a row of three cottages.
- 9.11 The Council's 'Home Extensions and Alterations Design Guide' SPD advises that *“extensions should normally match the original building in materials, proportions, roof pitch and window detailing. Ideally, the eaves and ridge lines should be lower than those of the main roof to make the extension subservient to the original building”* and *“should be designed to reflect the character of the original building in the design”* (section 5). It is noted that the roof pitch of the extension is slightly shallower than that of the main building, however the overall form, proportions, materials and window detailing are a good match to the host building and the extension is demonstrably subservient by virtue of the stepped down eaves and ridgeline. Given this, the

development is considered to reflect the character of the original building, as required by the Design Guide, in light of which, as noted by the Conservation Officer, *“the design, siting and materials of the extension are considered to be complementary to the building and not to detract from or further reduce the legibility of the building.”*

- 9.12 Interested third parties have raised concerns that the Conservation Officer's comments do not introduce any new factual information that the Planning Committee was not aware of during its consideration of the previous application and further note that the conclusions reached by the Conservation Officer are very similar to those put before the Planning Committee by Planning Officers on 11th July 2024. The refusal reason for the previous application hinged on the adverse impacts of the development on a non-designated heritage asset, however, and in this context, it is important to note that at that time the development had not been assessed by one of the Council's heritage experts. The current application was accepted for consideration in order to accommodate this expert assessment of the heritage impacts and, given the contentiousness of the application, the development was discussed amongst members of the Conservation Team prior to the Conservation Officer submitting formal comments. Given this, due weight should be afforded to the assessment provided by the Conservation Officer of the impacts of the development on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
- 9.13 Whilst it is acknowledged that the host building and its associated row can be regarded as a non-designated heritage asset, the significance of the asset has been much diminished by extensive alterations that have already been made to the building and are not related to the subject development. As such, its original agricultural character has been lost, and it has the character and appearance of a row of three cottages. The extension to the building accords with the Council's supplementary planning document in relation to the design of householder extensions and, by extension, the requirements of CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 in achieving a high quality design that complements its setting. As detailed above and confirmed by the comments of the Conservation Officer, the works are considered not to be harmful to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. The extension therefore accords with the relevant requirements of CLP 2015 Policy ESD15, CLP 1996 Policies C28 and C30, and Section 16 of the NPPF.

Residential amenity

- 9.14 Amongst other matters, CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 requires that new development should *“consider the amenity of both existing and future development, including matters of privacy, outlook, natural lighting, ventilation, and indoor and outdoor space”*. Similarly, CLP 1996 Policy C30 seeks to secure acceptable standards of amenity and privacy in relation to new housing development or proposals for extension.
- 9.15 The extension proposed for retention adjoins the side elevation of an existing gabled protrusion from no.77 High Street, the northern gable ends of both structures forming a continuous building line. By virtue of the siting of the subject development, no.77 is the only nearby residential property whose amenity could be affected. Given the positioning of the development in relation to the existing built form and openings, it would not result in adverse impacts on neighbouring residential amenity having regard to privacy, outlook, natural lighting, ventilation, indoor or outdoor space, or any other material considerations in this regard. It is therefore considered to accord with the relevant requirements of CLP 2015 Policy ESD15, CLP 1996 Policy C30, and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Highways impact

- 9.16 CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 seeks to secure high quality design that complements and enhances the character of the area, delivering safe and healthy places to live and work in. Amongst other things, it requires new development to integrate with existing streets and patterns of routes and spaces and promotes permeable, accessible places that are well connected and sustainable.
- 9.17 Section 9 of the NPPF promotes sustainable transport. Paragraph 109 requires transport issues including the potential impacts of development on transport networks and the environmental impacts of traffic to be considered from the earliest stages of development proposals. Paragraph 116 states that “*development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impacts on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe*”.
- 9.18 The Local Highway Authority raised no objection to the previous application (ref. 23/03368/F), which would have resulted in the same impacts on parking and highway safety as the current proposal, specifically insofar as both applications result in the loss of the garage for parking. A condition was requested to secure details of secure cycle storage provision and it is considered reasonable to attach a similar condition to any forthcoming grant of permission. The application site is very close to local amenities, services, and access to public transport links, by virtue of its position adjacent to the village centre, in light of which it is considered suitable for car-free development. Given this, it is considered to accord with the relevant requirements of CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 and Section 9 of the NPPF.

Other matters

- 9.19 Third party concerns have been expressed in relation to the accuracy of the information submitted, particularly in relation to statements within the Design and Access Statement that contradict the submitted drawings. Such inaccuracies have been noted, and the assessment of the proposals has therefore been based on the submitted drawings and observations of the ‘as built’ development. Concerns regarding the accuracy of the plans are also noted and these have since been rectified. Other concerns regarding the site boundaries and their relationship to the title deeds of the subject property and that adjoining it are noted; however, property ownership is civil matter between the parties involved and not a material consideration in the assessment of the proposed development. The submitted plans show the application site, and the development proposed for retention, and this is what they are required to do to enable the assessment and determination of the application.
- 9.20 A number of the concerns raised regarding procedural issues have been addressed through the Council’s formal complaints procedure. In summary, however, given that the Planning Committee refused the previous application on heritage grounds in the absence of technical advice from the Conservation Officer, the current application was accepted for consideration in order to allow a full and proper assessment of the heritage implications of the development. It is considered that this accords with the relevant procedural requirements. In relation to the remaining procedural matters, the Council was satisfied that the description of the proposal (“*RETROSPECTIVE - First floor extension over an existing garage with eaves height increment to accommodate new windows*”) was accurate prior to publicising the application and it is normal practice to accept amended plans during the course of an application if required. The Article 13 Notice was served by the applicant to advise other landowners of an application that will affect land in their ownership and the Council advised the applicant of the necessity of this as soon as it was realised that it had not yet been done. Notwithstanding this, given the site history it is clear that the affected landowner was already fully aware of the application.

- 9.21 Objections from interested parties state that the development is contrary to The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). This Order sets out development that can be undertaken without the benefit of express planning permission: given that the development under consideration is the subject of an application for express planning permission, its compliance or otherwise with the Order is irrelevant.

10. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

- 10.1. The upper floor extension that is the subject of this application conforms with the relevant requirements of the Council's supplementary planning document 'Home Extensions and Alterations Design Guide'. Whilst the historic origins of the building as a barn is acknowledged, it no longer has the character and appearance of a converted agricultural building and the 'Design Guide for the Conversion of Farm Buildings' is not, therefore, of relevance to the assessment of this application. The significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset has been diminished by virtue of its conversion to three dwellinghouses and associated alterations and additions, as well as the erosion of its context with the development of the surrounding car park, supermarket, and housing. The subject development does not further reduce the legibility of the non-designated heritage asset nor detract from its character, and it is therefore considered not to result in harm to the asset.
- 10.2. The proposal does not, therefore, conflict with CLP 2015 Policy ESD15, CLP 1996 Policies C28 and C30, Section 16 of the NPPF, or other material considerations relating to design or the conservation of heritage assets. As set out in section 9 of this report, there is no conflict with any other relevant policies of the Local Plans, the NPPF, or other material considerations and guidance. In accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF, permission should therefore be granted.

11. RECOMMENDATION

DELEGATE TO THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT TO GRANT PERMISSION, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS SET OUT BELOW (AND ANY AMENDMENTS TO THOSE CONDITIONS AS DEEMED NECESSARY)

Conditions

1. Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall remain strictly in accordance with the application form and following approved plans:

- A101 Rev A, 'Block and Site Plan'
- A106 Rev A, 'Proposed Floors and Roof Plan'
- A107, 'Proposed Elevations'

Reason – For the avoidance of doubt, to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority and comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby permitted, access to covered cycle parking facilities shall be provided on the site in accordance with details which shall be firstly submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the covered cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained and maintained for the parking of cycles in connection with the development.

Reason - In the interests of sustainability, to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Planning Informative

Planning permission only means that in planning terms a proposal is acceptable to the Local Planning Authority. Just because you have obtained planning permission, this does not mean you always have the right to carry out the development. Planning permission gives no additional rights to carry out the work, where that work is on someone else's land, or the work will affect someone else's rights in respect of the land. For example, there may be a leaseholder or tenant, or someone who has a right of way over the land, or another owner. Their rights are still valid, and you are therefore advised that you should seek legal advice before carrying out the planning permission where any other person's rights are involved.

CASE OFFICER: Sophie Browne