

## **7. FULL APPLICATION - PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING FACTORY AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW DWELLING, THE FACTORY, ALMA ROAD, TIDESWELL (NP/DDD/1120/1024, SPW)**

**APPLICANT: MR JOHN WATSON**

### **Summary**

1. This application proposes the demolition of a 20<sup>th</sup> century factory, artificial stone building of no architectural or historic interest and the erection of an open market dwelling in the village of Tideswell. It is in close proximity to other dwellings, some of which are also listed buildings. The site is within Tideswell Conservation Area and currently detracts from its special character and interest. The factory is potentially unneighbourly, particularly by virtue of over-looking. Its removal and replacement by an open market dwelling is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle as it would represent a significant enhancement. The proposed scheme is considered to achieve that enhancement and is therefore recommended for approval.

### **Site and Surroundings**

2. The application relates to a building that was erected in the 1960s as a factory. It is concrete framed, with split-faced artificial stone walls. As the site slopes from east to west, the building is single storey when viewed from Alma Road (north-east elevation), but two storey on the south-west elevation, which faces into a yard shared with the flats in the Old College. The building has a shallow pitched corrugated sheet roof and occupies most of the length of the site, other than its southern end which is occupied by two single storey storage buildings which form the boundary with St John's Road, and which have doors at either end.
3. The building sits on the north-eastern boundary of the site, abutting the yard, which is accessed off St John's Road. There is a parking/turning area in front of the building on the Alma Road side, with access off Alma Road. There is a high boundary wall along the highway edge to the north of this access, with no pavement.
4. All other buildings in this part of Tideswell are traditionally houses and flats. Immediately to the south-west is a grade II listed building, known as the Old College, which was converted into flats in the early 1980s. This shares an access to the factory's lower floor level. The south-east limestone boundary wall running along St. John's Road is listed grade II. On the opposite side of St. John's Road is Eccles Hall, which is also listed grade II. Blake House, facing the south west end of St. John's Road is also grade II listed. Rockingham Lodge is the dwelling to the north-west of the site, facing onto the square.
5. The site is within the Tideswell Conservation Area.
6. The building is in poor condition, as described in greater detail in the submitted structural report. There are a number of trees on and near the site boundaries. These are described in detail in the submitted tree survey.

### **Proposal**

7. It is proposed to demolish the existing concrete framed, former factory building on Alma Road, Tideswell and replace it with a new dwelling on the northern part of the site. The proposed dwelling will be faced externally with natural limestone and the

roof clad in natural blue slates. The scheme retains part of the existing basement, which will be re-modelled and faced with natural limestone, for use as ancillary accommodation in connection with the proposed dwelling.

8. The existing factory building was constructed in the 1960's using a concrete frame which is now degenerating. Details of this are provided in the submitted Structural Engineer's appraisal. The report concludes that the main form of framed precast concrete used for the building, its age of approximately 60 years and its current condition caused by extensive water ingress mean that it is uneconomical to repair and upgrade the main 2 storey section of the building to current standards. It recommends that partial demolition to remove the aging precast concrete is carried out as part of the redevelopment of the site.

### **Planning History**

9. The factory is understood to have been built in the 1960s, but there is no recent planning history.
10. Pre-application advice: Prior to submitting the application, the applicant sought pre-application advice on the conversion of the existing building to a dwelling. He was advised that this was unlikely to be acceptable because of the form and character of the existing building. He was also advised that he needed to demonstrate that the building was no longer required for employment purposes.
11. This advice was followed up in July 2019 with a site meeting to discuss in principle the redevelopment of the site for residential use. The initial concept was to retain and convert the existing building to form 2 dwellings. Officers set out the policy parameters with regard to residential development on the site and advised that before an application for an open market house could be approved, it would have to be demonstrated that:
  - the site is not suitable for affordable dwelling(s); and
  - the existing industrial use of the site is inappropriate for its location; and
  - the scheme offers significant enhancement of the site.
  - With regard to the scheme discussed at that time, officers considered provided the above could be demonstrated that it was unlikely that policies would approve two dwellings on the site; and that the concept of retaining/converting the existing building because of its form and massing. A scheme for a new dwelling which would provide significant enhancement was more likely to be supported.
12. Following this pre-application advice, the scheme as now submitted is for a single open market dwelling, with the existing factory to be largely demolished.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

13. **That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:**
  - **Statutory time limit for implementation**
  - **Development in accordance with amended plans, subject to design conditions:**
    - **Submit and agree stone sample and agree panel.**
    - **Submit and agree slate sample.**
    - **Windows to be white painted timber unless otherwise agreed.**
    - **Other minor design details**
  - **No development shall commence until construction management plan has been submitted and approved. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved details.**

- **Submit scheme for enhancement of doors of the adjacent storage building and implement to agreed timescale.**
- **Landscaping scheme to be implemented prior to or within first planting season of the first occupation of the dwelling.**
- **The parking and manoeuvring areas shall be laid out, constructed and available for use prior to the first occupation of the dwelling.**
- **Development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with recommendations of submitted tree survey report.**
- **Remove permitted development rights for alterations, extensions and outbuilding, and boundary on boundary facing the Old College.**
- **Ancillary accommodation in basement to remain ancillary to dwelling and be used for no other purpose.**
- **The existing storage buildings along St John's Road shall not be used other than for domestic storage purposes, without the Authority's approval.**

### **Key Issues**

- Would the submitted scheme achieve significant enhancement to the Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings?
- Would the scheme remove a potentially unneighbourly use and would the proposed dwelling have an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties?
- Is the employment use still required and should it be retained?
- Is the impact on trees acceptable?

### **Consultations**

- 14 **Highway Authority:** The proposed dwelling will be accessed via the existing access to Alma Road which upon inspection of Street View images appears to have substandard emerging visibility due to the height of the boundary wall. Exit visibility at the access should be commensurate with 85th percentile vehicle approach speeds or the speed limit in the absence of appropriate speed readings. On this basis, recommended exit visibility sightlines for an access at this location would be 2.4m x 43m. Whilst such splays are not considered achievable, in view of the extant use of the site as a factory it is considered the proposed change of use to a single dwelling is unlikely to cause intensification in use, however the Highway Authority would recommend that the existing boundary wall be lowered to no greater than 1m, relative to the adjoining nearside carriageway level, to assist with emerging visibility. The Design and Access Statement notes the retention of an existing store/micro-brewery proposed be retained within the site. In view of the above, details on the number of vehicles/employees currently using the site for parking to use the storeroom would confirm parking provisions for residents of the proposed dwelling. No details have been submitted regarding the storage of bins and collection of waste, an area for standing of waste bins on refuse collection days should be provided adjacent to, but not within, the public highway to serve the dwelling.
- 15 It is recommended that the applicant is given opportunity to submit revised details demonstrating measures to satisfactorily address the above issues. However, should the proposal be acceptable in planning terms and your Authority is minded to approve the application in its submitted form, I would be grateful for the opportunity to discuss possible highway related conditions and notes for inclusion in any decision notice issued.
- 16 **District Council:** No reply
- 17 **Parish Council:** The Parish Councillors have discussed this application in detail and was felt

that representatives from the PC should attend a site visit. This has now been conducted by a selection of councillors visiting the site alone to ensure social distancing could be maintained fully. The Parish Council have discussed the application and do not have any objections. The Parish Council support the application.

18 **Tree Officer (PDNPA):** I am happy with the tree survey's program of works for the Factory, Alma Road and the new landscape plans.

**Representations:**

19 10 representations have been received in response to public notification.

20 Four object to the application on a number of grounds, including the following:

- The height of property proposed will impact its close neighbours and is inconsistent in scale to the land available for a 2 garden particularly if the 6 parking spaces noted in 8.3 are to be provided. There must be an alternative design under which the applicant is able to make a commercial return on their investment which results in a building(s) which benefits all of those living around it.
- As a general point we can confirm that the use of St. John's Road for commercial vehicles use creates safety issues and have twice had cars parked outside our property damaged by vans using this route. It is noted elsewhere however we would like to highlight again, that this road is narrow, has no pavement and is heavily used by pedestrians, a large proportion of which are school children. It seems however that there is an inconsistency in claiming the site is not suitable as a factory and the applicants stated long term intention to open and run a micro-brewery from this site.
- The building will sit in a conservation area. Cladding the roof in in natural blue slate is not consistent with other properties in the area which are stone slate.
- In relation to 1.2 Intarak Solutions Ltd the company was incorporated with a registered office in Bakewell in 2013 and failed. There is no evidence presented to confirm its failure was the result of its location in Tideswell.
- This application is for one 5/6 bedroom dwelling, with cinema/gym. This is totally out of context, given that the houses in the area are predominantly cottages. Equally, with the large number of holiday cottages here, there is a very real need for affordable housing in Tideswell and the Peak Park overall
- The loss of a place of work in Tideswell.
- An inappropriate development of a three storey six bedroom, six bathroom house with leisure centre in Tideswell conservation area.
- Loss of privacy, noise and disturbance to the home I have lived in for over thirty five years. A Georgian listed grade ii three hundred year old house adjacent to the site.
- The Factory is relatively discreet within its site if it operates within the covenants and regulations is much less of a nuisance than a new development. It is also of benefit to a working village. It would be difficult to separate the ownership of The Factory on Alma Road from The Long Shed on St Johns Road/corner of Alma Road. The long shed has no parking. Access to the garage doors opposite The Old College can only be gained after adequate notice is given. The garage doors to Alma Road have a deep verge, but no parking the doors open onto the road which is sited on the corner of a dangerous T junction. The Long Shed is two buildings. They are on two levels with no access between the two buildings. The Factory site contains an electricity sub station sited near to Alma Road it has rights of way and easements which would prevent some of the six car parking spaces on the new development.
- The development looks down into my garden and rooms in my house including bedrooms, with seven windows orientated towards my property.
- Likely to lead to the loss or damage to the existing trees which contribute greatly to the character of the conservation area. This area is the most densely tree-covered area and to lose any of these trees would greatly impact on the appearance of the

conservation area.

21. Four make general comments, summarised as follows:

- We are not against the redevelopment of the existing factory site for residential use but feel it could easily be done with only a minimal impact on our privacy and quality of life. This application takes neither of these factors into consideration. The development is too large to be in keeping with the houses along Alma Road and needs to be significantly set back from the boundary and our existing structures. There is absolutely no consideration made with regards to overlooking our garden; will have 6 windows and a glass annex with double doors facing our garden.
- There is concern that a larch tree in our garden is very close the development and may be impacted by it, however we cannot check this due to the absence of the tree survey. There are also a significant number of trees on the development site that form an essential part of the character and appearance of the conversation area, any loss of these trees will have a significant negative impact on the area. A number of these trees also currently screen our property from the site and their removal would increase the development's impact.
- We have concerns regarding the significant height of the proposed building which will result in the building overlooking many neighbouring gardens / properties including ours. The height is also significantly greater than the existing building. We feel this will result in the loss of ours and neighbours' privacy.

22. One response says: Support the application because:

- The corrugated concrete/asbestos roof will be removed by specialists.
- My windows won't be over-looked.
- Noise & dust will be kept to a minimum.
- I will have a clear view of the green space between St John's Rd & Bishop Pursglove school to the east.
- A definitive improvement on the view of the factory.

23. Two others support:

- Pleased to see something is finally being done with the building and site. Since the factory closed the building is falling into disrepair and is becoming an eye sore. It is only a matter of time before children gain access to the site, causing further damage and putting themselves in danger. Confident that any work will be carried out efficiently, with the minimum of fuss and to a high standard. Far from objecting to the planning application I welcome it.
- As a former tenant of the property, saddened recently to see the state of disrepair the building has fallen into whilst unoccupied. It would certainly appear to be hazardous in its current condition. I would suggest that the use of the building as a commercial property would be limited by the general access to the warehouse space for commercial vehicles - something we encountered, and general restrictions over use based on its location. I think a change of use to a residential property that is well designed and executed would be an enhancement.

## **Key Policies**

24. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. It was last updated in February 2019. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and those in the Development Management DPD adopted in May 2019. Policies in the

Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.

25. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF states that '*great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.*'

## **Development Plan**

26. The main Development Plan policies which are relevant to this proposal are: Core Strategy policies GSP2, GSP3, HC1 and CC1, and Development Management policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8 and DMC13.
27. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GSP1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.
28. Policy GSP2: *Enhancing the National Park* states that:
- Opportunities for enhancing the valued characteristics of the National Park will be identified and acted upon.
  - Proposals intended to enhance the National Park will need to demonstrate that they offer significant overall benefit to the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area.
  - When development is permitted, a design will be sought that respects the character of the area.
  - Opportunities will be taken to enhance the National Park by the treatment or removal of undesirable features or buildings. Work must be undertaken in a manner which conserves the valued characteristics of the site and its surroundings.
  - Development in settlements necessary for the treatment, removal or relocation of nonconforming uses to an acceptable site, or which would enhance the valued characteristics of the National Park will be permitted.
29. Policy GSP3 *Development Management Principles* sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
30. Policy DS1 *Development Strategy* sets out that most new development will be directed into named settlements. Tideswell is a named settlement.
31. Policy L1 *Landscape character and valued characteristics* seeks to ensure that all development conserves and enhances valued landscape character and sites, features and species of biodiversity importance.

32. Policy HC1 *New Housing* states that no new housing will be permitted other than exceptionally when (amongst other exceptions):
33. CI. - it is required in order to achieve conservation and/or enhancement of valued vernacular or listed buildings; or
34. CII. - it is required in order to achieve conservation or enhancement in settlements listed in core policy DS1 (of which Tideswell is one).

35. E1: Business development in towns and villages states in section D:

*“D. The National Park Authority will safeguard existing business land or buildings, particularly those which are of high quality and in a suitable location. Where the location, premises, activities or operations of an employment site are considered by the Authority to no longer be appropriate, opportunities for enhancement will be sought, which may include redevelopment to provide affordable housing or community uses”.*

36. Policy CC1 *Climate change and mitigation* requires that all development must build in resilience to and mitigate the causes of climate change by:
- A. making the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources:
- B. take account of the energy hierarchy by:
- reducing the need for energy;
  - using energy more efficiently;
  - supplying energy efficiently;
  - using low carbon and renewable energy.
- C. be directed away from flood risk areas.
- D. achieve the highest possible standard of carbon reductions.
- E. achieve the highest possible standards of water efficiency.

37. Development Management policies

38. Development Management policy DMC3: Siting, design, layout and landscaping requires development to be of a high standard that respects, protects, and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape, including the wildlife and cultural heritage that contribute to the distinctive sense of place. It also provides further detailed criteria to assess design and landscaping, as well as requiring development to conserve the amenity of other properties.
39. Development Management policy DMC5: Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings requires, amongst other considerations, that applications affecting a designated asset must explain why the works are necessary and how the asset will benefit from the proposal.
40. Development Management policy DMC7: Listed Buildings covers the same basic considerations as policy DMC5, but with specific reference to listed buildings.
41. Development Management policy DMC8: Conservation Areas covers similar matters to policies DMC 5 and 7, with specific reference to conservation areas.
42. Development Management policy DMC13: Protecting trees, woodland and other landscape features.
43. Development Management policy DME4: Change of use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in Core Strategy policy DS1 settlements states that the change of use, or re-use of non-safeguarded, unoccupied or under-occupied employment sites in or on the edge of Core Strategy policy DS1

settlements to non-business uses will be permitted provided that the site or building(s) have been marketed to the Authority's satisfaction for a continuous period of 12 months prior to the date of the planning application, in line with the requirements of this Plan, and the Authority agrees that there is no business need for the retention of them. The site which is the subject of this application is not specifically safeguarded in policy DME3.

#### **44. Assessment**

#### **45. Principle of Development**

46. This application follows pre-application discussions in which the main focus has been whether the loss of the long established employment use of the site can be justified on the basis of the enhancement of the site and its immediate setting through the erection of a single open market dwelling. Secondly, if the principle of the loss of an employment use is acceptable, should the redevelopment be for affordable housing rather than a single, relatively large, open market dwelling?
47. Officers consider that the existing building is now an anomalous feature in this part of Tideswell as it is a relatively large artificial stone structure under a corrugated roof, in contrast to the surrounding buildings, many of which are listed. Secondly, the use of the building is potentially unneighbourly. Whilst it appears to have been a B1 light industrial use which has not caused significant problems, it does heavily overlook the flats on the rear of the Old College, across the yard and whilst B1 uses are, by definition, capable of being carried out in residential areas, they can still generate levels of traffic that could be unneighbourly. As noted below, from September 2020, Class B1 uses now fall within a much broader Class E.
48. Policy E4 states that where the location, premises, activities or operations of an employment site are considered by the Authority to no longer be appropriate, opportunities for enhancement will be sought, which may include redevelopment to provide affordable housing or community uses. DM DPD policy DME4 sets out a requirement to advertise premises for a continuous period of 12 months before a redevelopment or change of use of the site will be permitted, but in the current case the consideration is not whether there is a need for the site to remain in employment use, but whether there is a greater planning gain to be achieved by redeveloping a site which does not conserve or enhance the Conservation Area or the setting of listed buildings, and the residential amenity of the area. Consequently, the applicant has not been asked to readvertise the site (he bought it after it had been on the market in 2018). It should also be noted that Tideswell is relatively well served with employment sites, particularly with the recently expanded Whitecross Road estate.
49. Both policy GSP2 and HC1 of the Core Strategy allow for development which would provide significant enhancement to the National Park and its special qualities. In the case of policy HC1, this could include a single open market house rather than affordable local needs housing. Given the scale, massing and detailing of the existing building it would not be appropriate to convert it into residential use and this would not achieve significant enhancement. Additionally, DM DPD policies DMC5, 7 and 8 consider the impact of the proposal on all aspects of designated and non-designated assets, listed buildings and conservation areas. They require that the proposal assess any impact on valued features and where possible offers some enhancement.
50. Turning to what might be an appropriate redevelopment, there are two factors to consider. Firstly, would it be viable to redevelop the site for affordable housing and secondly, would this be physically possible without causing unacceptable impacts.



51. With regard to viability, the applicant has submitted some details of costs but this is not a full RICS standard viability assessment. However, as the proposal is for a single dwelling, if it achieves significant enhancement, such an assessment is not required. Notwithstanding this, the figures submitted by the applicant are useful. The submitted information in the Design and Access Statement says:
52. *“It is therefore necessary to remove the existing factory building from the site and dispose of it in an approved location. This process adds considerably to the cost of the development of the site.*
53. *Prior to its purchase by Mr. Watson, the property was advertised in 2018 at a price of £240,000. It is estimated that its demolition and removal from site in accordance with all current legislation will cost a further £75,000. The cost of purchasing and preparing the site for re-development is therefore in the region of £315,000. Construction of four, 5 person affordable houses of 97 sq. m. each, at a cost of £2000/sq metre would be in the region of £775,000 - resulting in a total construction cost, including site purchase and clearing of the site, of £1,090,000, or £272,500 per dwelling. Allowing 20% for overheads, developer’s costs, advertising costs, legal fees and profit, the price per unit would rise to £327,000. Currently (at the time of writing) there are two open market, 3 bedroomed properties advertised for sale in Tideswell at £250,000 and £240,000. The calculated cost of providing an affordable dwelling on the factory site, as demonstrated above, is greater than existing properties available in Tideswell, without the affordable restriction. Affordable housing therefore is not a viable option for the development of this site”.*
54. Secondly, even if an affordable housing development were to be viable, a scheme of more than two houses would probably involve a greater building mass on site than is proposed and this would have an impact on the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring properties, particularly the flats in the Old College. A scheme with two smaller units would probably be achievable on a similar footprint to the proposed single dwelling.
55. On this basis, officers have concluded that a single open market dwelling that achieves significant enhancement to the Conservation Area, the setting of the listed buildings, and to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties is acceptable in principle and would accord with policies GSP2 and HC1.

## **56. Landscape and Design Impacts**

57. The proposal is for a two storey dwelling on the upper level of the site, with the main axis following the axis of the existing building, with two storey projections off each elevation. The new dwelling would be sited at the northern half of the site, leaving the southern half open, other than retaining the ground floor (when seen from the yard shared with the Old College) as a flat roofed basement, as this retains the rest of the site. This would contain ancillary accommodation and a gym/cinema room. The existing sub-station is retained but screened. The proposed dwelling is relatively traditional in its form, massing and detail. It includes solar panels on the southern elevation.
58. In terms of its design, the proposed dwelling is acceptable and would fit in with the established character of the area and be respectful to its neighbours. The materials are acceptable. In terms of its siting and massing, the proposal would remove the majority of the building that faces the Old College flats, improving their outlook and removing the potential for overlooking from windows from the existing factory. Officers have considered whether the new house would be better sited,

further south, to provide some enclosure to the street scene but this would have the effect of placing a house where the most intrusive part of the existing factory is. Although the scheme would result in a more open aspect on the site, it would reveal some views of the rear of the Old College, a listed building. On balance, the scheme is considered to be acceptable in terms of its siting and design.

### **59. Amenity Impact**

60. As noted above, the existing building has windows that look directly across the yard towards the rear of the Old College flats. Currently all windows facing south east from the factory face directly into the habitable rooms of the Old College. The proposed removal of the upper floor of the factory opposite the flats will minimise overlooking and loss of light to the properties. The existing relationship has the potential to be very unneighbourly unless the factory uses blinds during the working day. Secondly, the lawful use of the existing factory was considered to be Class B1, which now falls within the much wider Class E, which includes Commercial, Business and Service uses (from September 2020). Whilst these uses may not be inherently unneighbourly, they have the potential to generate levels of activity and traffic that would not be compatible with the adjacent residential uses. The Design & Access Statement says that during the previous user's (Intrack) occupancy, fork-lift trucks ferried materials goods to and from lorries parked on High Street, at the bottom of St. John's Road. It should also be noted that Bishop Purseglove School and its access are a short distance away on the opposite side of Alma Road to the east.
61. Consequently it is considered that the removal of the existing building and potential uses and its replacement with a dwelling, in what is predominantly a residential area, would be beneficial. As set out in the previous section, the proposed dwelling would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties because its location at the northern end of the site means that there would be no overlooking from primary rooms, although the new dwelling would inevitably have views of some adjacent properties and their gardens.
62. Whilst not forming part of this application, the proposal retains the existing use of the existing traditionally constructed single storey building along the St. John's Road boundary as a store building. It is currently used for storage purposes by the applicant in connection with his building business. It is also the applicant's longer-term intention to open and run a micro-brewery from this building, supplying local restaurants and public houses. As the buildings are included within the red-edged application area, for the avoidance of doubt a condition should be added to restrict the use of these buildings to ancillary residential storage, unless planning permission is sought and granted for an alternative use. A condition is also recommended to improve the industrial appearance of the doors on the ends of the buildings.

### **63. Highway Impact**

64. The Highway Authority notes the lawful use of the existing site but recommends that the access visibility is improved by reducing the boundary wall heights. However, the walls perform an important role in contributing to the character of the Conservation Area. Given that a single dwelling would produce significantly less traffic than the lawful use or permitted alternative uses, officers consider the access to be acceptable.

### **65. Tree/Ecology Impact**

66. The application is accompanied by a detailed tree survey and a proposed landscaping plan.
67. A Tree Survey has also been submitted with application. The tree survey revealed 13 items of woody vegetation, comprised of 12 individual trees and 1 group of trees/shrubs. From assessing the new development proposals, the removal of 2 trees and one tree/shrub group will be required as they are situated in the footprint of the structure or their retention and protection throughout the development is not suitable. The trees that are required to be removed are of lower value, retention category 'C', and have significant defects that are likely to limit their future prospects. Due to the low value of the trees to be removed the removals will have only a negligible negative arboricultural impact. The retained trees will require protection by fencing in accordance with BS 5837: 2012, during the development phase.
68. The Authority's Tree Officer is satisfied with tree survey and proposed planting.

### **69. Environmental Management**

70. The proposed dwelling incorporates solar panels on the south facing roof pitches to generate renewable energy. In addition to this, the new dwelling would be built to a much higher standard of energy conservation than the existing building. The proposal therefore meets the requirements of policy CC1.

### **71. Conclusion**

The proposal would remove an existing relatively modern factory building from a site within Tideswell Conservation Area, close to listed buildings and other dwellings. Whilst it would result in the loss of an employment site, the site is not specifically safeguarded and in the wider planning balance the replacement of the use and the associated building with a sympathetically detailed dwelling would result in an enhancement of the site and its setting and would improve residential amenity, in accordance with Development Plan policies. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

### **Human Rights**

Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

Nil

Report author: Steven Wigglesworth