

Report

Report subject: CONVERSION OF OFFICE/STUDY AND GAMES ROOM IN GARAGE BUILDING TO SELF-CONTAINED UNIT OF RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION – Planning application S/05/1614

Report to: Western Area Committee

Date: 19th January 2006

Author: W.Simmonds

Report Summary:

Planning application S/05/1614 (previously considered by the Western Area Committee on 13 October 2005 as item 496) is returned before the Western Area Committee at the request of the applicant who asks for the requirement for a Section 106 agreement that the unit of accommodation shall not be sold separately from the main house, and payment towards the provision of open space (Policy R2) be waived.

Introduction:

Planning application S/05/1614 was previously considered by the Western Area Committee on 13 October 2005 (item 496), whereby the Committee resolved to grant consent for the conversion of office/study & games room in a garage building to a self-contained unit of residential accommodation at 44 West Street, Wilton (copy of minutes attached at appendix A and copy of original planning officer's report to Committee which sets out the issues is attached at appendix B).

The Proposal

The applicant requests that the planning consent be granted without the requirements (i) to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement that the unit of accommodation shall not be sold separately from the main house, and (ii) the payment for provision of recreational open space in accordance with Policy R2 of the Local Plan.

Costs

N/a

Options for consideration:

- a) Decline to accept the applicant's proposal and thereby refuse planning application S/05/1614 for non-compliance with the requirements of the previous resolution.
- b) Accept the above proposal and issue the planning consent without R2 provision, or restriction on selling separately from 44 West Street



Awarded in:
Housing Services
Waste and Recycling Services



Consultation Undertaken:

None

Recommendations:

That the application be refused for non-compliance with the resolution of the Western Area Committee of 13 October 2005 in respect of S.106 agreement and provision under Policy R2 for the following reasons:

- (i) The adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants resulting from the potential separation of the unit of accommodation from the main house (contrary to Policies G2 & D2)
- (ii) The failure to make provision for outdoor recreational space in accordance with Policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

Background Papers:

Planning application file S/05/1614
Previous report to Western Area Committee
Minutes of Western Area Committee meeting of 13 October 2005

Implications:

- **Financial:** Loss of financial provision towards recreation facilities if Option (b) is followed.
- **Legal:** N/a
- **Human Rights:** The application has been dealt with no differently from any other planning application and the decision is in accordance with the Development Plan and National Policy Guidance.
- **Personnel:** N/a
- **Community Safety:** N/a
- **Environmental implications:** Loss of provision for outdoor recreational space (R2) if Option (b) is followed.
- **Council's Core Values:** Fairness and equality, Protecting the environment
- **Wards Affected:** Wilton

1. The Chairman has received correspondence from Dr Andrew Murrison MP regarding bridle paths and rights of way. Democratic Services will distribute a copy of the correspondence to all Western Area Councillors and Parish Councils.
2. Andrew Rose, Democratic Services Officer, is leaving Salisbury District Council on Friday, 14th October to relocate to Scotland. On behalf of the whole committee the Chairman thanked Andrew for his work and wished him best wishes for his future life.

495. S/2005/1713 – FULL APPLICATION - GARAGE AND EXTENSION TO SIDE AT 4 DOVES MEADOW, BROADCHALKE, SALISBURY SP5 5EL FOR MR & MRS R GULLIVER

Mrs Ingram, of 2 Doves Meadow, spoke in objection to the above application.

Mr Gulliver, the applicant, spoke in support of the above application.

Following receipt of these statements and further to a site visit held earlier that day the committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated) together with a schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting:

Resolved – that

- (1). For the following reasons:

The scale, design, siting and materials proposed are appropriate to the locality in accordance with the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan policies;

The above application be **approved** subject to the following conditions:

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

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension and garage hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed extension will satisfactorily harmonise with the external appearance of the existing building.

3. The garage doors shall not open out over the public highway.

Reason: In the interest of Highways Safety.

- (2). The applicant be informed that this decision has been taken in accordance with the following policies of the Salisbury District Local Plan:

G2	-	General Criteria for Development
D3	-	Good Design
H16	-	Housing Policy Boundary
CN8	-	Preserving or enhancing Conservation Areas
CN11	-	-New development in Conservation Area
C4 & C5	-	-AONB Landscape Conservation

- (3). That a letter be sent on behalf of the Western Area Committee to Housing Services at Salisbury District Council requesting that a hardstanding area be constructed outside 5 Doves Meadow to be used by the disabled and elderly lady who lives there.

496. S/2005/1614 - FULL APPLICATION - CONVERSION OF OFFICE/STUDY AND GAMES ROOM IN GARAGE BUILDING TO SELF-CONTAINED UNIT OF RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION at 44 WEST STREET WILTON SALISBURY SP2 0DG for MR AND MRS CAMISA

Mrs Moreland, of Wilton Town Council, advised the Committee that the Town Council supported the above application.

Following receipt of this statement and further to a site visit held earlier that day the committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated) together with a schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting:

Resolved – that

(1). For the following reasons:

1. The development provides a small unit of accommodation within the Housing Policy Boundary and , if tied by a section 106 Agreement not to sell separately from 44 West Street complies with policy H16 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan

And subject to the applicant and any other interested parties entering into a Section 106 legal agreement within three months of the date of this resolution for :

- (1) The unit of accommodation shall not to be sold separately from the main house, known as 44 West Street
- (2) The provision of outdoor amenity space for this unit within the land edged blue in accordance with details which shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
- (3) The provision of an R2 contribution

Then the above application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development for which permission is hereby granted must be commenced not later than the expiration of five years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. Should the S106 Agreement not be completed within 3 months the decision is delegated to the HDS to refuse for non compliance with its provisions.

497. S/2005/1371 – FULL APPLICATION - RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR THE REFURBISHMENT AND ALTERATION OF AN EXISTING FORESTRY BUILDING TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL STORAGE AND REST FACILITIES AND OCCASIONAL USE AS A BASE FOR RECREATIONAL/LEISURE PURSUITS ON THE ADJOINING LAND AND CONSTRUCTION OF A COMPOST TOILET BUILDING AT DONHEAD CLIFF GUTCH COMMON SHAFTESBURY SP7 9BG FOR Mr & MRS LOCKYER

Mr P Dance, agent to the applicant, spoke in support of the above application.

Mr Lockyer, the applicant, spoke in support of the above application.

Mr Dance and Mr Lockyer split the 3 minutes permitted to them between themselves.

Gerald Bone, of Donhead St Mary Parish Council, advised the committee that the parish Council objected to the above application.

Following receipt of these statements and further to a site visit held earlier that day the committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated):

Resolved – that

- (1). Subject to the applicants and any other interested parties entering into a Section 106 legal agreement to
- limit the buildings' use (particularly for overnight accommodation) to educational/recreational uses or woodland management uses for no more than 2 nights per month
 - limit the buildings' use (particularly for overnight accommodation) for forestry groups to 4 nights per year
 - Occupation by the owners is limited to 40 nights per year
 - A register of occupancy be maintained
 - The building not to be let, sold or otherwise alienated from the woodland edged blue:

Then the above application be **APPROVED** for the following reasons:

1. The buildings as built, in light of the planning history of the site, their materials and colour, and provided that their use (particularly for overnight accommodation) is limited to leisure/recreational uses or woodland management uses, do not cause harm to the open countryside or the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB or to highway safety that would justify refusal;

And subject to the following conditions:

1. Within one month of the date of this permission, a Travel Plan (including number of movements) shall be submitted to and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The site and buildings shall be used and occupied solely in accordance with the approved Travel Plan unless other wise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

The application has been called to Committee by Councillor Edge for reason of local interest

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site is within the residential curtilage of a Grade II listed dwelling house at 44 West Street, Wilton. 44 West Street is a two storey semi detached dwelling fronting onto West Street. To the north west side of the property is a commercial yard. The rear of the property is accessed (other than through the house) via an archway access which is in the ownership of the applicants, over which it is understood that adjoining neighbours have a right of access to the rear of their properties.

Immediately adjacent to the rear of the house at 44 West Street is an adjoining outbuilding which was previously a domestic garage. This outbuilding is also Grade II listed by virtue of being within the curtilage of the main dwelling house, it is presently used as a garage/office/study and games room ancillary to the main dwelling house.

THE PROPOSAL

It is proposed to change the use of the attached outbuilding and convert it to a one bedroomed separate unit of accommodation to be self contained to facilitate its use as a separate dwelling.

The proposal does not involve any physical enlargement of the building, the necessary internal alterations have been approved listed building consent under planning reference S/05/1233.

The proposal does not include the provision of any outdoor amenity space or the provision of any off road parking.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

1. S/05/1233 – L/B Application – New stud partition in first floor to annexe to create bathroom and ventilation extractors to kitchen & bathroom. AC 15.08.05
2. S/99/1506 – General modifications to include pitched roof to flat roof extension at rear ALBE 26.10.99
3. S/91/1562 – Change of use and conversion of double garage to single garage and office/study on ground floor with first floor games room WD 13.12.91
4. S/91/1563 - L/B Application – Proposed dormers and other alterations to an existing garage building AC 18.12.91

CONSULTATIONS

1. WCC Highways – Recommend refusal: Inadequate provision for the parking of motor vehicles will encourage parking on the highway to the detriment of highway safety
2. Environmental Health officer – No objection in principle, comments on modifications needed for internal layout in order to accord with the provisions of the Housing Act 1985.
3. Building Control – No response
4. Conservation Officer – No response

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes	expiry 15.09.05
Site Notice displayed	Yes	expiry 15.09.05
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	expiry 02.09.05
Neighbour response	No	
Parish Council response	Yes	

Wilton Town Council – Support the application, stating, “it appears the proposed conversion will not impact on the immediate neighbourhood. Sufficient parking is available in the garden.”

MAIN ISSUES

The acceptability of the proposal given the policies of the Local Plan
Character of the surrounding Conservation Area and amenity of the street scene
Impact on the adjoining GII Listed Building
Amenities of the occupiers of adjoining and nearby property
Highway considerations;

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP Policies G1 & G2 (General Criteria for Development), CN3 & CN5 (Listed Buildings), CN8 (Conservation Areas), H16 (Housing Policy Boundaries), R2 (Open Space Provision) & Appendix VI of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

General Criteria for Development

Policy G2 of the local plan outlines that Highway issues are material considerations in the determination of a planning application. It is considered that the proposed development, by virtue of the lack of provision of off road parking for occupants of the new dwelling, would encourage parking on the adjacent road to the detriment of highway safety. This view is supported by the consultation response from WCC Highways who recommend the application be refused for the above reason.

Listed Buildings

Policies CN3 & CN5 aim to preserve the character, setting and historic form of listed buildings. The internal works required to undertake the proposed conversion have already been granted listed building consent under planning reference S/05/1233.

Conservation Areas

The proposal is not considered contrary to Conservation Area Policies.

Housing Policy Boundary

The application site falls within the H16 Housing Policy Boundary for Wilton. This Policy allows small scale development and redevelopment subject to certain criteria, including (i) the proposal will not constitute tandem or inappropriate backland development, and (iii) in Wilton, the proposal will not exacerbate current problems associated with sewage disposal.

The proposed dwelling is small, having a footprint of only approx. 40.7 square metres, and the application makes no provision for outdoor amenity space for drying washing, bin / recycle bin storage or cycle storage.

The property can only be accessed via the rear courtyard of number 44 West Street, or by going through the inside of number 44 (via the front door and through to the back).

Whilst it is considered the outbuilding would be suitable for a granny annexe or as ancillary accommodation to the existing dwelling (subject to constraints in respect of its use remaining ancillary to the main dwelling, and restrictions on the occupation, sale, leasing, renting or other disposal of the building as a separate dwelling unit), the building, by virtue of its size, access arrangements and lack of outdoor space, is considered to be an unsuitable form of development, and therefore contrary to Policy H16.

Transportation Policies & Appendix VI of the adopted Local Plan

Policy TR14 seeks the provision of secure bicycle facilities at new developments to promote cycling as a sustainable alternative to the use of motorised transport, in line with national Government guidance. The Policy refers to Appendix VI of the local plan which sets out minimum cycle parking

standards for both new build development and changes of use. In respect of dwellings, this requirement is for 2 covered cycle spaces per unit (2m x 1.5m), provided as either additional space within a garage or elsewhere within the curtilage of the property. As the proposal has no outdoor amenity space, and makes no internal provision for cycle parking in accordance with the above requirements, it is considered contrary to Transportation Policy TR14.

Open Space Provision

As the proposal involves the creation of a new independent dwelling, Policy R2 requires that provision for recreational open space is sought. The applicant has completed and returned a unilateral undertaking to provide the relevant commuted sum and administration fee to the Council in respect of this. To date, the payment of these monies has not been requested.

CONCLUSION

The application relates to the conversion of an existing garage/office type outbuilding which adjoins the rear of a GII Listed dwelling. The building appears to be currently in use as a single garage and store with one single void/space above in the roof. The proposal is to convert the outbuilding into a separate unit of accommodation to facilitate its private letting/rental, not ancillary to the adjoining existing dwelling.

The proposed dwelling is small, having a footprint of only approx. 40.7 square metres, and has no outdoor amenity space for drying washing, bin recycle bin storage or cycle storage. The property can only be accessed via the rear courtyard of number 44 West Street, or by going through the inside of number 44 (via the front door and through to the back). The application makes no provision for parking and is therefore likely to encourage parking on the adjacent road to the detriment of Highway safety.

Whilst it is considered the outbuilding would be suitable for a granny annexe or as ancillary accommodation to the existing dwelling, the proposal, by virtue of its size, access arrangements and lack of outdoor space, is not considered a suitable form of development in the light of the policies of the local plan.

Should members be minded to approve the application, it is recommended that the applicant be required to enter into a legal agreement to restrict the separate sale or other disposal of the new dwelling from 44 West Street, to allow the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of amenity.

RECOMMENDATION: **REFUSE:** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of the small scale of the proposed dwelling and the relationship between the siting of the proposed dwelling and the existing dwelling house, taken together with the absence of any outdoor amenity space (e.g. for the drying of washing, storage of bins/recycle bins, and the provision of covered cycle storage), would result in an unsatisfactory form of development that would be detrimental to the amenities of existing and future occupiers of both the existing and proposed dwellings, contrary to Policies G2, H16, TR14 & Appendix VI of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.
2. The proposal makes inadequate provision for the parking of vehicles, and would therefore encourage parking on the highway to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to Policies TR11 & G2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.
3. The proposed residential development is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to Policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan because appropriate provision towards public recreational open space has not been made.

INFORMATIVE: - POLICY

This decision has been taken in accordance with the following policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan: G2, H16, TR11, TR14 & R2

44, WEST STREET, WILTON, WILTSHIRE, SP2 0DG. APPENDIX D

TELEPHONE: 01722 742 918

24 OCTOBER 2005

Head of Development Services,
Salisbury District Council,
Planning Office,
61, Wyndham Road,
Salisbury, SP1 3AH

Planning Application Reference: S/2005/1614

Conversion of outbuildings in garage block at 44, West Street, Wilton, SP2 0DG.

Dear Sirs,

In response to your letter of 19th October we wish to question some of the conditions attached to the potential grant of permission for change of use.

From what we can ascertain you are requesting three deliverables before you will grant permission for the property to be used for habitation by any person. These are:

1. A fixed fee (or potentially, fees, the letter is in no way clear) of £500 and an unquantifiable variable fee of around £500 towards the provision of a document preventing the separate sale of the garage outbuildings [*the annex*] from the main residential property at 44, West Street, Wilton.
2. The provision of outdoor amenity space associated specifically to the out-building for which the application has been made.
3. A fixed payment of £759 being a contribution towards the provision of recreational open space within the bounds of Wilton.

We would like to look at each point in turn as we do not agree that these conditions are either justified or fair given the circumstances of the application.

1. We have previously given an indication that we were prepared to agree to a form of legal undertaking that the annex will never be legally separated from the main property (*letter to the Planning Office of 9th August*). Such an indication was given in the knowledge that the annex never could be separated from the main property or sold alone given its' physical location and way in which it is entirely reliant upon the main property for its' continued usage and the imbedded restrictions of separation that therefore exist.

Given the physical restrictions on the feasibility of such a sale or any form of legal separation the assumption was made that a contract can be made in form of a letter, such as that already supplied giving a written undertaking to never separate (becoming a legally binding contract). We gave no undertaking to pay any unreasonable or unrealistic costs to draw up what should be considered a standard document, available from a template, nor to the creation of any form of restrictive covenant upon the title of the main residence itself (which would be totally unacceptable to my mortgage company and also incur considerable costs from their legal teams).

If permission were granted with a condition that the permission is only valid whilst the annex remains within the legal curtilage of the main property then it would be impossible to sell the

annex as a separate unit (which cannot be physically done anyway). No prospective purchaser would be able to use the property as the planning permission would no longer be valid.

We must repeat the actual impossibility of separating this building from the main residential property and explain the facts fully as we do not believe that these have been considered.

Consultations with third parties (surveyors, estate agents etc) have indicated that the property could not be sold as a separate unit given its location within the boundary of the main residence, size and construction. This is made evident by the following facts:

There would be no right of way (public or private) to the annex from the public highway. The only accessible route other than that through the main body of the house is down the driveway shared by 40, 42 and 44, West Street. This driveway is owned by whosoever owns 44, West Street. A restrictive covenant upon the title deeds of 40, 42 and 44, West Street defines precise and exact accessibility for those three properties and only those three properties. Any separation of the annex would mean it would be excluded from this covenant – the terms of which are non-negotiable and cannot be amended, thus meaning any access to the annex would require trespass over private property.

Other than the driveway issue the access to the annex entrance would be across the rear garden of the main residence of 44, West Street. This would be fine for a controlled situation involving a member of the family, short-term tenant or lodger where rules and limitations can be applied under threat of eviction, but not for any other third party and their visitors who would have a legal ownership or leasehold of the building.

The annex also has no separated supply of water or electricity or any form of independent drainage. The supply of electricity and water are from the single metered supplies to the main residence itself. If, for example, the main fuse to the main residence were to blow then there would be no power to the annex either. The combined Fair and Foul drainage is also shared with the main property and run entirely within the boundaries of it. To put in a separate supply would not be possible, as it would require the breaking of the restrictive covenant covering the driveway. Telephone and cable television connections too are an issue as there is no access to bring in a supply without first attaching it to the main residence and bringing it across the bounds or airspace of the main property.

Please understand that we are not objecting to a condition such that permission would not exist if the annex was separated – we do not (given the fact that it cannot). We object to the stipulation that we must pay for the drafting, checking and implementation of an unnecessary conditional document and the associated costs of monitoring something that can never happen.

We are happy to agree to a condition of non-separation and will write a separate letter to that effect if required that will pledge that we understand that the planning permission is conditional that the annex is never separated from the main residence. This may remain on your file and we will have a copy sent to the Land Registry for reference. This should satisfy your criteria as it will indicate to any future prospective purchasers of the property of 44, West Street the existence of the limitation.

2. You request detail of what amenity space would be provided as part of this conversion. Why is this relevant? The main residence has a substantial garden. The purpose of the conversion is to provide more living accommodation for the main residence (apart from any short term letting of it to

suitable persons in order to recover conversion costs and maintenance). Unless you anticipated this being a completely separate unit over which we had no control (i.e. an outright sale) there would be no requirement to provide any such space – lodgers are not usually allowed access to gardens and flats do not have to provide garden space specific to each flat in the development. Why should the annex do this when there is no intention or possibility of separation from the main? In fact, the requirement seems to imply that it is expected that the annex to be sold or separated from the main residence, which contradicts your first requirement.

If we rented the annex out (on a short term contact basis) the tenant or lodger would not be given any right of use of or access to the main body of the cultivated garden (they would have access across the paved area to reach the annex, however). A small raised terrace to the right side of the annex, by the woodshed, overlooking the garden, of about 5' by 12' would be made available for their use (although not their unique use). No doubt the case officer and the committee saw this when they visited. We can certainly remember it being pointing out to the conservation officer when he visited.

3. We are not aware why any contribution applies in this case. We are not creating a new dwelling – we are merely increasing the accommodation on the existing, for which this tax would not apply. To insist upon such a contribution is merely a way of raising revenue rather than for the purpose of which it was intended. Also, Wilton has one of the largest per capita ratios of open public recreational space in the country, most of it unused by the vast majority of residents. Why is further revenue required to provide more? What restrictions are in place to ensure that the funds extracted for this purpose are actually spent in this way (especially given the financial difficulties being encountered in other areas of local authority budgets)?

During telephone calls to the planning office, we were informed that the reason for the contribution was due to the fact that we had applied for the provision "a separate unit of accommodation". This indicates that much of the decision is based upon the initial impressions of the wording of the application. As non-professional applicants we requested assistance from the planning office in the initial drawing up of the application. We explained what we wanted to do and why. We were told that we should word the reason for the application in the exact manner given on the form as "it was the only way it would be considered properly without being returned". We stated that we didn't want to use the wordings we were supplied with as they didn't represent the true situation but the unnamed female member of staff at the planning office insisted that this was the only possible way of ensuring attention and reduce the likelihood of initial rejection of the application. Other members of staff have also indicated that for the type of conversion we are doing (of an existing building, already with a kitchenette, into which we were, effectively, only putting in a toilet and shower) that it was "highly unlikely" that any form of contribution would be required.

In summary we do not believe that these conditions are fair or justified for the application, especially the condition of separate amenity space and the restriction of sale requirements (which contradict themselves). We also do not believe that the contribution to the provision of local amenity space is correct in this instance. We are not trying to create a separated development. We are trying to extend the accommodation that we already have by utilising space that is of no use as it is (indeed, we are trying to comply with our listed building obligations by creating a more maintainable space that can be looked after

and protected properly). We are putting in a new kitchen area only because a). there was already one there when we purchased the property and b). because it allows us to raise, in the short term, a modicum of revenue sufficient to pay back the costs of the works we are undertaking (which are not even under this application but under the listed building consents already granted). It is only to recoup the initial outlays are we intending to take any form of lodger or tenant – this is not a profit generating exercise. Once the costs are recovered we intend to stop considering any form of tenancy (which will have an impact on our privacy as we have two young children and it was never our intention to take on permanent tenants or lodgers).

Longer term this unit will be used only for the short stay of guests and family – the kitchen area of the building would at that point be used mainly for the provision of outdoor entertaining etc reducing the need to continually traipse through the main property to the kitchen area there when outside. The rest of the area downstairs would become a place for the children to socialise with their friends without parental disturbance (and vice-versa). In the very long term (12+ years), it will be somewhere for our children to use as a place to gain a modicum of independence before they try to get to grips with the distressingly difficult first steps of their having own homes, be they rented or owned.

As you will deduce, we are not planning to vacate these premises in the short term nor to "cut and run" should we see a profitable exit via an outbuilding development. Our intentions are to stay at 44, West Street for the very long term. It is our family home and one which we have spent the past six years, many tens of thousands of pounds and a vast amount of physical effort and mental stress restoring, landscaping and improving. Indeed, once the mortgage has been paid off, we have even considered placing the ownership of the property into a unique trust jointly owned by ourselves and our children to ensure that it can be enjoyed by the family for the very long term. We like Wilton and intend to stay in it.

After talking to the Planning Inspectorate they have recommended that we refuse to comply with the conditions laid down in your letter. They suggested that this letter was compiled and the request put to the planning committee to re-consider the conditions placed upon the grant of permission to this application given the circumstances listed above.

If the committee will not consider such changes to the conditions given and will thus refuse to grant planning permission for the required usage then we have been told to initiate a formal application for appeal to the inspectorate. To do this we will require written confirmation of the refusal and reasons why the application was refused. Hopefully this will not be required and that a reasonable solution to the application can be achieved.

Regards,

Samuel D. Camisa

Amanda J. Camisa