

are popular due to the excellent accessibility via its network of public footpaths, bridleways, and permissive trails.

26. The retained residential accommodation at first floor has a reduced size compared to the previous use as a residential dwelling at ground floor and first floor. Furthermore, the use of the ground floor as a paediatric treatment facility is likely to attract patrons from the local area and is unlikely to then result in associated onward trips to the SAC. Therefore, it is highly probable that the acceptable elements of the appeal scheme would not increase use of the SAC for recreational activities and have a likely significant effect on the qualifying features of the SAC. As such, based on the evidence, I do not consider that an Appropriate Assessment is required in this instance.

Conditions

27. I have had regard to conditions suggested by the Council, as well as to the Framework and national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). A time limit condition is not necessary as the use has already been implemented. For similar reasons, a condition stating the approved drawings is not necessary.
28. Conditions to mitigate noise and disturbance are required to ensure that the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers are protected from potential noise and disturbance. The conditions largely reflect those suggested by the Council, including the hours of operation which align with those specified on the original application form. However, for clarity and precision purposes, I have made minor changes, where necessary.

Conclusion

29. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the change of use to a treatment centre at ground floor and the residential use of the first floor retained. Insofar as the appeal relates to the new access, driveway and permeable surfaced hard-standing for parking, I conclude that for the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Having considered all other matters raised I therefore conclude that this element of the appeal is dismissed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR