

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

SMD/2021/0841
Valid 13/06/2022

2 – 4 SILK STREET
WAREHOUSE
LEEK

**THE CONVERSION,
ALTERATIONS AND
EXTENSION OF THE TWO-
STOREY FORMER
WAREHOUSE AND SILK
SHADE TO CREATE THREE 3-
BEDROOM PROPERTIES.
PLUS A 2-BEDROOM
DETACHED DWELLING IN
PLACE OF THE FORMER
OUTBUILDING.**

(FULL - MINOR)

MAIN ISSUES

- The principle of the new use in the town centre
- Design
- Impact on the historic significance of the Listed Building
- Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- Living conditions for occupiers and neighbours
- Highway safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site lies within the development boundary of Leek and is in the town centre fronting a narrow cobbled side road off Stockwell Street. The building is in severe disrepair. It comprises a two-storey red brick and clay tiled former silk thread making workshop of linear form. Openings are a mixture of steel-framed windows and obviously utilitarian doorways of varied forms. In its walls the building bears the marks of its near 200 year age with many adaptations and changes evidently having come and gone from the structure. The property backs-on to the town centre Silk Street car park which is a well-frequented public space. The backs of Stockwell Street properties also look out over this space but at right angles to the application property. The car park is at a slightly higher level than the mill and the Stockwell St properties (by perhaps a metre) and is bounded by a stout brick wall of about 1.5m along the boundary with the mill.

The front elevation of the mill building opens directly on to Silk Street (also known as Stafford Street) and faces the backs of Market Street properties which are mainly shops or other commercial premises but with flats over. Entrance to the Silk Street car park and a modern public toilet block stand off the south end of the site. At its

north end the building is attached to neighbouring properties which turn the corner on to Stockwell Street and it is with these properties that the application building is Listed with the address 16 and 18 Stockwell Street. Internally the building comprises a largely uninterrupted or 'undivided' linear open room at both ground and first floors with only the northerly quarter (ground floor) to one third (first floor) segregated into a separate space. Very substantial and fine timber purlins and King post trusses support the roof.

First Listed 30th June 1986, the Historic England listing description reads:

"House, later pair of houses, now dental surgery and shop. Silk warehousing to rear, now disused. House early C19, warehousing probably mid C19, but rear range (possibly silk weaving workshops) may also be early C19. House is Flemish bond brickwork with plain-tiled and slate roofs. EXTERIOR: 3 storeys, 5-window range. Doorway in centre of left-hand section, a 6-panelled door in reeded architrave with moulded stone panel (once recording a date?) above it. Flanking squared bay windows (later C19 additions) with moulded entablatures carried on brackets, and triple round-arched sash windows. Upper windows are 16-pane sashes each side of central 12-pane sash window. Right-hand section converted to shop by early C20: early C20 shop front to ground floor, with 16 and 12-pane sash windows above. 6-pane sash windows throughout in attic storey. All windows have flat stone lintels and cills; angle quoins on original left-hand gable wall; stone plinth and string course cut by bay windows. Narrow bay to left added in mid C19 and comprising return of silk warehousing to rear. This building is also brick, with plain-tiled roof. 2 storeys and basement, with loading door to left of ground floor, and irregularly spaced fixed-light windows with iron glazing. Similar windows in upper storey. Door in full height basement storey, which is lit by very small window openings. Stone coped gable to right may be evidence of earlier core to this range also. Adjoining this building to the left on Silk Street elevation, a further building intended for industrial use: also brick with plain-tiled roof; 2 storeys, 5-window range. Upper windows all fixed lights, one enlarged to form a loading door. Inserted double doors to lower left, then doorway flanked by fixed light windows, and a further doorway, 2 inserted doors, and 2 windows, one a 12-pane sash. Dentilled eaves. Stone plinth, and cills to lower windows. INTERIOR: not inspected."

The location is also within the Leek Conservation Area and there are references to it in the Leek Conservation Area Appraisal including at para 5.19 where it is remarked:

"Less easy to distinguish are buildings that served as twisting shades, like the two storey example on Silk Street, where each floor had a single room four bays in length which required no specific window type".

At para 3.28 it is commented in the Appraisal in relation to the 'shades' that "Identification is important as they are becoming rare".

Part of the significance of this property is that it is believed to have been the first works premises of John Brough who was the founding partner to Brough, Nicholson and Hall which by the 20th C became one of Leek's largest textile firms (Victoria County History of Staffordshire Volume VIII 1995).

According to the submitted heritage statement the building has been 'vacant' for over 50 years. It is thought by the LPA that the building has certainly had very limited use in the last 30 years, for no more than incidental storage at most, and not even this in the last 10 years.

PROPOSAL

This is a full planning application and Listed Building Consent application for the restoration and extension of the main building to create three dwellings each of three bedrooms and to create a fourth dwelling of two bedrooms in a detached new building – all two storey. These plans broadly repeat the previously approved scheme of 2019. The detached dwelling takes the place of a former detached garage or store. The differences from the 2019 scheme are relatively slight with perhaps the main one being the effect of creating three dwellings (rather than two) in the main building which means a greater amount of internal sub-division.

Revised plans have been submitted during the course of the determination (10th June 2024) after the LPA advised (October 2023) following a period of discussions that those first submitted were unlikely to be supported. Further minor revisions were received 25th July 2024 reducing the size of skylights in the new build elements and reducing the amount of change in the front (east) elevation.

As in the 2019 scheme a series of three two-storey outriggers are proposed to extend to the rear. The architect has provided the following summary with the revised scheme noting differences from the initial submission:

- We have developed the design to incorporate a traditional masonry construction with a reclaimed/reused brick outer leaf to match the existing building.
- A Staffordshire blue tile will be used to match the existing and the ridge height of the outriggers has been reduced so that there is a 200mm step down from the original mill.
- Crittall/Metal windows to match existing and a Crittall double door replace the contemporary frameless glazing to the gables.
- Similarly, a metal framed Crittall window and door will be used at the entrance to each dwelling. We would like to keep the visibility of the original mill through this double height entrance.
- The footprint widths have been adjusted slightly to allow for full brick sizes whilst still meeting National space standards for 3no three bedroomed dwellings.
- Traditional rainwater goods will be used to match the existing.

For the detached Garage/Dwelling...

- We have developed the design to incorporate a traditional masonry construction with a reclaimed/reused brick outer leaf to match the existing building.
- A Staffordshire blue tile will be used to match the mill and the height of the ridge is lowered.
- Crittall/Metal windows to match existing and Crittall doors will be used.

- The overhang has been removed, with the footprint only slightly larger than the existing garage to allow for a two bedroomed dwelling and be within standard brick sizes.
- Originally, Passive house principles were to be incorporated into the dwelling. As the applicant no longer intends to live in the dwelling, the low carbon and renewable energy measures will be reviewed.

The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement (22pp); Heritage Statement (31 pp); Structural Narrative (39pp); a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (42pp); and a Lighting proposal with impact assessment noting residential receptors relative to predicted light spill.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan (adopted 9th September 2020)

- SS1 Development Principles
- SS2 Settlement Hierarchy
- SS5 Leek Area Strategy
- DC1 Design Considerations
- DC2 The Historic Environment
- H1 New Housing Development
- NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
- NE2 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
- T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2023)

Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;
 Section(s) 4 – Decision making; 6 – Building a strong and competitive economy; 7 – Ensuring the vitality of town centres; 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities; 11 – Making effective use of land; 12 – Achieving well designed places and beautiful places; 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPD/G):

- Space About Dwellings SPG
- Design Principles SPG
- Design Guide SPD adopted 21st February 2018

Local Plan Supporting Evidence Documents:

- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008)

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

There is a lengthy planning history but of primary relevance is only the most recent approved development under **SMD/2019/0315** and **SMD/2019/0316** which respectively granted Planning and Listed Building consents for 'Conversion, alteration and extensions of former warehouse to form two dwellings' – one of three

bedrooms and one of four bedrooms. This scheme has however been allowed to lapse without being implemented (there is no record of any DOC applications).

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 21st July 2022

Neighbour [second] consultation period ended: 2nd July 2024

Press Advert: 27th July 2022

Public Comments

Support (x2) but request inclusion of nest bricks for Swifts in the building eaves.

Town / Parish Comments

Leek Town Council – no objection. It will be a good use of a listed building in the town centre and will enhance town centre living accommodation opportunities. It would be good to see a response from the SMDC conservation officer to make sure the building is preserved as it should be for historic purposes.

Environmental Health

There is insufficient information supplied to address noise concerns. The application should be supported with a site specific noise assessment and mitigation scheme if appropriate. The proposed units are close to existing commercial premises (Restaurant /take away), council car park and a main road. There are concerns that operational and plant noise may compromise the amenity of future occupiers and compromise the business activities in the existing commercial premises. In addition the car park and road traffic noise should be considered in any assessment undertaken. Conditions as per SMD/2019/0315.

1. Sound insulation (Insufficient Information)
2. Construction Impacts (Condition)
3. Lighting (condition Submission)
4. Unexpected contamination (Condition)
5. Asbestos (Advisory)

Staffordshire County Council Highways

Three parking spaces are proposed for the four dwellings. This is below the level required in SMDC Local Plan. However, site is in a highly sustainable location in Leek town centre. Site is adjacent to public car park. Cycle parking is referred to in the planning statement, which should be provided. Site plan shows little context. It is

not entirely clear that there is adequate space to allow manoeuvring into and out of 2.4m x 4.8m spaces. Pedestrian gate also opens into one of the spaces. Either use of the space will be restricted or access to the dwelling will be restricted. This should be reconsidered. Silk Street is a private road. The applicants should satisfy themselves that they have appropriate rights to carry out these works and appropriate rights of access.

Severn Trent Water

No objection subject to condition for drainage plans for the disposal of foul and surface water flows. These to be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use.

Ecology

The preliminary ecological appraisal (Elite Ecology Jan 2022) finds consideration needed only for nesting birds. The survey refers back to a bat activity survey in 2018 by the same company when no evidence of bat usage was found. Their conclusion now is that "The site structures have no potential to support bat species due to being very exposed to the elements, and their derelict state allowing a large amount of light entering the structures. With this all considered, the site is not likely to support roosting bat species".

SMDC Heritage Conservation Officer

Comments that the heritage statement is now out of date and does not relate to the revised scheme which is a different concept. The revised scheme dated 2024 appears to be more in keeping in terms of material palette, however there are a number of issues with regard to design and architectural features.

Rear outriggers – these are overbearing and of a poor ratio in terms of form against the host building; they "do not sit quietly" nor harmonise with the existing vernacular of the listed building; their size is quite imbalanced and looks to cause harm in terms of historic interest and legibility to their host. In plan they are almost twice the size of the narrow barn footprint and extending perpendicular to the host. This is not a successful design and does not appear to be informed by the existing conditions. Historic England and that of SPAB advise that additions are to be well read, respectful and subservient. Unfortunately these are none of those things and are instead in competition with the asset. The design and fenestration is contrived and sees a set of three twin French doors alien to the character of the building; the ridge height between the out-shots and the host are overbearing and appear to consume the character of the host dwelling, this should be reduced dramatically in order to acknowledge the style and features of the former barns. It should be noted and respected that this barn/warehouse was never domestic in origin; it appears the scheme at the moment is looking to drastically confuse this legibility and transform it into something it isn't, this does not have the special interest of the building in mind.

Concerns are raised about:

- Possible discrepancy in the ridge heights between drawings
- The three out-shots are too close to the ground floor and first floor windows
- Rooflights not level or uniform and appear to all be set at random heights; too many and too large
- Each out-shot to have a narrow ground to eaves 'curtain' window at the juncture with the original building – a detailed alternative suggestion is discussed

With regard to the detached unit:

- Not supportive of the two rooflights on the north elevation
- Generally positive otherwise

Historic Buildings and Places

Historic Buildings and Places (HBP) recognise that the existing buildings are in poor condition and that introducing a new use is vital to securing this grade II heritage asset and providing it with a viable future. However, the rear extensions are considered excessive and overly dominant. They change the historic, elongated form of the warehouse range and almost entirely obscure the rear elevation.

While the Silk Street elevation will be restored, the size and design of the extensions changes the character of the rear elevation to one more akin to a row of terrace housing, which results in the loss of the industrial character of the building from within the courtyard. This is further exacerbated by the brick finish, which does little to delineate the new from the old.

Internally, it appears the remaining roof trusses, which are indicative of the former warehouse use of the building, appear to be removed and much opening up of the rear will result in the loss of historic building fabric. Cumulatively, these changes erode the significance and the historic character and interest of the building.

Each extension adds more than two thirds of the floorspace of that within the host heritage asset and therefore would appear to be an over development. There is potential for a more modest lean-to structures that would maintain the industrial character of the building. Perhaps this would be better achieved with two, rather than three dwellings.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

In its general approach in accordance with policies SS1 and SS2, the Council expects the development and use of land to contribute positively to the social, economic and environmental improvement of the Staffordshire Moorlands. When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. This means that planning applications that accord with the policies in the

Local Plan shall be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

As commented for the 2019 scheme, this derelict listed building is in the town centre and, although non-residential uses such as retail or commercial would be prioritised for such sites, the site is exceptional due to the historical importance and listed status of the buildings and therefore securing the optimal use for the buildings to secure their future and safeguard them is of paramount importance. In principle the proposal is in line with these aims. There is no negative impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre as the site has been derelict for a considerable amount of time and is not located on a primary frontage. Whilst a retail or commercial use would be desirable (and a previous approval was for such a conversion 13/00484/FUL), new dwellings would also assist with the vitality and viability aims of the town centre, particularly as no readily usable retail or commercial floorspace (in the existing structure) would be lost. Furthermore, there is a continuing undersupply of housing in the District – currently 3.58 years.

Heritage

As regards the Listed Building there is a statutory duty placed on the LPA, under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to consider the impact of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building affected, and its setting and “have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”.

As regards the Leek Conservation Area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 places a statutory duty on the LPA in assessing planning applications in respect to any land or buildings in a Conservation Area to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. In reaching its decision the LPA has to demonstrate that the Section 72 Duty has been applied and discharged. Section 72 (and Footnote 7 of para.11 of the NPPF) creates a strong presumption in favour of the preservation of Conservation Areas and their setting.

An LPA can only discharge its duty if it has carried out a proper assessment of the impact on a Conservation Area and/or a Listed Building, is conscious of the duty and has demonstrably applied it in assessing the proposal. This assessment extends to setting, the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced.

Historic Environment Policy DC2 of the Local Plan is to give protection to designated heritage assets and their settings and non-designated heritage assets as set out in the NPPF.

NPPF paragraph 205 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, “great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation”.

Paragraph 206 goes on to say that: “any harm or loss [to a heritage asset] should require clear and convincing justification.”

NPPF paragraph 208 states that: “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”

Although the Conservation Officer is critical that the submitted heritage statement has not been revised to consider the amended scheme, it is nevertheless fully useful in terms of the building history and significance. The degree to which the proposal affects the special interest should then be relatively straight forward to assess. Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is similarly straight forward to assess by reference to the plans and the extant surroundings.

Of perhaps chief importance is that both Heritage consultees are un-supportive of the rear out-rigger extensions and indeed appear strongly critical of this part of the scheme. They reach this position without reference to the 2019 scheme (which was approved, though now lapsed) or to the degree of negotiation the LPA has been entailed in to get to here. The building is ‘at risk’ and parts are in a perilous condition. Neither respondent assigns a category or level of harm. They are though obviously aware of the need to find ‘a scheme’ due to the building’s failing condition. It must also be acknowledged however that the NPPF para 202 says, “Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.” The decision must therefore be based on the degree of harm from the proposals balanced, in the case of ‘less than substantial harm’ with the public benefits – including achieving an “optimal viable use” (NPPF 208).

Impact on the special interest of the Listed Building

The special interest is summarised in the applicant’s specialist Heritage Statement (HS) at section 2.2. This identifies the special interest as being architectural, historic in terms of the human or societal usage of the property, and archaeological in terms of evidencing the historic functional role of the building.

As noted in the site description (above) the Council’s Leek Conservation Area Appraisal records the building as an early textile mill with the specific function and somewhat select role as a twist mill or ‘shade’ in which silk strands would be drawn and twisted together into thicker thread. The undivided linear interior was a pre-requisite to this purpose. Herein therefore lies surviving archaeological evidence in the extant building.

In terms of the societal human history associations of the building it is especially notable that the premises were occupied by John Brough in 1815 and were thus a starting point for one of Leek’s most pre-eminent mill owning dynasties, as noted by the LPA from the Victoria County History of Staffordshire vol. VIII (1995).

The architectural interest lies straight forwardly in the utilitarian plain brick form and obviously non-domestic functional doorways and other openings. Points of detail

and distinction can be noted in for example the slightly flared eaves and steep roof slope and the 'chamfered' wall corner at the south west end. The erosion and patina of the exterior brick demonstrates the building's age. It is also apparent that the building has been much altered over time and often in a rough and ready way, as can be expected with a very functional works building – a contrast with the refinement and greater care expected with a domestic building. The HS notes the building "still retains its original layout in addition to much of its original/historic fabric including the metal window frames on the first-floor, its roof timbers and its sandstone foundations on the front elevation". The LPA notes that internally the building has very notable trusses and roof structure work and some cast iron supports.

The HS notes the building chronology "can be clearly traced through the evolution of its structure and architectural detailing which provides a historic narrative of its original function as a silk weaving workshop and later use for local small-scale industry and trades".

The HS further notes that "Whilst much of the original and historic fabric of the AB survives it has been subject to considerable neglect having been vacant for over fifty years. As a result, the rear of the AB is in a state of near collapse whilst the roof has fallen in at the northern end of the building allowing water to penetrate and rot the suspended timber floor within".



The LPA must conclude that there would be harm to the significance of the mill as a Listed Building as it would be quite radically altered both internally and externally. The 2019 scheme had partially retained the sense of the linear openness internally at least at ground floor. As noted this is representative of some of the building's significance because the length of the space was key to its function as a twist shade mill. This was made possible by keeping the overall conversion to two dwellings. The current applicant however does not find this economically viable and whilst no detailed figures have been submitted the 30 plus years of little or zero use to some extent validates this concern. The LPA is well aware that conversion of a very old and Listed structure that is also very dilapidated represents a specialist undertaking with unique extra costs compared to a typical new build development. As a town centre development the applicant does not believe that the larger dwelling would achieve a sufficient sale value and the LPA finds this a not un-reasonable stance, three-bedroomed dwelling perhaps being more saleable in this town position.

The 2019 scheme was more faithful to the front (east) façade in its surviving form but with the revision E scheme the 'smoothing' has been reduced with more of the irregularities and asymmetries now retained which are an integral aspect of the age and workaday nature of the building and therefore its history.

There is criticism from HBP that the internal roof timbers will be retained only in non-functional roles. The applicant argues that to re-use the timbers functionally would require very destructive strengthening and timber replacement whereas they can be retained more completely if not being relied upon. There are pros and cons to this argument but it is not without rationale.

The LPA must conclude there will be harm to the historic significance of the Listed Building through change in appearance and loss of original layout. This is far from being 'total loss' as, away from the rear elevation, the south gable, east front and east roof slope would all be retained effectively as existing. The LPA can reasonably find this to be 'less than substantial' harm in the meaning of the NPPF though it might also reasonably be expected to conclude that the harm is at the upper end of the scale.

Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

The most accessible public front (east) would be little changed in terms of Conservation Area character. Oblique views from Market Street of the rear extensions and more obvious views of these from the public car park would bring a change to the existing building compared with the impact of being restored simply as it is now. However the design form and materials would not be out of keeping. In pure character and appearance terms the changes are acceptable. In an 'academic' sense there is some harm to the CA in that the bldg will not be seen to contribute in its historic form. There is to this extent some harm but in NPPF terms, 'less than substantial'.

Detached new dwelling

In terms both of CA and Listed Bldg setting the proposed detached outbuilding may reasonably be considered neutral in its effects as it is in-keeping in terms of scale

and materials and takes the place of a previous – though non-historic – brick store / garage and in the town development boundary is acceptable in principle in planning terms.

Design

Most design matters have been covered above. In terms of the NDSS the new detached dwelling just meets the 70m² space standard for a two storey two bedroom dwelling and is acceptable. The three conversion dwellings are of the order of 93m² corresponding to 3 bedroom / five person standard for two storey dwellings and therefore acceptable.

Amenity

Outside amenity space is limited for all four dwellings but each has access to some private or partially shared space and the three mill units have theirs facing west where there is good light. For town properties, where public amenity space is close by, the reduced private space can be accepted. The space allocated to the detached unit will need to be re-configured slightly to take account of the SCC Highways comments.

At distances of c.12m from the east facing elevations there are residential flats facing which at a first floor level may have some principal windows.

Principal windows are defined in the Council's SPG as "the main window in a living room, dining room, kitchen and first and second bedroom". Of the nine openings in the ground floor only proposed windows GF5 and GF6 would be principal on basis of serving a second bedroom. These face a high yard wall and would not be likely to cause a sense of intrusion. Occupiers are likely to adopt privacy measures in any event due to being alongside the public cobbled passage.

Of the five first floor openings none of these are the sole windows serving the respective living spaces – they are arguably not strictly covered by the guide. The windows are not large and they are subdivided into particularly small panes which potentially create a form of 'seclusion' if not complete privacy. FF3 and FF4 would be opposite first floor facing windows at a separation of c.11m serving a flat over or linked to 27 Market Street. Opposite FF1 and FF2, no. 25 and part of 21 Market Street have facing windows at a lesser separation of c.10m.

Flats at the south end of the Market Street Row have windows facing the east elevation of the detached unit. The separation is c. 14m.

In the town situation these separation distances are better than the norm of typically c.8m. On that basis they could be considered acceptable. Alternatively a condition could be included to require secondary obscuration at first floor unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA but this is not recommended as it would be discordant with the character and appearance and heritage value of the building and on balance is not considered necessary.

Highway Safety

Noting SCC comments this is satisfactory or capable of being made so by slight re-configuration subject to condition re frontage to the detached unit.

Environmental Health

The EH recommendations follow those for SMD/2019/0315. The same issue about sound insulation was raised then and the case officer resolved with EH that this could be addressed by pre-commencement condition. There would seem no reason that this could not be repeated. EH matters 2 to 4 (above) can similarly be covered by conditions as before. It should be noted that in 2019 EH simply summarised their advice as: 1. Sound insulation; 2. Construction Impacts (Condition). The latest response has the five points as noted above. Although lighting is recommended (3, above) the application comes with a lighting plan as part of the submission and this should be conditioned.

Other matters

Informatives only are needed in respect of bats and nesting birds. However it would be appropriate to respond to the public representations made with regard to Swifts to attach a condition for 'Swift bricks' to be incorporated.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

A viable end use to secure the conservation of this important Grade II Listed Building is urgently needed.

The proposal would provide four new dwellings in a very sustainable location with only degrees of harm to the Conservation Area and the Listed Building as discussed in detail in the report. The identified harms are found by the LPA to be 'less than substantial' when assessed in the terms of the NPPF (in accordance with policy DC2).

Some amendments to details were agreed which are included in revised drawing 0001 E.

The views of the heritage consultees including with regard to the rear outriggers have been carefully considered as set out in the report and whilst giving 'great weight' to the conservation of these heritage assets (CA and LB), for the reasons given, in particular the imperative to secure an optimal viable use, the public benefits of the development are found to outweigh the 'less than substantial harm'. In reaching this decision it is also noted that the 2019 approval whilst now lapsed and

different in some details but involving not dissimilar rear outriggers was granted under the same NPPF terms.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : **Approve planning and grant LBC subject to conditions**

Case Officer: Arne Swithenbank

Recommendation Date: 26th July 2024 rev 05.08.2024

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council