

TWC/2011/0959 Isombridge Farm, Isombridge, Shropshire, TF6 6NF Conversion of 2no. redundant agricultural buildings to a combined live/work unit

APPLICANT

Brian Evans

RECEIVED

07/11/2011

PARISH

Rodington

WARD

Wrockwardine

This application has previously been considered by Members on 11th April and 1st August 2012. At 1st August Plans Board, Members resolved to recommend approval subject to the Applicant entering into S106 Agreement and conditions outlined in the update report.

The Applicant has not yet signed the S106 Agreement. The Agent has raised concern regarding the wording of Conditions 8 and 9 of the draft decision notice.

Condition 8 removes permitted development rights and Condition 9 states that the Live/work unit is to remain as a single unit, and on the termination of the business, the residential unit shall be vacated.

The Agent has highlighted that these conditions do not conform to the model conditions listed on the planning portal which are the following:

- (1) The business floorspace of the live/work unit shall be finished ready for occupation before the residential floorspace is occupied and the residential use shall not precede commencement of the business use;*
- (2) The business floorspace of the live/work unit shall not be used for any purpose other than for purposes within Class [B1] in the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.*
- (3) The residential floorspace of the live unit shall not be occupied other than by a person solely or mainly employed, or last employed in the business occupying the business floorspace of that unit, a widow or widower of such a person, or any resident dependants.*

The Council would propose that the third model condition be revised slightly due to the nature of the development being located in two separate buildings and the following addition is suggested to ensure that the work unit would not be occupied in the event of the live work unit being occupied under the third limb. It is essential that the work and live elements remain together to ensure that a separate residential dwelling is not created in the countryside

In the event of occupation of the live unit by a last employed, widow or widower or resident dependants, no use shall take place in the work unit.

Officers have discussed the matter with the Council's Solicitor and consider that the wording of the model conditions is significantly different to the wording of the

conditions approved by Members at 1st August Plans Board.as that envisaged that the residential unit would be vacated if the business unit was not in use. The recommendation for approval is unchanged. Officers still consider it is necessary to control the development through S106 Agreement and appropriate conditions in order that the resultant development does not create a new residential dwelling in the open countryside. This is especially important given the physical separation of the two buildings which are proposed as the live/work unit. A live/work unit is usually one single unit with for example a work space downstairs and living accommodation upstairs and if Members are happy to approve the development with the model conditions then the existence of the two separate units has to be borne in mind

The Agent for the Applicant indicates that the third limb of the model condition is required to enable a prospective tenant to obtain finance to operate the live /work unit as the original condition 9 would be considered too draconian. However the model condition assumes one single live /unit and the Council would wish to ensure that if a last employed person remained in the residential unit then the work unit would be unoccupied.

The proposed Condition 8 (removal of permitted development rights) seeks to ensure that the form and character of the existing agricultural buildings is maintained through controlling any extensions and alterations to the buildings and the curtilage. However, as live/work is both residential and commercial and does not fall into B or C use class, thus is Sui Generis, it is considered that there are no permitted development rights for the live/work development and condition 8 is not required in this instance. The Applicant's Agent has confirmed that he accepts that no permitted development rights apply to either the live unit or the work unit

In addition to the revisions to Conditions 8 and 9, the Council's Solicitor has discussed revisions to the wording of the S106 to ensure that the live/work unit is controlled and retained as a single unit, and that it is also tied to the existing farm i.e. the live unit and the work unit will not be let or sold separately to each other and also the live/work unit will not be sold separately to the farm The Applicant's Agent is happy for the wording to be revised to reflect this.

Accordingly the application is recommended for approval subject to revised S106 agreement which ensures that the live unit and the work unit are not let or sold separately to each other and in addition the live unit and the work unit will not be sold other than as part of the farm and revised conditions outlined below:

-
- | | | |
|----|---------|---|
| 1. | A04 | Time limit |
| 2. | B11 | Samples of materials to be submitted |
| 3. | B19 | Details of doors and windows to be submitted |
| 4. | B61 | Foul and surface water drainage |
| 5. | C12 | Car parking |
| 6. | Ccustom | Erection of nest boxes |
| 7. | C38 | Development in accordance with plans |
| 8. | Dcustom | Model condition 1 - business floorspace completed before residential floorspace occupied;residential use shall not precede commencement of business use |
| 9. | Dcustom | Model condition 2 - business floorspace of live/work unit shall fall within Use Class B1 |

10. Dcustom Model condition 3 – occupation of residential floorspace of live unit by person employed, last employed etc in business occupying work unit

Update presented to Members on 1st August 2012:

Since preparation of the officer report to Plans Board, further information has been submitted by the Agent to clarify how the potential occupants of the live/work unit would operate their businesses from the site.

With regard to the florist business in Wellington, the relocation of the business would allow the florist to have a workshop for the preparation of flowers, bouquets, wreaths, etc and to have living accommodation. It is not necessary to have a retail outlet as the majority of business is by way of delivery of flowers to customers.

With regard to the catering business (Simply Crepes), the potential occupant was born and brought up close to the site (in High Ercall) and believes that relocating the business will bring considerable benefits. It is a mobile catering business which has operated for 7 years and travels around 40 – 50 countryside and related shows, such as West Midlands Show, the Newport Agricultural Show where he sells crepes and other food from his van. His requirement is to have a food preparation area, storage including cold stores, and to live on site. Due to the nature of the business, there is no requirement for a retail outlet.

The Master Craft Cues business which is currently based locally at Unit 8A of Rodenhurst Business Park would also benefit from being located in a live/work unit. There are many local clients; and once the cues have been prepared in the workshop, these are delivered to various snooker halls, as well as internet based sales. Another positive factor is that he would be able to hold stock and equipment on site, close to hand to where he lives. The business is delivery-based and does not require a retail outlet.

The Agent has not received any further details of potential businesses from the local estate agents; however officers consider this additional clarification of how the potential occupiers' businesses would be operated enables further consideration of the proposal and the resulting development. Following submission of the additional information regarding the potential businesses that would operate in the live/work unit, officers consider the proposal is now acceptable and would comply with planning policies. The supporting information has demonstrated that the proposed live/work unit in this rural location can be justified and that there is sufficient interest in business use at the site. Furthermore, the development can be strictly controlled through legal agreement to ensure the resulting development does not create a new residential unit in the open countryside. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION: Subject to the Applicants entering into a Section 106 Agreement that the residential element shall be tied to the business and shall not be sold as a separate unit or let as a separate unit, to be delegated to the Manager of

Development Management to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. A04 Time limit
2. B11 Samples of materials to be submitted
3. B19 Details of doors and windows to be submitted
4. B61 Foul and surface water drainage
5. C12 Car parking
6. Ccustom Erection of nest boxes
7. C38 Development in accordance with plans
8. D01 Removal of all permitted development rights
9. DCustom Live/work unit shall remain as a single unit, and on the termination of the business, the residential unit shall be vacated

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

The supporting information has demonstrated that the proposed live/work unit in this rural location can be justified and that there is sufficient interest in business use at the site. Furthermore, the development can be strictly controlled through legal agreement to ensure the resulting development does not create a new residential unit in the open countryside.

THIS APPLICATION WAS DEFERRED AT 11TH APRIL PLANS BOARD TO ENABLE THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT FURTHER INFORMATION TO DEMONSTRATE THE ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Following the deferral of the application, officers have requested additional information to establish marketing and any potential take-up of the live/work unit, to demonstrate that the proposal is a genuine and viable proposition and would not result in the creation of a new dwelling in the open countryside. The Agent has requested that the application is referred back to 1st August Plans Board.

At 11th April Plans Board, the application was recommended for refusal on the following grounds:

1. The Local Planning Authority considers the proposed conversion of the existing agricultural buildings to a live/work development is unacceptable because the buildings are not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit and do not make a significant contribution to the character of the area to justify conversion to ensure their retention. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.
2. The application site is located outside the suitable settlements in the rural area and is within the open countryside where development will be strictly controlled. The Local Planning Authority considers insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that live/work development is required in this location in the open countryside. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy and Policy E6 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

With regard to the proposed refusal reason 1 and the relevant planning policies in the Wrekin Local Plan, officers wish to clarify that Policy H18 states residential use will be permitted where it is part of a scheme for the re-use of a building or complex of buildings for employment purposes. This element of Policy H18 is a material consideration in assessing the proposal and both Policies H18 and E6 refer to the reuse of existing buildings. Therefore providing the residential element is tied to the work element, the proposal would accord with this part of Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan. In this regard, the Applicant has now confirmed that he would be prepared to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to tie the residential element to the business and ensure the live/work unit remains in perpetuity and does not result in a new unrestricted dwelling in the open countryside. It is therefore considered that the first reason for refusal has now been addressed.

With regard to refusal reason 2, further information has been submitted with regard to possible businesses who would occupy the live/work unit. The Agent has submitted three letters from potential businesses – one from a local florists business who lives at Marsh Green in close proximity to the application site; another from the owner of a family-run business who makes crêpes, and is currently based in Denbigh, Wales; and a third letter from a local business based in Rodington that makes and sells snooker cues. The letters are supportive and all state that the opportunity to live and work at the same site would be positive for their business. The Florist suggests that the live/work unit would become the shop outlet instead of Wellington, where she must vacate from her current retail unit. She lives in the local area already and her customers are local to the site. The potential occupant who makes crepes does not provide any further information regarding his business or how it would operate from this site. Officers wonder whether these businesses would be viable in a rural location or whether they require a retail unit in a town or village. The third potential occupant operates his business from a unit at the nearby Rodenhurst Business Park in Rodington, thus the business is already based in the rural location.

It is acknowledged that there is some interest in the live/work development. Further information is due to be submitted by the Agent from local estate agents to identify other interest in the live/work unit. This information has not yet been submitted; therefore, at this stage officers cannot establish that the Applicant has adequately demonstrated the live/work development is required in this open countryside location. However, if this additional information is submitted prior to the Plans Board meeting, an update will be prepared for Members.

The original report presented at 11th April Plans Board is attached below.

COUNCILLOR SEYMOUR HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS APPLICATION IS DETERMINED BY MEMBERS AT PLANS BOARD

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED: Yes

MAIN ISSUES: Principle of Development in the Countryside, Historic and Architectural Merit, Commercial Viability, Design, Character and Appearance

THE PROPOSAL: The application seeks planning permission to convert two agricultural buildings located at either end of a small field on the edge of Isombridge Farm to a live/work unit.

The Applicant's Agent has submitted a number of reports with regard to the historic and architectural merits of the buildings and has amended the design of the development.

Despite discussions between the Applicant's Agent and officers, no information has been provided to outline the type of business which would occupy the work element of the live/work unit. The original submission states that the business would fall within Use Class B1 which includes offices, research and development and light engineering.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site comprises 2 linear red brick and tile agricultural buildings. The buildings comprise a small barn (stables or implement shed) which abuts and fronts the farm access road and dates back to approx. early 20th Century and a mid-19th Century four-bay open cartshed set back within the field. The roof trusses are constructed of an assortment of timbers from other buildings and machine-cut clay tiles. A brick boundary wall links the southernmost corner of the cartshed to the southwest corner of the barn.

The application site is located approx. 50 metres to the north of the farm house at Isombridge Farm, and the buildings subject of this application are isolated from the rest of the farm, with agricultural land to the north, east and west of the site. There are a number of residential properties within the farm complex including a row of 17th century timber-framed cottages adjacent that are Grade II listed, with 2 modern detached properties located opposite. The site is located in the open countryside; with the nearest settlement, Longden-on-Tern located some 1.5km to the north of the application site.

PLANNING HISTORY:

W2004/0050 Change Of Use Of Agricultural Land To Residential Use, Conversion And Extension Of Existing Farm Building To Form New Dwelling, Conversion Extension To Existing Farm Building To Form Garages & New Vehicular Access, Full refused for the following reasons:

The site was located in the open countryside where new development would only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. The barn was not of sufficient architectural or historical merit to warrant its retention; there was no structural survey and the proposal was contrary to Policies H9, H11 and H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan. Furthermore, no information had been submitted to demonstrate that the development could be satisfactorily drained, thus contrary to Policy EH2 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

W2008/0420 Conversion of Barn to form 1no. 2 Storey Dwelling, Withdrawn

W2010/0017 Conversion of redundant farm building into dwelling house and garaging, Approved at Plans Board. Members considered the farm building was of

sufficient architectural merit to accord with Policy H18 and an exception to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy.

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT:

National Planning Policy Framework

Saved Wrekin Local Plan Policies

UD2 Design Criteria

E6 Rural Employment General

H9 Location of New Housing

H18 Conversion of Non-Residential Buildings to Residential Use in Rural Areas

H24 Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions Policy

LDF Core Strategy

CS1 Homes

CS2 Jobs

CS7 Rural Areas

CS15 Urban Design

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Rodington Parish Council supports this application. The buildings are redundant agricultural buildings which should be developed to improve the local area.

Conservation Officer: Objects to the proposal and does not consider the two buildings are of any outstanding architectural merit or historical value. They are isolated farm buildings, disjointed, not forming part of any recognisable 'typical' farmsteads that may convey some element of historical agricultural development nor any model farm. The architecture is generic and commonly seen in many farms around the area. The quality of the building is rather poor too and this may explain their decayed state. The proposal conflicts with saved Wrekin Plan Policy H18 which requires: *"In addition to the above criteria, elsewhere in the Rural Area, the conversion of non residential buildings to residential use will only be permitted where the building is, in the opinion of the Council, of sufficient architectural or historic merit or makes a significant contribution to the character of the local area,"*

Following submission of reports regarding the condition of the buildings and a site meeting, the Conservation Officer has assessed map data and notes that the small stable building was constructed post 1919, whereas the cartshed, and other structures that have since been demolished, appear on the 1843 map. Many of the roof trusses have been reused from other buildings, with some more modern machine cut timbers, and the use of machine cut clay rooftiles of the interwar years. The roof of the cartshed appears to have been rebuilt in the 20th Century. No information has been submitted by the agent as to the structural integrity of the roof and whether the existing roof timbers would meet building regulations standards or require any replacement.

The stable/shed are likely to be an early 20th Century construction using reclaimed materials including a possibly 20th Century tiled roof. The roof timbers are various and do not represent a singular roof structure but a combination of various different elements from various other buildings and of varying ages. Cannot therefore find that

the building is of any particular age in itself or representative of a unified style or character that merits preservation through development. As regards the cart shed, this appears to be the older of the two buildings with some indication of a presence in the early Victorian period, though there is a question mark over what does survive from this period. Certainly the roof is a later reconstruction, possibly done at the same time as the building of the shed/stables as there is broad similarity in the way it has been constructed out of re-used materials and machine cut tiles. As with the stables/shed it does not stand out on its own merits a single readily identifiable period roof structure but rather 'dogs breakfast', to speak in the vernacular, of re-used timbers from other buildings, some 19th Century some 20th Century. We must therefore question what is being preserved here. These two structures do not represent any kind of complete or even near complete survival of historically significant farm structures. The historical integrity as a singular record of an agricultural building type is undermined by the significant re-building and/or re-use of parts from other buildings.

When Shropshire County Council carried out their farmstead characterisation survey of 1994 as part of an English Heritage Initiative, it is notable that these remaining structures were not deemed to be part of a readily identifiable dispersed historic farmstead, being omitted from the survey for the farm. The buildings sit some way away from the farm and according to the historical research these buildings may relate to constructions done under separate tenancies/ownerships. There is some suggestion both in the report by Jill Ming and the Shropshire County survey that Isombridge Farm may have at one time been two separate farmsteads that were later joined together. Therefore there must be some question of which farm these structures relate to. No evidence has been submitted to clearly indicate the historical provenance of the structures as part of the main Isombridge Farm site. The buildings are largely comparatively recent 19th/20thC re-builds and there is limited survival of anything that could be argued to be original to the construction. They represent structures that are neither rare nor unique within the landscape, locally or otherwise. Therefore cannot find that it is of sufficient architectural or historic merit to warrant residential conversion to ensure its retention.

An amended plan has improved the design with more vertical emphasis to the windows; however it does not overcome any of the inherent concerns regarding historical value and the proposal is considered contrary to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

Highways: no objection subject to Condition C12 Car Parking and standard highways informative I11.

Drainage: No objection subject to condition B61 regarding Foul and surface water drainage details to be submitted and approved.

Geotechs: no comment

Ecology: Initial objection to the proposal as a further survey was required to establish whether great crested newts would be affected by the development. The results of the updated survey established that there were no great crested newts found in adjacent ponds; therefore there were no further objections subject to a

Condition regarding Erection of nest boxes and Informatives regarding Bats, Lighting, Refuges and Update survey.

Shropshire Council: no comment

Shropshire Fire Service: Advice regarding Access, Water supplies and Sprinkler systems

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

The proposal comprises the change of use of vacant agricultural buildings in the countryside to a live/work development. The smaller building to the east of the application site adjacent to the highway would become the one-bedroomed residential element and the cartshed would become a work unit with workshop, office and kitchen/w.c facilities. The live/work units would face into the courtyard/parking area, with designated parking to the north of the site.

In terms of national policy and guidance, Live/work development is not clearly defined; however Circular 03/2005 *Changes of Use of Buildings and Land* describes it as Sui Generis use, as it comprises both residential and business use. The *Taylor Review of the Rural Economy and Affordable Housing* in 2008 and subsequent Government response in 2009 have recognised the need for rural enterprise, and the option of home-based working to support the rural economy.

The broad principles of live/work development meet sustainable criteria in terms of living within or next to a place of work without the need to travel. Paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies should support sustainable economic growth in rural areas and promote diversification of agriculture.

As well as national studies of live/work development; a feasibility study by Live/Work Network was commissioned to assess potential live/work developments in Telford & Wrekin. This was undertaken in December 2009. A shortlist of 8 sites within The Ironbridge Gorge, Lightmoor Village, Priorslee, Newport and its rural hinterland were appraised. All of the sites had some constraints to development such as Conservation Area designation and flood risk; however the opportunities were considered to be redevelopment of brownfield sites, good accessibility to local shops and services, links to existing local businesses and complementary to surrounding land uses. It was recognised that sites in the open countryside were constrained by planning policy, and the most suitable location was considered to be one of the sites in the Ironbridge Gorge.

There are currently no local planning policies for live/work units. Therefore it is considered that the proposal should be assessed against extant housing (barn conversion) and economic policies as well as design policies.

In this regard, Isombridge is not one of the suitable settlements listed in H9 of the Wrekin Local Plan or Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy where new residential development in the rural area would be permitted. The policy states that development within the rural area will be focussed on 3 key settlements, namely High Ercall, Tibberton and Waters Upton. Beyond these settlements, development will be limited, and development within the open countryside will be strictly

controlled. The application site is located on the edge of Isombridge Farm, in the open countryside. Therefore it is considered that there must be a clear justification for any new residential development. Furthermore, the feasibility study of potential sites for live/work development in Telford & Wrekin listed good accessibility and links to other businesses as important factors. Therefore, further justification is required for live/work development in this location in the open countryside.

With regard to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan, the conversion of non-residential buildings to residential use in the rural area will be strictly controlled. Any proposals for such conversion must meet criteria with regard to marketing for business reuse, be of permanent construction, not lead to dispersal of activity, scale and design appropriate to the surroundings, buildings capable of conversion without major reconstruction, conform to policies regarding pollution control and must conform with rural housing numbers in CS1, unless specifically for an agricultural or forestry worker's dwelling. In this regard, the application includes details of earlier marketing of the buildings between 2008 and 2010 for B1/B8 Use Class (business/storage and distribution) whereby the majority of interest was for residential conversion; the buildings are considered to be capable of conversion without major reconstruction and the buildings are relatively modest in scale.

The proposal is not strictly for a new residential unit alone as it is proposed to have a work unit linked to it. Another exception to the creation of residential development outside the key settlements in the rural area would be where the proposed development would create an affordable dwelling; however in this instance, the application does not propose an affordable dwelling. If the live/work development were deemed to be appropriate, in order to strictly control the development in the open countryside, the Applicant has been advised that to ensure a standalone residential unit does not result from any approval, it would be a requirement to tie the residential and work elements together with a Section 106 agreement.

In addition to the above criteria, Policy H18 sets out that where the proposal is located outside the suitable settlements in the rural area – in this case in the open countryside, the conversion of the buildings will only be permitted where the building is, in the opinion of the Council, of sufficient architectural or historic merit or makes a significant contribution to the character of the local area.

The Applicant's Agent has submitted additional information to seek to demonstrate that the buildings are of sufficient merit. Officers have thoroughly considered the condition and character of the buildings. The Planning and Conservation Officers have undertaken site visits and a site meeting with the Applicant and Agent, and have also assessed all the documentation submitted in this regard, such as the local history research, and updated report on the merits of the buildings. However, in the Council's opinion, the buildings are not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit, nor contribute significantly to the character of the area to justify their retention and conversion. The Conservation Officer considers the buildings are 19th/20th Century and comprise substantial rebuild or construction with materials and timbers from other buildings. No definitive evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the buildings are of sufficient architectural or historic merit to warrant conversion. Accordingly it is considered that the proposal fails to comply with Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.

In accordance with Policy E6 of the Wrekin Local Plan, employment development should be related to agriculture or forestry or assist in the diversification of the rural economy, including farm diversification. This should be achieved through the conversion of existing rural buildings, in or adjacent to a settlement, or within a farm unit for purposes of farm diversification, or enable expansion of an existing employment use. The development would constitute conversion of existing buildings; however this is outside a settlement and the Applicant has not demonstrated that the proposal would constitute farm diversification. Policy E6 also asserts that where development is in the open countryside, it will be strictly controlled.

Officers have requested that additional information is submitted to demonstrate the type of business proposed in the work element, B1 use class is a viable business option as in the Marketing Report submitted with the application, the conclusions state that there was little or no demand for commercial use (including B1 use class) at the time that marketing on the buildings was undertaken. The report states that most enquiries were for residential rather than commercial use. Furthermore, officers have requested more information to clarify the types of businesses that have shown an interest in live/work development referred to in the letters from Barbers Rural (Estate Agents and Chartered Surveyors) which have accompanied the application, in terms of why this site and the buildings would be suitable, and that live/work development is essential in this open countryside location. This information has not been forthcoming.

Unfortunately, without more detailed information, it is not possible to assess the viability of a business in this location. It is possible that a compatible business for the farm's surroundings could be accommodated; however officers cannot consider the suitability of live/work development in this location without further information. Officers are concerned that without a strong economic justification and market demand for continued employment use, granting planning permission for the live/work development could result in the creation of a new residential dwelling in the open countryside, which would be contrary to the aims of the Core Strategy (policies CS1 and CS7). Accordingly, in its current form, there is a lack of information to demonstrate that the proposal conforms to Policy E6. Furthermore, the Applicant has failed to address the conclusions in the submitted marketing report which states B1 use class is not a viable option; thus the proposal cannot be recommended for approval.

Officers note the design of the development has been amended from the initial submission and the revised design is an improvement to the original design, maintaining the character of the agricultural buildings, with vertical boarding infill panels. However officers would still assert that the principle of live/work development in this open countryside location and the economic justification for the proposal has not been demonstrated, and the Applicant is not prepared to enter into a S106 legal agreement to tie the residential and employment elements together. Furthermore, the buildings are not of significant architectural or historic merit to justify their retention and conversion; and the amendments to the design will not overcome the fundamental policy issues.

RECOMMENDATION: to REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

1. The Local Planning Authority considers the proposed conversion of the existing agricultural buildings to a live/work development is unacceptable because the buildings are not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit and do not make a significant contribution to the character of the area to justify conversion to ensure their retention. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy H18 of the Wrekin Local Plan.
2. The application site is located outside the suitable settlements in the rural area and is within the open countryside where development will be strictly controlled. The Local Planning Authority considers insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that live/work development is required in this location in the open countryside. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy and Policy E6 of the Wrekin Local Plan.