



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/W/16/3167636

Parade Street Store, Parade Street, St Helens, Merseyside

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mike Cosey against the decision of St. Helens Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2016/0660/FUL, dated 27 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is change of use from storage unit to house in multiple occupation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use from storage unit to house in multiple occupation at Parade Street Store, Parade Street, St Helens, Merseyside in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2016/0660/FUL, dated 27 July 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan; Existing Layout and Elevations / Proposed Layout and Elevations; Existing Layouts; Proposed First Floor Layout; Proposed Ground Floor Layout; Existing Elevations.
 - 3) No development shall take place until a scheme of sound insulation, to protect the existing dwelling at No 2 Brynn Street from noise generated within the development hereby permitted, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development, and shall thereafter be retained.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of No 2 Brynn Street with regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a large two storey building that is currently disused. It shares a party wall with No 2 Brynn Street, which is located immediately to the north.

4. The proposed conversion would involve the creation of new bedrooms next to the party wall with No 2 Brynn Street. No shared lounge is proposed and so future occupiers would be likely to spend a significant proportion of their time in these rooms. Whilst this has the potential to generate noise and disturbance, the shared boundary could be fitted with appropriate sound insulation measures. These could be secured by condition and would ensure that the amenity of the adjoining occupiers would be protected. Moreover, whilst a total of 10 bedrooms are proposed, I note that only 3 of these would be located next to the party wall.
5. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not significantly harm the living conditions of No 2 Brynn Street with regard to noise and disturbance. It would therefore accord with Policy CP1 of the St Helens Local Plan Core Strategy (2012). This policy seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that new development avoids detrimental impacts on the amenities of the area.

Other Matters

6. Whilst the development does not propose any off-street car parking, it is located on the edge of St Helens Town Centre and so is in a highly accessible location. Future occupiers who meet the criteria would be eligible to apply for a residents parking permit if necessary. In this regard, there is no evidence before me of high levels of on-street parking stress in the area.
7. Interested parties have raised concerns regarding the adequacy of the proposed kitchen facilities for the number of rooms that are proposed. However, this matter falls outside of the planning regime.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plans. This is necessary for clarity and to ensure a satisfactory development. A further condition requiring the submission and approval of a scheme of sound insulation is necessary in order to protect the living conditions of No 2 Brynn Street.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR