

Title of Report:	Planning Committee Report – LA01/2023/0417/F
Committee Report Submitted To:	Planning Committee
Date of Meeting:	27th November 2024
For Decision or For Information	For Decision – Referred Application by Cllr Richard Holmes

Linkage to Council Strategy (2021-25)	
Strategic Theme	Cohesive Leadership
Outcome	Council has agreed policies and procedures and decision making is consistent with them
Lead Officer	Development Management and Enforcement Manager

Estimated Timescale for Completion	
Date to be Completed	

Budgetary Considerations	
Cost of Proposal	Nil
Included in Current Year Estimates	N/A
Capital/Revenue	N/A
Code	N/A
Staffing Costs	N/A

Legal Considerations	
Input of Legal Services Required	NO
Legal Opinion Obtained	NO

Screening Requirements	Required for new or revised Policies, Plans, Strategies or Service Delivery Proposals.		
Section 75 Screening	Screening Completed:	N/A	Date:
	EQIA Required and Completed:	N/A	Date:
Rural Needs Assessment (RNA)	Screening Completed	N/A	Date:
	RNA Required and Completed:	N/A	Date:
Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)	Screening Completed:	N/A	Date:
	DPIA Required and Completed:	N/A	Date:

<u>No:</u>	LA01/2023/0417/F	<u>Ward:</u>	Dundooan
<u>App Type:</u>	Full		
<u>Address:</u>	175m SSE of 23 Ballymacrea Road, Portrush		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Refurbishment and conversion (former workshop to a dwelling and former canteen to a garage) with associated landscaping and access		
<u>Con Area:</u>	N/A	<u>Valid Date:</u>	05.04.2023
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>	N/A		
Agent:	David Dalzell, 10 Fairview Lane, Articlave, BT51 4JX		
Applicant:	Kathryn Brown, 15 Dhu Varren, Glenmanus Townland, Portrush, BT56 8EW		
Objections: 0	Petitions of Objection: 0		
Support: 0	Petitions of Support: 0		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Full planning permission is sought for the refurbishment and conversion (former workshop to a dwelling and former canteen to a garage) with associated landscaping and access under Planning Policy Statement 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside.
- The application site is located outside of any settlement development limits as identified in the Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016 and lies immediately adjacent to Craighulliar ASSI.
- The proposal is considered to be contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY4 of PPS21.
- DFI Roads, NI Water, Historic Environment Division (HED), NIEA and Environmental Health were consulted in the application. Majority of consultees raised no concerns however Environmental Health had concerns regarding loss of amenity.
- There have no representations.
- The application is recommended for Refusal.
- Reasons for Referral by elected member are attached as an annex to this report.

Drawings and additional information are available to view on the Planning Portal- <https://planningregister.planningsystemni.gov.uk>

1 RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

2 SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is located approximately 175m SSE of 23 Ballymacrea Road, Portrush
- 2.2 The site comprises the two vacant buildings which are subject to this application namely the single storey canteen/toilet block and the larger workshop unit. Access to the site is via an existing laneway onto Ballymacrea Rd which provides access to Craigahulliar Caravan Park, the application site and continues to the south to provide access to Craigahulliar landfill site located to the south/west of the application site. The buildings are sited on an area of hardstanding immediately adjacent the access lane to the western side, with a steep rising rockface bounding the site to the eastern/north-eastern side. Another building to the north of the subject buildings is included within the red line application boundary however, is not part of the proposed development.
- 2.3 The application site is located outside of any settlement development limits as identified in the Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016 and lies immediately adjacent to Craigahulliar ASSI.

3 RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 Proposal: Relocation of gas-flaring equipment and installation of electricity-generating equipment

Application Number: C/2009/0044/F
Decision: Permission Granted
Decision Date: 3 November 2009

- 3.2 Proposal: Non-compliance with Condition 3 (hours of operation of gas flare) of previous approval C/2009/0044/F to allow 24hr operations of gas flare.

Application Number: C/2010/0474/F
Decision: Permission Granted
Decision Date: 16 September 2011

- 3.3 Proposal: Retention of a leachate treatment system incorporating a holding tank for leachate prior to treatment (Tank A), a treatment tank (Tank B), a discharge tank (Tank C), a caustic dosing tank (Tank D) and associated infrastructure. The development also includes the retention of a waste inspection building with a roof to be constructed and the construction of a 1.5m high concrete retaining wall.

Application Number: C/2011/0078/F
Decision: Permission Granted
Decision Date: 17 February 2012

- 3.4 Proposal: Discharge of Conditions No. 2 and 3 for C/2013/0097/F
Application Number: LA01/2015/0695/DC
Decision: Approval
Decision Date: 23 December 2015

- 3.5 Proposal: Retrospective application for gas pressurised reduction system (pipework), with proposed concrete hardstanding, single-storey container and 2.6m high security fencing (Amended scheme and additional information). Application Number: LA01/2017/1053/F

Decision: Permission Granted
Decision Date: 21 December 2017

- 3.6 Proposal: Discharge of conditions 3 & 13 of C/2013/0097/F

Application Number: LA01/2017/1641/DC

Decision: Approval

Decision Date: 04 October 2018

- 3.7 Proposal: Discharge of Condition Number 3 of C/2013/0097/F
Application Number: LA01/2018/1331/DC
Decision: Approval
Decision Date: 07 December 2018
- 3.8 Proposal: Discharge of condition 5 of planning approval C/2013/0097/F
Application Number: LA01/2018/0995/DC
Decision: Approval
Decision Date: 03 June 2019
- 3.9 Proposal: Discharge of Condition Number 12 of planning approval C/2013/0097/F
Application Number: LA01/2020/0371/DC
Decision: Approval
Decision Date: 05 November 2020
- 3.10 Proposal: Retention of design amendments to previously approved caravan park (approved under planning permission C/2013/0097/F), including 59no. caravan pitches suitable for static caravans in lieu of 48no. approved touring caravan pitches and 14no. approved static caravan pitches (a reduction from 62no. approved to 59no. pitches constructed), Laundry Building in lieu of Amenity Caravan, relocation of Bin Store and Gas Tank Compound. Reconfiguration of Play Area. (amended proposal)
Application Number: LA01/2022/0080/F
Decision: Approval
Decision Date: 11 January 2023

4 THE APPLICATION

- 4.1 Full planning permission is sought for the refurbishment and conversion (former workshop to a dwelling and former canteen to a garage) with associated landscaping and access.

5 PUBLICITY & CONSULTATIONS

5.1 External

Neighbours: Neighbours: Four (4) neighbouring properties were notified. No letters of representation have been received.

5.2 Internal

DFI Roads-No objections

NI Water-No objections

Historic Environment Division (HED)- No objections

NIEA- No objections

Environmental Health- Concerns regarding loss of amenity

6 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Section 45(1) of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 requires that all applications must have regard to the local plan, so far as material to the application, and all other material considerations. Section 6(4) states that in making any determination where regard is to be had to the local development plan, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.2 The development plan is:

- Northern Area Plan 2016 (NAP)

6.3 The Regional Development Strategy (RDS) is a material consideration.

6.4 The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS) is a material consideration. As set out in the SPPS, until such times as both a new local plan strategy is adopted, councils will apply specified retained operational policies.

6.5 Due weight should be given to the relevant policies in the development plan.

6.6 All material considerations and any policy conflicts are identified in the “Considerations and Assessment” section of the report.

7 RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE

The application has been assessed against the following planning policy and guidance:

- Regional Development Strategy 2035.
- Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016
- Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS) 2015
- PPS 2: Natural Heritage
- PPS 3: Access, Movement and Parking
- PPS 6: Archaeology and the Built Heritage
- PPS 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Building on Tradition: A Sustainable Design guide for Northern Ireland.

8 CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

8.1 The main consideration in the determination of this application relate to the Principle of Development, Integration and Rural character, Habitat Regulations Assessment, Access, Movement and Parking, Natural Heritage, Archaeology and the Built Heritage and Abandoned Mines.

Principle of Development

8.2 The policies outlined in Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY 1 of PPS 21 outline the range of types of development which are considered acceptable in principle in the countryside. Other

types of development will only be permitted where there are overriding reasons why that development is essential and could not be located in a settlement, or it is otherwise allocated for development in a development plan. This application was submitted for the refurbishment and conversion of existing building to residential use, and therefore falls to be assessed under paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY 4 of PPS 21.

8.3 Policy CTY 4 of PPS 21 states planning permission will be granted to proposals for the sympathetic conversion, with adaptation if necessary, of a suitable building for a variety of alternative uses, including use as a single dwelling, where this would secure its upkeep and retention.

8.4 Policy CTY 4 states that such proposals will be required to be of a high design quality and to meet all the following criteria:

- (a) the building is of permanent construction;
- (b) the reuse or conversion would maintain or enhance the form, character and architectural features, design and setting of the existing building and not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the locality;
- (c) any new extensions are sympathetic to the scale, massing and architectural style and finishes of the existing building;
- (d) the reuse or conversion would not unduly affect the amenities of nearby residents or adversely affect the continued agricultural use of adjoining land or buildings;
- (e) the nature and scale of any proposed non-residential use is appropriate to a countryside location;
- (f) all necessary services are available or can be provided without significant adverse impact on the environment or character of the locality; and
- (g) access to the public road will not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic.

8.5 Buildings of a temporary construction such as those designed and used for agricultural purposes, including sheds or stores will not however be eligible for conversion or reuse under this policy.

- 8.6 Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS introduced a stricter policy test for the conversion and re-use of buildings, advising that provision should be made for the sympathetic conversion and reuse of a 'locally important building', noting that locally important buildings can include those such as former school houses, churches and older traditional barns and outbuildings. Paragraph 1.12 of the SPPS outlines that any conflict between the SPPS and any policy retained under the transitional arrangements must be resolved in the favour of the provisions of the SPPS.
- 8.7 The buildings under consideration for conversion are a former workshop (dwelling) and a former canteen (garage). Both buildings are constructed from block with the workshop having a stepped flat reinforced concrete roof while the former canteen has a corrugated tin roof.
- 8.8 The agent submitted a supporting statement (Doc 05) which provides information on the historic development of the site. The document provides a significant historical background of the site and its quarry at an industrial scale from 1908-1960. The document advises that the workshop would have been erected in the 1950's or 1960's whilst the canteen/toilet block would have been erected in the 1960's or 1970's. The agent advises that the buildings should have some historical merit in accordance with appendix 1 of Historic Buildings of Local Importance: A Guide to their Identification and Protection (Historic Environment Division, 2017).
- 8.9 Appendix 1 of this document advises that the key criteria for Historic Buildings of Local Interest are: architectural interest and historic interest. A building can be selected for meeting either type of criteria but in most cases it will have both.
- 8.10 The agent argues that while the buildings are of no architectural merit in terms of their style etc., the buildings meet criteria K in terms of architectural interest in that the buildings have group

value when considered with the other buildings on the site. Additionally, it is argued that the buildings are of historical interest in terms of their authenticity and age.

8.11 Officials consider that the workshop and canteen are not ‘locally important’ buildings given the lack of architectural and historical merit. With regard to Appendix 1 of Historic Buildings of Local Importance: A Guide to their Identification and Protection (Historic Environment Division, 2017), the term group value relates to where a building forms part of a terrace, square or other planned architectural composition. In this instance the subject buildings are not part of such a composition, rather they serve as ancillary components to the overall former industrial use of the site.

8.12 While the wider environs may have some economic importance historically, the proposed buildings do not in their own right. While the buildings may be approximately 60-70 years old the existing design and finishes of the buildings are not of any merit or importance worthy of retention, nor do they make a valued contribution to the local setting and would not be regarded as focal points or locally important buildings. As such the proposal fails to comply with Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS. This assessment is in line with the Planning Appeals Commission’s assessment of locally important buildings as set out in Planning Appeal 2019/A0056 (Appendix 1), notably Paragraph 10, which assessed the age, style and local importance of the subject building and found it to be of limited value.

8.13 Officials are content that the proposal meets with criteria a-h of Policy CTY4

Integration & Rural Character.

8.14 Policy CTY13 of PPS21 states planning permission will be granted for a building in the countryside where it can be visually

integrated into the surrounding landscape and it is of an appropriate design.

A new building will be unacceptable where:

- (a) it is a prominent feature in the landscape; or
- (b) the site lacks long established natural boundaries or is unable to provide a suitable degree of enclosure for the building to integrate into the landscape; or
- (c) it relies primarily on the use of new landscaping for integration; or
- (d) ancillary works do not integrate with their surroundings; or
- (e) the design of the building is inappropriate for the site and its locality; or
- (f) it fails to blend with the landform, existing trees, buildings, slopes and other natural features which provide a backdrop; or
- (g) in the case of a proposed dwelling on a farm (see Policy CTY 10) it is not visually linked or sited to cluster with an established group of buildings on a farm.

- 8.15 Policy CTY 14 states that planning permission will be granted for a building in the countryside where it does not cause a detrimental change to, or further erode the rural character of an area.

A new building will be unacceptable where:

- (a) it is unduly prominent in the landscape; or
- (b) it results in a suburban style build-up of development when viewed with existing and approved buildings; or
- (c) it does not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area; or
- (d) it creates or adds to a ribbon of development (see Policy CTY 8); or
- (e) the impact of ancillary works (with the exception of necessary visibility splays) would damage rural character.

- 8.16 The application proposes the conversion of the buildings to include the additions of doors and windows with internal alterations. The dwelling would also have an addition of roof lights and roof terrace. Walls are to be finished in white render with dark grey roof and composite grey windows. These changes have been illustrated on Drawing 03, submitted 5th April 2023.
- 8.17 The proposal would not rely primarily on the use of new landscaping for integration and the building would blend with the existing landform which provides a backdrop. The design of the dwelling would be considered in keeping with the site in general and would not create or add to a ribbon of development.
- 8.18 The proposal is considered to be compliant with Policy CTY 13 and 14.

Habitat Regulations Assessment

- 8.19 The potential impact of this proposal on Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites has been assessed in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 43 (1) of the conservation (Natural habitats, etc) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1995 (as amended). The proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect on the features, conservation objectives or status of any of these sites.

Access Movement and Parking

- 8.20 Planning Policy Statement 3 relates to vehicular and pedestrian access, transport assessment, and the protection of transport routes, and parking. Policy AMP2 Planning permission will only be granted for a development proposal involving direct access, or the intensification of the use of an existing access, onto a public road where:
- a) such access will not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic; and
 - b) the proposal does not conflict with Policy AMP 3 Access to Protected Routes.

8.21 DFI Roads were consulted in relation to the proposal and offered no objection. The application as proposed is unlikely to prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic at this location.

Natural Heritage

8.22 The application site sits immediately adjacent to and partially within Craigahulliar ASSI. NIEA Natural Environment Division were consulted and advised that the application site contains species which are protected by the Wildlife (Northern Ireland) Order 1985 (as amended). NIEA, Natural Environment Division (NED) have considered the impacts of the proposal on designated sites and other natural heritage interests and, on the basis of the information provided, has no concerns subject to conditions.

Archaeology and the Built Heritage

8.23 HED were consulted and advised that they have assessed the application and on the basis of the information provided is content that the proposal is satisfactory to SPPS and PPS 6 archaeological policy requirements because the SMR dot is not relevant to the location.

Abandoned Mines

8.24 The application site is located in the vicinity of a number of abandoned mines. Geological Survey for Northern Ireland were not consulted on this application but were consulted on the adjacent application LA01/2023/0418/F, approximately 100m north of the application site, and offered no objection to that proposal. On the basis of Geological Survey for Northern Ireland's comments on that application officials are content that there are no unacceptable risks to the application site.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The application site fails to meet with the principle planning policies as the building within the application site to be converted is not considered a locally important building. The proposal does not meet with any of the permissive circumstances for development in the countryside, and no over-riding reasons have been provided as to why development is necessary at this location. The proposal is subsequently contrary to Paragraph 6.73, of the SPPS and Policies CTY1 of Planning Policy Statement 21.

10 REFUSAL REASONS

1. The proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland and Policy CTY1 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential in this rural location and could not be located within a settlement.
2. The proposal is contrary to paragraphs 6.73 of the SPPS in that the buildings to be converted are not considered to be locally important buildings.

Site Location Plan



Appendix 1



Appeal Decision

Park House
87/91 Great Victoria Street
BELFAST
BT2 7AG
T: 028 9024 4710
F: 028 9031 2536
E: info@pacni.gov.uk

Appeal Reference:	2019/A0056
Appeal by:	Mr Michael Simpson
Appeal against:	The refusal of full planning permission
Proposed Development:	Conversion of barn to dwelling including extension and alteration
Location:	44m north of 31 Glebe Road, Ahoghill (access onto Carnearney Road)
Planning Authority:	Mid and East Antrim Borough Council
Application Reference:	LA02/2019/0007/F
Procedure:	Written representations and accompanied site visit on 6 th November 2019
Decision by:	Commissioner Diane O'Neill, dated 10 th January 2020

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Amended drawings were submitted within the appellant's statement of case primarily illustrating the retention of stone and brick finishes on the rear and side elevations of the barn as well as the use of grey corrugated plastic roofing rather than slates. Given the minor nature of the changes, which seek to retain the original finishes of the building, the distance from other unconnected properties and the fact that there were no objectors to the proposal, I consider that the drawings can be considered as part of this appeal without prejudice to any party.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development is acceptable in principle in the countryside.
4. Section 45 (1) of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 requires the Commission, in dealing with an appeal, to have regard to the local development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. The Ballymena Area Plan 1986-2001 (BAP) operates as the local development plan for the area where the appeal site is located. The site is located outside any settlement development limit within BAP and is within the countryside. The BAP has no material policies for dealing with the appeal proposal.
5. The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS, published in September 2015) sets out the transitional arrangements that will operate until a

local authority has adopted a Plan Strategy for the whole of the council area. Paragraph 1.12 states that any conflict between the SPPS and any policy retained under the transitional arrangements must be resolved in favour of the provisions of the SPPS. It cites an example whereby the SPPS introduces a change of policy direction and/or provides a policy clarification that would be in conflict with the retained policy and states that in that instance the SPPS should be accorded greater weight in the assessment of individual planning applications.

6. The SPPS retains certain existing planning policy statements and amongst these is Planning Policy Statement 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside (PPS 21, published June 2010). In terms of the conversion and re-use of existing buildings, the planning authority argued that the SPPS provides policy clarification with the requirement for the appeal structure to be converted to be a 'locally important building' as opposed to a 'suitable building' under Policy CTY 4 of PPS 21.
7. Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS, which is the basis for the first reason for refusal, identifies a number of strategic policies for residential and non-residential development in the countryside which should be taken into account in the determination of planning applications. The strategic policy in relation to conversion and re-use of existing buildings for residential use states that provision should be made for the sympathetic conversion and re-use, with adaption if necessary, of a locally important building (such as former school houses, churches and older traditional barns and outbuildings), as a single dwelling where this would secure its upkeep or retention.
8. Policy CTY 1 of PPS 21 sets out a range of types of development which in principle are considered to be acceptable in the countryside and that will contribute to the aims of sustainable development including the conversion of a non-residential building to a dwelling in accordance with Policy CTY 4. Policy CTY 4 states that planning permission will be granted to proposals for the sympathetic conversion, with adaption if necessary, of a *suitable building* (my emphasis) for a variety of alternative uses, including use as a single dwelling, where this would secure its upkeep and retention. Such proposals are required to be of a high design quality and to meet a number of identified criteria. When one looks at the emphasised wording of Policy CTY 4 and that contained in paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS, it is apparent however that there is a conflict between the retained policy and the SPPS in terms of the conversion and re-use of existing buildings for residential use. Under the identified transitional arrangements in paragraph 1.12 of the SPPS, the SPPS should therefore be accorded greater weight in the assessment of this appeal proposal.
9. The appeal proposal is for the conversion, including extensions and alterations, of a modest agricultural barn. The building sits slightly back from the road within a roadside plot along the Glebe Road with the proposed new access to the site being via the adjacent Carneaney Road. The appellant's residential dwelling (No.31) is located to the south of the appeal building with a large farm building to the west of the subject barn. The modest single storey appeal building has a small lean-to structure on its northern side elevation. Its elevations are finished in smooth render and stone with brick detailing; the roof is constructed of corrugated sheeting.

10. Whilst 'locally important' is not defined in the SPPS, I consider that it requires the building to be of some merit and importance to its local setting making it worthy of retention and to warrant it being of 'special character or interest'. Whilst it may be approximately 80 years old and typical of a building within rural Northern Ireland, the existing design and finishes of the appeal building are not of any merit or importance worthy of retention. Despite its position at the junction of Carnearney and Glebe Roads, its modest nature and lack of character, interest and visual presence means that it does not appear as a focal point or locally important building as claimed by the appellant. It fails to make a valued contribution to its local setting. The substantial nature of the proposed changes to the structure would eradicate any interest which the building possesses with its modest lean-to structure raised to form single storey bedroom accommodation and the agricultural front elevation door would be replaced with two floor-to-ceiling bedroom windows. A substantial T-shaped extension would also be added onto the western elevation of the existing building to provide an open plan living, kitchen, dining area together with a bathroom and utility room.
11. Policy CTY 4 requires that proposals for the conversion and reuse of existing buildings to be of a high design quality and meet all seven criteria listed. The third reason for refusal refers to criterion (b) in that the reuse or conversion would not maintain or enhance the form, character and architectural features, design and setting of the existing building. Whilst the appellant has amended the proposed finishes of the scheme to include original natural stone, brick detailing and corrugated roofing, the extensive nature of the proposed works as previously detailed would not maintain or enhance the form of the building and result in the loss of the little character that the barn possesses.
12. The appellant alluded to other cases where planning permission has been granted for similar proposals. However, substantive details about these cases were not provided in order to establish whether they were indeed comparable. The planning authority also referred to one of the cases being approved prior to the introduction of the SPPS in September 2015. At any rate, each case has to be assessed on its own merits taking into account all material considerations.
13. The appeal proposal does not fall within any of the other types of development that are acceptable in principle in the countryside under Policy CTY 1 which is the basis for the second reason for refusal. No overriding reasons were presented as to why the development is essential.
14. Accordingly, the three reasons for refusal are sustained and therefore the appeal must fail.

This decision is based on the following drawings:-

Drawing 01/1 1:1250 site location map dated received by the planning authority on 14th January 2019

Drawing 02/1 1:500 proposed site plan dated received by the planning authority on 14th January 2019

Drawing PAC 1 1:100 existing floor plan and elevations submitted in the appellant's statement of case

Drawing PAC 2 1:100 proposed floor plan and elevations submitted in the appellant's statement of case

COMMISSIONER DIANE O'NEILL

Appendix 2 - Referral Request

Hi,

I would like to request a call-in for planning application LA01/2023/0417/F.

The reasons for the requesting the call in are as follows:

The applicant is not putting up new buildings but trying to sympathetically convert existing buildings to retain them. Under SPPS 6.7, development in the countryside must integrate in its setting and respect rural character. I believe that the Natural Environment Division, Historical Environment Division and DfI have no objections to the plans.

SPPS 6.73 provides examples of existing buildings which could be considered locally important but this list can never be described as exhaustive and local heritage is very much local and not subject to a nationwide policy. There should be no reason why quarry buildings can't be included in this and help retain part of the north coast's industrial heritage.

In terms of PPS21 CTY4, the proposal meets all of the criteria, a to g, of this policy. It is a permanent building, respect has been shown to the original characteristics, residents are not impacted, little adverse impact on the locality and DfI are satisfied with the proposals.

The planner have considered the buildings to be of late construction but they are now in the region of 70 years old and form part of the local history and architectural interest can be considered to be subjective.

I would request that the planning committee be given the opportunity to consider the case.

Thanks

Rick