

Planning Committee
Wednesday 22 April 2015

Addendum Report

Addendum Report

Item 9

Planning Reference: P14/V2757/FUL. Land off Colton Road, Shrivenham

Update

The applicant has provided a letter and a plan (Ref TA08 A) to demonstrate that the as built site access from Stallpits Road will be 4.8 metres wide with a 1.5 metre footway, which meets the requirements of the County Council.

It has been brought to officers' attention that Ward Members have been expecting consultation on amendments. Officers have checked the council's procedures, Ward Members are sent notification of planning applications, committees and decisions, they are not routinely sent notification of amendments.

It is important to note that the consultation procedures meet statutory requirements.

Further representations

Additional letters of objection have been received from eleven local residents raising the following concerns:

1. Inadequate consultation because properties near the application site have not been consulted.
2. Inspector for Local Plan 2011 concluded the site should not be allocated for housing. This is a legal judgement therefore the site should not be used for housing.
3. Site is 850 metres from the High Street so people will drive to local amenities resulting in Increased parking pressure on the High Street.
4. 5 year housing supply is met by the new Local Plan therefore this site should not be developed.
5. The application has not taken sufficient account of the hazard of the access on to Colton Road from a cul-de-sac. County Council has not addressed the negative aspects of access from the cul-de-sac on a bend.
6. Both Colton Road and Stallpits Road Accesses are inadequate.
7. Planning Officers should not ignore the representative and elected local Parish Council and Vale councillors recommendation to reject this application.
8. Application does not comply with Local Plan policy GS1.
9. There is supposed to be a Grampian requirement requested by Thames Water but this is not clearly stated anymore.
10. Application is not consistent with Local Plan policy GS10.
11. POS is too small and is immediately on main exist road raising safety issues.
12. The Local Plan has not been used in the assessment of the application.
13. Noise impacts are significant and contrary to Paragraph 109 of the NPPF.
14. The A420 has been resurfaced and is noisier, and the updated noise survey has failed to identify this as noise readings were taken at a quiet time of the day.

15. Overlooking to neighbours, particularly at site's southern end where there are level changes.
16. No provision appears to have been made for alternative access for site vehicles during the development stage.
17. Impact on sewage systems.
18. Impact on other infrastructure.
19. Parts of Stallpits Road regularly have power cuts, and a new development will exacerbate electricity supply problems.
20. There will probably be 2/3 years of noise, air pollution and access problems. Cars will inevitably be blocked in during day time. How will 2 lorries [20 or 40 ton articulated] pass particularly with the inevitable overflow parking in the Colton Road spur?
21. There are more suitable development sites elsewhere in the area and the Vale.
22. Property values will be adversely affected.
23. The proposal will adversely affect the health of surrounding residents.
24. Proposal will result in structural damage to neighbouring properties.
25. Proposal will result in internet speeds slowing down.
26. Proposal will make it even harder to get a place in local schools.

Shrivenham Parish Council responded to object again to the application for the following key reasons:

1. The Parish Council has commissioned an independent noise assessment, which questions some of the methodology in the applicant's noise report, and considered the proposed glazing to be insufficient to mitigate noise impacts.
2. Questioned whether it is acceptable for affordable housing to be a noise buffer.
3. Raised concern that some house types still have offices; consider these should be treated as bedrooms and that consequently mix is too skewed towards large dwellings.
4. Colton Road is not wide enough to provide access to the site.
5. County Council objected to the previous application, considering the access alignment to be ill-conceived, and applicant has failed to address the issues. Surely they will object to this application as well.
6. Secondary access from Stallpits Road is not as wide as the County Council requires, and is therefore unfit for purpose.
7. Due to the lack of visitor and delivery parking, vehicles are likely to park on the spine road and will therefore block other traffic.
8. Site is 900 metres from local amenities, so people will drive, exacerbating parking problems.
9. There is very limited employment opportunity in Shrivenham. Transport Statement is therefore inaccurate where it states the development offers significant opportunities for residents to travel to and from work by bicycle.
10. Concerned at County Council's request for bus stops near Junction of Highworth Road and Townsend Road – further from the site than existing stops so clearly a mistake.
11. This is not a strategic site and offers no benefit to the village.

Key stakeholders representations

The council's environmental protection team has reviewed the independent noise assessment provided by the applicant. They consider that in terms of what is proposed to mitigate noise impacts on external living areas, both reports appear to be in general agreement. Where the reports differ is in the noise reduction capabilities of the proposed acoustic double glazing and ventilation. The environmental protection team is still satisfied that acceptable noise levels can be achieved, with suitable mitigation in place. They have recommended the following additional planning conditions:

"1. Prior to the occupation of a dwelling, that dwelling shall be insulated against all sources of external noise in accordance with a scheme which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme may require the insulation of the walls and roofs, the fitting of double-glazed windows and doors, the treatment of site boundaries and the provision of acoustic barriers/bunds.

2. Prior to the first occupation of a dwelling a site completion report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The site completion report shall validate that all approved noise mitigation measures have been completed in accordance with the scheme approved by the Local Planning Authority."

The County Council responded to make the following key comments:

Transport: Noted the only transport related changes relate to widening of footpath near Farleigh Road to 1.8 metres, and road alignment change near Plot 34 to ensure tracking for refuse vehicles. No further comments.

Education: No objection subject to the following contributions (amended to reflect revised mix).

- Expansion of primary school - £239,168
- Expansion of secondary school - £320,438
- Expansion of special needs provision in the area - £13,220

Property: No objection subject to the following contributions (amended to reflect revised mix)

- Library - £16,062.45
- Central Library - £3,240.84
- Waste Management - £12,094.08
- Museum Resource Centre - £944.85
- Adult Day Care - £14,091.00

The council's leisure team responded to state the amendments to the POS are an improvement. They suggested that the play area should be conditioned as follows:

"Play equipment must conform to EN1177. The Komplam Robina range proposed would be suitable as it appears to meet this standard. The LEAP needs to be laid out in accordance with Fields in Trust advised criteria. The range of items as shown

appear to meet FIT equipment criteria. Suitable arrangements for adequate play maintenance must be agreed".

It is recommended that condition 24 in the officers report is amended to include these requirements.

The Council's landscape architect responded to state that the amendments address many of their previous concerns. Identified the following points of detail yet to be addressed:

- There should be a bench in the wider POS area as well as within the play area.
- The style of play area would lend itself to grass matting safety surface within a general treatment of grass.
- Bins should be provided near the path exits points from the park.
- Larger native hedgerow tree species should be used on the northern site boundary.
- The tree planting in the south western area of POS either side of the road with both Magnolia and Sorbus aria is a bit fussy. If limes could be used similar to the other area of POS then this would visually link the east and west entrances and provide a stronger entrance feature.

The Council's countryside officer responded to state no further comments.

Officers Response

Responses to comments from objectors are as follows:

1. All properties that adjoin the application site have been consulted, which meets statutory requirements.
2. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites"*. This means that the relevant housing policies in the adopted Local Plan are not considered up to date and the adverse impacts of a development would need to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits if the proposal is refused.
3. The application will result in additional parking pressure however these impacts are not severe in the context of the NPPF.
4. The strategic sites included in the publication version of the Local Plan 2031 cannot be included in the housing trajectory at this stage as they have not yet gone through independent examination and therefore cannot be relied upon.
5. The County Council have assessed the accesses to the site and have deemed them acceptable. They have not raised any safety concerns regarding hazard of the access on to Colton Road from a cul-de-sac.
6. The County Council have assessed the accesses to the site and have deemed them acceptable. Outline planning permission has already been granted for access.

7. Comments from the Parish Council and elected representatives have been fully taken into account in arriving at a recommendation.
8. Policy GS1 is inconsistent with the NPPF and is therefore out of date.
9. Thames Water have recommended two planning conditions which are attached to the officers report (conditions 11 and 12).
10. Policy GS10 no longer exists, as it was not 'saved' by the Secretary of State.
11. The POS size accords with policy requirements and its location is considered acceptable and not a safety concern.
12. The adopted Local Plan has been referred to heavily in the assessment of the application.
13. Noise impacts are significant but can be mitigated to an acceptable level.
14. The updated noise survey has been assessed by the councils environmental protection team and deemed acceptable.
15. Overlooking to neighbours has been considered, and whilst there will be some overlooking the impacts are not unreasonable. A condition for obscure glazing is recommended. In addition two additional conditions requiring details of the existing ground levels of the site and the proposed slab levels of the new buildings, along with sections through the site access are recommended to ensure as built impacts are acceptable.
16. There is no provision for alternative access for site vehicles during the development stage, however officers can not insist on this.
17. Covered in detail in officers report.
18. Covered in detail in officers report.
19. Power supply is not a material planning consideration.
20. A condition for a construction traffic management plan is proposed to ensure this is appropriately managed to reduce impacts on surrounding neighbours.
21. This may be the case, however every application has to be assessed on its merits.
22. This is not a material planning consideration.
23. The councils environmental health team has not raised any concerns regarding health impacts. The applicant will need to comply with relevant legislation that controls working practices, dust control etc during construction.
24. As with any development, the developer will need to ensure the risk of structural damage to neighbouring properties is avoided. This is covered in building regulations.
25. This is not a material planning consideration.
26. The applicant will be required to make a significant contribution towards the expansion of local schools to mitigate the impact of the development, as identified in Section 6.120 of the officer's report.

Responses to Parish Council objections are as follows:

Shrivenham Parish Council responded to object again to the application for the following key reasons:

1. The council's environmental protection team has reviewed the independent noise assessment, and are still satisfied acceptable noise levels can be achieved subject to the conditions identified above.
2. The council's housing team have not objected to the form or location of the affordable housing.

3. Some house types still have offices but it is considered reasonable to allow some offices, especially in larger dwellings.
4. The County Council has deemed the access suitable.
5. The County Council has not objected, and whilst they have concerns regarding the design of the access road, they accept that it meets the requirements of their design guide.
6. The Stallpits Road access will be widened to accord with County Council requirements and the applicant has provided a letter and plan to demonstrate this.
7. The proposal is considered to have adequate visitor and delivery parking.
8. The application will result in additional parking pressure and some traffic impacts however these impacts are not severe in the context of the NPPF.
9. No comment.
10. The location of the new bus stops is to be agreed with the county council.
11. This is not a strategic site but must be assessed on its merits in view of the 5 year housing supply situation as discussed in detail in the officers report.

With respect to the additional comments from the Landscape Architect, the applicant has confirmed they agree to the suggested changes, and a condition for a detailed landscaping scheme is recommended to ensure the last minor outstanding issues are fully addressed. This would replace condition 6 in the officers' report.

Item 10

Planning Reference: P14/V2829/FUL. 23 Wallingford Street, Wantage

Update

The environmental health officer has provided comments raising concerns about the proximity of the building to the loading bay of the Waitrose store opposite and requesting that the noise insulation within the bedrooms achieves the 'good' standards for internal noise levels outlined in BS8233:1999. The noise report requires updating and the environmental health officer has provided suggested conditions to address this.

Officer Response

It is therefore recommended that condition 28 is omitted and replaced with the following two conditions, as suggested by the environmental health officer:

28: Prior to the occupation of a dwelling, that dwelling shall be insulated against all sources of external noise in accordance with a scheme which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme may require the insulation of the walls and roofs and the fitting of double-glazed windows and doors and acoustic ventilation.

Reason: To protect the amenity of residents (Policy DC10 of the adopted Local Plan).

29: Prior to the first occupation of a dwelling a site completion report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The site completion report shall validate that all approved noise mitigation measures have been completed in accordance with the scheme approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of residents (Policy DC10 of the adopted Local Plan).

The environmental health officer has also suggested the following informative is included:

Informative

It is noted that the noise report submitted in support of this application was based on monitoring carried out in 2010. There may have been changes in the local noise climate in the area since 2010. It is requested that the applicants undertake further monitoring in order to verify that the findings of the 2010 noise report. Any mitigation should be designed to meet good internal noise levels as specified in BS 8233 2014

Item 11

Planning reference: P15/V0154/O. Land adjacent to Fernham Gate, Faringdon

Update

The applicant provided a revised site layout plan (Ref FA2/P03 Rev B) on 21 April, which indicates an additional area of sloping land along the north boundary will be excluded from the site. This allows for a boundary fence to be erected along the top of the slope which will remove the opportunity for overlooking of neighbours from Plot 4. Officers consider this minor change to be an improvement to the application.

Additional letters of objection have been received from six local residents raising the following concerns:

1. Consultees have been given inadequate time to respond to amendments, and the committee report was written before all representations on amendments had been received, therefore representations have not been given sufficient consideration. Question the process followed by the council, and consider there to be grounds for judicial review.
2. Applicant has failed to consult with affected residents in breach of NPPF guidelines
3. Revised plan is lacking in detail and textual annotation.
4. Object to illustrative plans; the application should be detailed.
5. Revised plan destroys the hedgerow along the western boundary.
6. No detailed designs for bungalows, which could significantly impact on neighbours.
7. Site is at a higher level than adjacent Fernham Gate and will over-dominate and overlook Nos. 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28 Fernham Gate.
8. Application provides no boundary treatment details.
9. No daylight and sunlight assessment has been carried out.

10. Site is not identified for development in current or emerging local plan
11. Development will have significant landscape impact contrary to local plan policies NE7 and NE10.
12. Development is contrary to both Faringdon and Great Coxwell neighbourhood plans.
13. A new contaminated land survey should be carried out before granting permission, as the survey submitted is outdated.
14. Due to the landfill under the site, a unique habitat has resulted which should be protected.
15. Tree planting is likely to fail due to landfill under the site.
16. Ecology report makes inaccurate statements and is flawed. There should be a condition requiring Ecology Report recommendations to be followed.
17. Consider that the habitats in the site should be classed as Priority Habitat Open Mosaic Habitat, and the application should have been assessed on this basis.
18. Further detail should be added to the site layout plan or conditions to confirm that garden and site boundary fencing will be permeable to wildlife
19. Noise pollution will be significant across the development. PPG24 does not support development in this location.
20. Noise Assessment is flawed in its assumptions and also because readings were not taken in a representative position.
21. Noise Assessment has not been updated to reflect the amended site layout.
22. Noise assessment does not take into account the approved extension of the quarry across the A420 from the site.
23. Transport Statement has not been updated to reflect amended scheme.
24. Proposal will further increase traffic in Fernham Road and wider road network.
25. Concern that surface drainage will migrate to neighbouring properties.
26. Faringdon's infrastructure cannot cope as it is.
27. SSSI remains the responsibility of the applicant and access to it should only be for bona fide interested parties by prior arrangement.

Great Coxwell Parish Council responded to object again to the application for the following reasons:

- Site is very close to the A420; there will be noise intrusion for the prospective residents.
Too much traffic coming on to Coxwell Road off Fernham Road which is already congested with school traffic and cars parked everywhere.
- Overload of water and sewage utilities in the town.
- Poor water pressure.
- Proposal does not comply with policy NDS8 (building to plot ratio) of the Great Coxwell Neighbourhood Plan due to poor comparison with Fernham Gate. Also fails to comply with policy NDS4 which requires ancient hedges to be preserved. Detailed design should comply with relevant design policies in the neighbourhood plan.
- Expect to be consulted at design stage.

Faringdon Town Council responded to object again for the following reasons:

- Support original objection from the council's environmental protection team.

- Support comments from Natural England, Great Coxwell Parish Council and residents.
- Take issue with paragraph 6.17 of the officers report which refers to a population increase of 20% - this is more like 30-39%.
- Take issue with paragraph 6.18 officers report which refers to population increase of Faringdon, where the application actually falls within Great Coxwell.
- Officers' report underestimates impacts on neighbours due to slope in the land.
- As number of houses has been reduced the proposal will not contribute to infrastructure.

The Council's countryside officer responded to request the following additional planning condition to be added to any approval in light of comments from objector:-

"Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, including any works of site clearance, a method statement for biodiversity enhancements designed to mitigate the loss of habitats on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the biodiversity enhancement measures shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:

To promote the preservation and Enhancement of biodiversity in accordance with government policy as stated in paragraphs 109 and 117 of the NPPF."

Natural England responded to state that their previous advice applies equally to the amended layout. They had not objected but requested two planning conditions which are attached to the officers report.

Following the submission of the amended layout, the council's environmental protection team requested the applicant to provide an update to the original noise assessment. That report was received by the council on 17 April, and the council's environmental protection team subsequently responded to state:

"...the scheme is much improved with all garden areas predicted to meet the 50-55dBA guideline levels in full, with the exception of Plot 1 which will meet this range of levels in parts of the garden. In view of this the scheme as proposed is predicted to broadly meet the target noise levels for outdoor living areas and is acceptable subject to the insertion of the mitigation measures proposed in the WBM acoustic report 4346 14 January 2015 and the amendment on 16 April 2015."

Given the above, the application is considered acceptable in terms of noise impact. Officers recommend that condition 9 in the report should be amended to include the update to the noise report.

Officer Response

Comments on the points raised by objectors are as follows:

1. National Planning Practice Guidance states (at Paragraph 025): *“Where the local planning authority has decided that re-consultation is necessary, it is open to them to set the timeframe for responses, balancing the need for consultees to be given time to consider the issue that is being re-consulted upon and respond against the need for efficient decision making.”* The council has a policy of allowing consultees 14 days in which to respond with further comments regarding amendments to planning applications. All comments received after the committee report was written have been considered as reflected in this addendum report. Officers consider that the application has been dealt with fairly and proportionally and in full accordance with correct procedure.
2. Whilst the applicant should have consulted with affected neighbours prior to submitting the application, this is not a reason on which to refuse the application.
3. The revised plan meets the basic requirements of an outline application and is considered adequate to assess the access arrangements in sufficient detail. The applicant will be required to submit full details of landscaping, layout, scale and appearance at reserved matters stage.
4. The council cannot force an applicant to submit a full detailed application, and outline applications have to be assessed on their merits.
5. The hedgerow will be lost, however most of it is outside the application site and would be lost to visibility splays. Furthermore, removal of the hedge enables there to be dwellings fronting the street, which represents a good design.
6. Detailed design for bungalows will be provided at reserved matters stage. The applicant will need to demonstrate impacts are acceptable.
7. Whilst the outlook currently enjoyed by the adjoining properties will change, the likely scale of the buildings on the illustrative site layout will not result in undue impacts on neighbours. An additional condition requiring details of the existing ground levels of the site and the proposed slab levels of the new buildings is recommended to give neighbours comfort that their amenity will not be unduly harmed.
8. Boundary treatment details will be provided as part of future reserved matters applications.
9. A daylight and sunlight assessment is not necessary in this instance.
10. Covered in detail in officers report.
11. Covered in detail in officers report.
12. Covered in detail in officers report.
13. The council’s environmental projection team has no objection subject to a phased contaminated land risk assessment to be agreed pre-commencement.
14. Tree planting may be more difficult however is not impossible and will be assessed at reserved matters stage when landscaping details are under consideration.
15. A planning condition is recommended requiring the recommendations in the Ecology Report to be followed.
16. The council’s countryside officer has suggested a further planning condition, as identified in this addendum, to address the comments made. It is not considered necessary for a new Ecology Report to be submitted.
17. Can be assessed at reserved matters or discharge of conditions stage when boundary treatments are under consideration.

18. Noise impact is considered acceptable by the councils environmental team, and PPG24 is out of date.
19. Council's environmental protection team is aware of the location where readings were taken from but have not objected to noise modelling undertaken and subsequent results.
20. The applicant provided an update to the noise assessment at the request of the environmental protection team, and this was deemed acceptable as detailed above.
21. Officers also questioned the council's environmental protection team regarding the quarry extension across the A420 from the site. The response received was as follows:- *"The quarrying operation is a low level activity and has been running for years without complaint or anyone really being aware of it. The working quarry is below the natural surface level and this provides an acoustic bund to noise from on site operations. There is an approved extension of the quarry to the west. It is proposed to strip the topsoil and to incorporate this into a bund at the boundary to provide visual and acoustic screening of the site. The vehicle movements are not anticipated to increase above the existing permitted maximum 66 movements per day. In view of this I do not anticipate that the impacts of the quarry are likely to be significant and any impacts would be significantly outweighed by the impacts of the A420 traffic."* In light of this, it is not considered necessary for the noise report to be updated to include an assessment of the quarry use.
22. The County Council has not requested an updated Transport Statement.
23. Covered in detail in officers report.
24. Covered in detail in officers report.
25. Covered in detail in officers report.
26. A condition requiring a management program for the SSSI including access/security arrangements is appended to the officers report.

The issues raised by Great Coxwell Parish Council are all covered in detail in the officers report. The Parish Council will be consulted at reserved matters stage.

Comments on the issues raised by Faringdon Town Council are as follows:

- This development will result in such a very small increase to the population of Faringdon. Cumulative impacts would therefore be difficult to quantify and for this reason the cumulative impact of this development is considered acceptable.
- Whilst the application site is within Great Coxwell parish, it is on the edge of Faringdon therefore it is sensible to refer to an increase in the population of Faringdon.
- Impacts on neighbours have been considered fully, and the applicant has produced an amended site layout plan to address overlooking. The development will result in some overshadowing however the likely impacts are not unreasonable. Impacts on neighbours will be assessed in more detail at reserved matters stage when elevations and detailed plans are considered. A slab level condition is recommended.
- Officers confirm that this proposal will not be required to make developer contributions as discussed in section 6.90-6.92 of the officers report.

Item 12

Planning Reference: P14/V2540/FUL. Land east of Drayton, Drayton Road, Drayton

Update

Sutton Courtenay Parish Council, the neighbouring parish wish to make the following comments to the application:

1. The increased traffic on local roads. There would be vehicle movements through settlements from various fields to one storage location. The B4016 has a bend and a dip in the vicinity of the site, where visibility is poor and the junction with the Milton Road is always busy. Additional slow moving traffic all heading towards one location would add to existing traffic problems.
2. The site is a prominent one in the open area between the villages of Sutton Courtenay and Drayton, and the members of Sutton Courtenay Parish Council believe that, given the height of the building, there would be considerable harm to the rural character and landscape setting of such a prominent site. Greater importance should be given to the landscape setting and the intrusive impact the proposal would have.

The agent has had ongoing discussions with the drainage engineer regarding surface water and foul water. The surface water details are acceptable.

Officer Response

1. The application has been assessed by the Highways Liaison who considers the application to be acceptable. Their comments are noted in the table included at Paragraph 3.1 and considered in para. 6.5 of the report.
2. In addition the prominence of the site and the long views of the proposed development, whilst visible, are considered not to be significantly or demonstrably harmful to this area that requires some landscape enhancement given its farm complex appearance in a countryside location, as discussed in Paragraph 6.3 of the Officers report.

The foul water condition will still be included on any grant of planning permission however the surface water details have been satisfied and are no longer needed to be included as a condition.

Item 13

Planning Reference: P14/V2478/FUL. C L R C, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory adjacent to Building R40, Harwell

Update

Further discussion with the council's landscape officer. She has suggested that we need to ensure there is sufficient growing medium within the car park area to allow the trees to grow. She proposed the following additional condition:

"That the trees adjacent or within the car park area must be planted into site specific tree pits. The tree pits are to be a crated pit design that incorporates technology that will enable tree/s to successfully grow in hard surface environments. The pits must provide the significant quantities of growing medium required to allow the trees to become established and grow on to maturity, sustaining the trees in a healthy condition and allow for ease of maintenance. Details of the tree species and the tree pits, and an implementation programme, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development on the site. In the event of any of the trees so planted dying or being seriously damaged or destroyed within 5 years of the completion of the development, a new tree of a species first approved by the Local Planning Authority, be planted and properly maintained."

Officers Response

The proposed trees will contribute to mitigating the impact of the development. It is therefore important that they can be successfully retained long term. Suggest condition is added.

Item 14

Planning Reference: P14/V2894/FUL. Court Farm House, Letcombe Bassett

Update

The council's conservation officer has provided comments on the amended scheme. The comments outline the discussions held during the office meeting and sets out the amendments which have been made. The conservation officer considers that the amendments have addressed the conservation and design objections regarding the impact on the farmhouse and its setting. On balance, it is now considered that the scheme has been adapted sufficiently to recommend approval of the application, subject to conditions.

An additional letter has been received from Mr and Mrs Jameson who live at Church End. They have reviewed the amended plans but retain their objection to the proposal for the same reasons as set out in their initial response. In particular they are concerned about the precedent that this development will set, and the impact of the proposal on the conservation area and setting of the nearby listed buildings.

Officer Response

The conservation officer's comments are welcomed and support the officer's recommendation to approve the application.

The concerns raised by the neighbour do not raise any new points and it is considered that these have been covered sufficiently in the report.

Item 15

Planning Reference: P14/V2791/HH. 11 The Green, Shrivenham

No Updates.