

ITEM NUMBER: 5e

21/02968/FHA	Part single storey, part two storey front, side and rear extension.	
Site Address:	Greenbanks Toms Hill Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5SA	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr and Mrs Barraclough	Mrs Rebecca Flood
Case Officer:	Natasha Vernal	
Parish/Ward:	Aldbury Parish Council	Aldbury & Wigginton
Referral to Committee:	Contrary views from Aldbury Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The site is located within the Rural Area, wherein the principle of extensions to existing dwellings is acceptable in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.).

2.2 The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in design terms, given that the works do not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene, the Aldbury Conservation Area or surrounding countryside & Chilterns AONB. Furthermore, it is not considered that the proposal would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by being visually overbearing or resulting in a significant loss of sunlight / daylight, overlooking or overshadowing. Sufficient private amenity space would be provided for future occupiers of the site in line with the relevant policies.

2.2 Given all of the above, the proposal complies with Paragraphs 176, 197, 199, 201 and 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policies CS7, CS11, CS12, CS24 and CS27 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013), Sections 66 and 72 of The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Saved Policy 120 and Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004).

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The site is occupied by a two storey detached dwelling located on the southern side of Toms Hill Road in the Aldbury area of Tring. The site is situated within the area of archaeological significance, Rural Area, Aldbury Conservation Area, Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The surrounding area is predominately residential in character.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 This application seeks full householder permission for the construction of part single storey, part two-storey front, side and rear extension.

4.2 It is noted that a previous application (reference: 21/00517/FHA) was refused at the site for the following reason (in italics):

“The proposed two storey side / front extension by virtue of its mass, bulk and scale would be an incongruous addition to the surrounding area. The proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Aldbury Conservation Area. The proposed scheme therefore fails to comply with Policies CS11, CS12 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004), Sections 12 and 16 of the NPPF (2019), Saved Policy 120 of

the Dacorum Local Plan (2004) and Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act (1990).”

4.3 Amended plans were received on 13th September 2021 addressing the concerns raised from the Conservation Officer by scaling down the development by setting the front dormer into the existing roof slope, setting back the front projection in line with the existing front projection, reducing the scale of the hipped roof dormer and providing street scene plan.

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications (If Any):

21/00517/FHA - Two storey side and front extensions
REF - 21st April 2021

Appeals (If Any):

6. CONSTRAINTS

Area of Archaeological Significance: 29
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: CAONB outside Dacorum
CIL Zone: CIL1
Aldbury Conservation Area
Parish: Aldbury CP
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m)
RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: RAF HALTON: DOTTED BLACK ZONE
Rural Area: Policy: CS7
Small Village: Aldbury
Parking Standards: New Zone 3
EA Source Protection Zone: 3

7. REPRESENTATIONS

Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)
Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)
Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

Relevant Policies:

NP1 - Supporting Development
CS1 - Distribution of Development

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages
CS7 – Rural Area
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design
CS12 - Quality of Site Design
CS24 – Chilterns AONB
CS27 – Quality of the Historic Environment
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2020)
Planning Obligations (2011)
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)
Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2011)

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The application site is located within the designated Rural Area wherein small-scale development is acceptable in accordance with Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy (2013), provided it has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside and supports the rural economy and maintenance of the wider countryside.

9.3 Policy CS7 fails to define what constitutes 'small-scale development.' Furthermore, whilst Saved Policy 22 of the Local Plan (2004) offers qualitative criteria with which an assessment of the above policy can be made, this policy is partially inconsistent with the NPPF, and as such, little weight is attributed to this policy.

9.4 Given all of the above, the definition of 'small-scale development' is taken to reflect a matter of planning judgement, made using a case by case approach.

9.5 The existing garage would be demolished. The proposed two storey side extension would extend approximately 4.3 metres from the existing side elevation and be set down from the original roof ridge by 0.3 metres. The proposed development at ground floor would not extend beyond the principal elevation however would extend approximately 1.3 metres from the existing rear elevation. At first floor level the proposed extension would not extend beyond the existing front or rear elevation. The proposal would be set back from the side boundary by approximately 1 metre.

9.6 Given the scale and height of the proposed extension, the proposed development can reasonably be considered to reflect 'small-scale development.' The key issue of consideration to the application is therefore whether the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on the Aldbury Conservation Area which has been considered in the following section of the report.

Impact on the Aldbury Conservation Area

9.7 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF (2021) states that in determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF outlines that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, 'great weight' should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 201 states that where proposed development will lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, Local Planning Authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm. Where the harm is considered less than substantial, Paragraph 202 states that this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

9.8 The site is located within Aldbury Conservation Area (a heritage asset), whereby development is expected to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS27, Saved Policy 120 of the Local Plan (2004) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021).

9.9 The Conservation Officer was consulted and raised no objections to the proposal however it was noted that the roof of the side extension should be set back or in line with the existing front projection and the hipped roof front dormer should comprise a shed or mono-pitch roof.

9.10 With further discussions with the agent, amended plans were received addressing the concerns raised from the Conservation Officer by setting the side extension back and in line with the existing front projection, reducing the scale of the hipped roof dormer comprising a shed roof and providing existing and proposed street scene plans.

9.11 The Conservation Officer has been re-consulted and raised no objections to the proposal subject to a matching materials condition, noting that the proposed extension to Greenbanks considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Aldbury Conservation Area in accordance with policy CS27.

9.12 In light of the comments provided by the Conservation and Design Officer, no harm has been identified to the Aldbury Conservation Area as the proposed works are considered to be sympathetic to the existing dwelling, protecting and conserving the integrity, setting and distinctiveness of this designated heritage asset. In comparison to the previous refused scheme under LPA ref: 21/00517/FHA, the proposed scheme through design, scale and positioning are considered sympathetic to the Aldbury Conservation Area.

9.13 Taking the above policies into account, the proposed development is considered acceptable in principle. In accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS27, Saved Policy 120 of the Local Plan (2004), Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Paragraphs 197, 199, 201 and 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021).

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.14 Core Strategy (2013) Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 highlight the importance of high quality sustainable design in improving the character and quality of an area, seeking to ensure that developments are in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of scale, mass, height and appearance. This guidance is supported by Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Local Plan (2004).

9.15 The surrounding area is characterised by detached dwellings in a variety of design and roof form, many of which show alteration / extension.

9.16 The proposal would comprise pitched roofs including the insertion of a front dormer which would be set in approximately 1 metres from the flank walls and is considered modest in scale.

9.17 The proposal development would feature brickwork and cedar cladding to be in keeping with the existing dwelling. However, a materials to match condition is required to ensure no adverse impacts on the Aldbury Conservation Area. The proposed fenestration would be in keeping with the existing fenestration.

9.18 Although some elements of the proposed development would be visible from the public realm, the proposal would be set back from the public highway by approximately 15 metres and therefore the proposal would be less prominent when viewed along Tom Hill Road. Furthermore, the proposal is considered to harmonise with the existing dwelling and the surrounding street scene. Therefore, it is not considered to result in a massing that would be unduly prominent or out of keeping within the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.

9.19 It is considered that the design, layout and scale of the proposed development respects that of the existing and surrounding dwellings. The architectural style is sympathetic to the surrounding area and the proposal will not have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore complies with Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS10, CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2021).

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

9.20 In terms of the Chilterns AONB, Core Strategy (2013) Policy CS24 and Local Plan (2004) Policy 97 seek to conserve the special qualities of this area and ensure that materials used for developments fit the traditional character of the area. Additionally, Paragraph 176 of the NPPF (2021) states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB.

9.21 The surrounding area is rural in character with pockets of residential development concentrated towards the south east. The area is predominantly characterised by large detached two storey dwellings.

9.22 It is considered that the proposed use of materials and sympathetic design of the development will not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the surrounding properties or its wider setting of the Chilterns AONB. The proposal therefore complies with Policy CS24 of the Core Strategy, Policy 97 of the Local Plan (2004) and the NPPF (2021) in that regard.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.23 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy, seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon the neighbouring properties and their amenity space.

9.24 It is noted that formal objections were received from the neighbouring property at Old Rectory Cottage objected on the grounds of the scale of development not in keeping within the existing dwelling or the Aldbury Conservation Area.

9.25 The proposal would be sited approximately 21 metres from Old Rectory Cottage and with the amendments provided, the proposal would not extend beyond the existing dwelling. Although fenestration is proposed to face towards Old Rectory Cottage, these views are similar to those existing windows at first floor. Given the sufficient separation distance of 21 metres between the subject property and Old Rectory Cottage, it is not identified that the proposal would have detrimental impacts on loss of sunlight / daylight, overlooking or overshadowing. Regarding the design of development, these matters have been addressed in the impact on Aldbury Conservation Area and quality of design / impact on visual amenity assessment.

9.26 Formal comments were received from the adjacent neighbouring properties at Ridgways and Trinity supporting this application.

9.27 The proposed development would be sited approximately 1 metre from the common boundary with the neighbouring property at Trinity. The proposed two-side extension would not extend beyond Trinity's front elevation and no side fenestration is proposed to face towards this property. The neighbouring property at Trinity does not benefit from side windows and therefore the proposal would not result to overlooking or overshadowing. Given the orientation between the subject property and Trinity, it is unlikely that the proposal would have a significant impact on loss of sunlight / daylight, overlooking or overshadowing.

9.28 It should be noted that the neighbouring property at Ridgeways benefit from a two storey side extension, chimney and provision of vehicular access granted under LPA ref: 4/00005/90/FUL.

9.29 The proposed development would be on the opposite side of the existing dwelling and would be sited approximately 8 metres from the common boundary with Ridgeways. Furthermore no fenestration is proposed to face towards Ridgeways. Given the orientation between the subject property and Ridgeways, it is not identified that the proposal would have a significant impact on loss of sunlight / daylight overlooking or overshadowing.

9.30 Although views of the surrounding properties front and rear gardens would be possible, these views are similar to the existing windows at first floor. Therefore, it is unlikely that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on overlooking.

9.31 Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal will be acceptable with respect to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and the NPPF (2021).

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.32 There would be no changes to the existing access, nor any changes that would affect the adjoining highway. In terms of parking, the parking standards are comprised within Appendix A of the Parking Standards SPD (2020). The site resides within Accessibility Zone 3, wherein the parking requirement for a 3-bedroom dwelling is 2.25 spaces.

9.33 The existing dwelling comprises three bedrooms, as a result of the proposed development there would be four bedrooms and would therefore require 3.0 off-street parking spaces. The proposed development will not result to a shortfall of parking spaces as this four bedroomed detached dwelling has a sufficient area of hardstanding located to the frontage that can accommodate at least two vehicles. In addition, the proposed scheme introduces a new garage which would accommodate at least one internal parking space. Furthermore, there are local public transport routes situated in close proximity to the application site.

9.34 It is considered that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on local parking provision, nor will it have a severe impact to the safety and operation of the adjacent highway. Thus, the proposal meets the requirements of Appendix A of the Parking Standards SPD (2020).

Other Material Planning Considerations

Aldbury Parish Council

9.35 Aldbury Parish Council were consulted and raised an objection stating the following (in italics):

This application is a modification of the earlier plan: Ref 21/00517/FHA (refused) and does nothing to address the previously expressed concerns of the Parish Council. The 2-storey side extension would increase the flank elevation to slightly below the height of the existing roof ridgeline and extend it by approximately 1/3rd of the current length. This would substantially reduce the current gap between this and the adjacent property, presenting a larger continuous built frontage to the detriment of the conservation area and the character of Toms Hill. This proposal does not meet the criteria laid out in the Aldbury Conservation Area Character Appraisal which is on the Dacorum Borough Council's planning website (page 36)

"1.9 Setting and Views: The setting of the conservation area is very important and development which impacts in a detrimental way upon the immediate setting and longer views into and from the conservation area will be resisted."

9.36 Amended plans were received on 13th September 2021 addressing the concerns raised from the Conservation Officer by scaling down the development by setting the front dormer into the existing roof slope, setting back the front projection in line with the existing front projection, reducing the scale of the hipped roof dormer and providing street scene plan. Aldbury Parish Council were re-consulted but the amendments did not satisfy their concerns and they still objected on the grounds scale of development impacting the Conservation Area.

9.37 Overall, the proposal allows visual reading of the existing elevation and is considered to harmonise with the existing dwelling and the Conservation Area.

Historic Environment

9.38 The site is situated within an area of archaeological significance. Historic Environment were consulted and raised no objections to the proposal noting that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.39 It is noted that formal objections were received from the neighbouring property at Old Rectory Cottage objected on the grounds of the scale of development not in keeping within the existing dwelling or the Aldbury Conservation Area. However, the matters raised have been addressed in the impact on residential amenity assessment.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.40 Policy CS35 requires all developments to make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure required to support the development. These contributions will normally extend only to the payment of CIL where applicable. The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was adopted in February 2015 and came into force on the 1st July 2015. The application is not CIL liable as it would result in less than 100 square metres of additional residential floor space.

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 The proposed development through its design, scale and finish will not adversely impact upon the visual amenity of the immediate street scene, the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants, the Aldbury Conservation Area or surrounding countryside & Chilterns AONB. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Saved Appendices 3 and 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS7, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS24 and CS27 of the Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraphs 176, 197, 199, 201 and 202 of the NPPF (2021).

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

Case Officer Check List	Officer Check/Comments
Has the consultation letter/site notice/advert period expired?	Yes
Was a site notice posted and if so, was the date entered into Uniform?	Yes
Is the Article 35 Statement included?	Yes
Is the CIL box ticked/un-ticked in Uniform?	Yes
Are all plans, documents, site photographs and emails saved to DMS?	Yes
If applicable, please give the reason why the application is overtime.	DMC
Does the application involve the demolition of any buildings that are currently in use?	Yes
Is there a Legal Agreement?	No
Has the Uniform Legal Agreement box been filled in?	N/A
Is a copy of the agreement on DMS (both redacted and non-redacted versions)? Has the agreement been published on the website?	N/A

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

1. **The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:**
 - PA211-04
 - PA211-05
 - PA211-06
 - PA211-1250

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. **The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match the existing building in terms of size, colour and texture.**

Reason: To make sure that the appearance of the building is suitable and that it contributes to the character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
<p>Conservation & Design (DBC)</p>	<p>Greenbanks is a mid 20th century detached brick built property with gabled concrete tile roof, the roof continues down with a monopitch over the existing single storey front projection. There is a flat roof garage to the side. Greenbanks is set back from Toms Hill Road with an attractive front garden setting and sits alongside other circa mid 20th century detached properties, also set back from the road, there are good sized gaps between the properties.</p> <p>A previous application for 2-storey front and side extensions to Greenbanks was refused.</p> <p>The 2-storey side extension is set down slightly at the eaves and its roof is set back slightly from the existing roof slope, the bulk of the extension is increased by it being set forward of the main wall line and in line with the front projection but this is not considered harmful enough to refuse. Clarification is needed on the following:</p> <p>Regarding the window of the en-suite to the front elevation, is this going to be set in to the proposed roof slope?</p> <p>The elevation plans seems to show the roof of the side extension projecting forward further than it does on the side elevation, ideally the roof should not come any further forward than the existing front projection and if anything be slightly set back.</p> <p>The hipped dormer proposed to the front elevation would, in my view, suit a shed / monopitch roof better - this would correspond to the existing roof form.</p> <p><u>Further comments received on 7th October 2021</u></p> <p>Greenbanks is a mid 20th century detached brick built property with gabled concrete tile roof, the roof continues down with a monopitch over the existing single storey front projection. There is a flat roof garage to the side. Greenbanks is set back from Toms Hill Road with an attractive front garden setting and sits alongside other circa mid 20th century detached properties, also set back from the road, there are good sized gaps between the properties.</p> <p>A previous application for 2-storey front and side extensions to Greenbanks was refused.</p> <p>The 2-storey side extension which will occupy the position of the</p>

	<p>existing single storey flat roofed garage is set down from the ridge and eaves of the main property and therefore does have some level of subordinate relationship with the host property. Unfortunately the perceived bulk of the extension is increased by it being set forward of the main wall line (of the 2-storey part of the house) and it is acknowledged the flank elevation will be a more visible element within the street scene – but this is not considered to be completely out of character with this group of mid 20th century properties along this part of Toms Hill Road.</p> <p>The plans have now been clarified / amended showing the window of the en-suite will be set in to the roof slope of the extension and the roof of the extension comes no further forward than the existing. The front dormer has been reduced in size and looks to be a more proportionate element on the front roof slope.</p> <p>On balance the proposed extension to Greenbanks is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Aldbury Conservation Area in accordance with policy CS27 and the conservation based policies within the NPPF, recommend approval.</p> <p>If approved a condition requiring external materials to match existing is recommended.</p>
Parish/Town Council	<p>Aldbury Parish Council Object</p> <p>This application is a modification of the earlier plan: Ref 21/00517/FHA (refused) and does nothing to address the previously expressed concerns of the Parish Council. The 2-storey side extension would increase the flank elevation to slightly below the height of the existing roof ridgeline and extend it by approximately 1/3rd of the current length. This would substantially reduce the current gap between this and the adjacent property, presenting a larger continuous built frontage to the detriment of the conservation area and the character of Toms Hill. This proposal does not meet the criteria laid out in the Aldbury Conservation Area Character Appraisal which is on the Dacorum Borough Council's planning website (page 36)</p> <p>"1.9 Setting and Views: The setting of the conservation area is very important and development which impacts in a detrimental way upon the immediate setting and longer views into and from the conservation area will be resisted."</p> <p><u>Further comments received on 7th October 2021</u></p> <p>21/02968/FHA Part single storey, part two storey front, side and rear extension. Greenbanks Toms Hill Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5SA The Parish Council Objects based on the fact that the revised plans do not address any issues and that previously submitted objections were not addressed.</p>

Historic Environment	Due to the fact that the dwelling is modern in date, the proposal is partly over an existing garage and its size, in this instance only, we consider that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest, and we have no comment to make upon the proposal.
----------------------	---

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
4	3	0	1	2

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
Old Rectory Cottage Toms Hill Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5SA	<p>The current application is a modification of the earlier plan: Ref 21/00517/FHA: which was refused because it did not meet the requirements for development in a Conservation Area. These included (i) the lack of subordinate character of the side extension and (ii) the need to respect established building lines.</p> <p>In the new plan the width and profile of the side extension is unchanged from the previous plan at more than one third of the width of the existing house. The ridge height has been only marginally reduced so overall the extension appears almost the same size as before when viewed from the road. This does not seem to us to meet the requirement of being subsidiary to the main house.</p> <p>There is an established building line along the principle elevation of Greenbanks which matches the principle elevation of Trinity. The previous plan was criticised by the Planning Officer because it came forward of this line. In the present proposal the front wall of the new bedroom 1 is in front of this line, the gable window is further forward and the garage has been brought forward in front of its present position. The overall effect of this is to encroach on the open space of Toms Hill Road.</p> <p>Because of the above issues and the comments previously made by the Planning Officer, we think the plan as it stands is inappropriate for the Aldbury Conservation Area and we wish to register our objection.</p> <p><u>Further comments received on 4th October 2021</u></p> <p>We previously objected to this proposal because it is too large and too far forward. Both of these issues were referred to in the Conservation comments which accompanied the previous refusal.</p> <p>Although some minor amendments have been made to the previous</p>

	<p>plan we see no change to the overall size and location despite the recommendation of the Planning Officer. We therefore continue to have the same objections to this plan on the grounds that it is unsuitable in the Conservation Area.</p>
--	---