Richard Cobb
B.A Econ (Hons), Dip. T.P, M.R.T.P.I

Chartered Town Planner

84 Kimberley Road, Solihull, West Midlands B92 8PX – T: 01217434957 - M: 07802722867

richardcobb@blueyonder.co.uk

PLANNING APPEAL

On Behalf of Carbury Investments Ltd

LAND TO REAR OF 18- 20A HIGH STREET, BOTLEY, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 2EA

LPA Ref C/16/79036

Proposal - Construction of 3 no. two bedroom apartments into 2no. two storey blocks with associated parking, bin & cycle storage & amenity space, following demolition of existing outbuilding

APPELLANT'S STATEMENT OF CASE

MARCH 2017

1. BACKGROUND

Site context

1.1 The appeal site is located at the rear of Botley High Street and is within is a designated Conservation Area which covers much of the centre of Botley as well as areas to the south and North West. The frontage buildings – 18-20a High Street are within the ownership of the Appellant but do not directly form part of the application or appeal

1.2 The Conservation Area was originally designated in 1975 and extended in in 1988. The Conservation Area document is attached to this Statement.

1.3 The frontage properties back onto the appeal site and there is a wooden shed immediately at the rear. The brick storage building at the rear of the yard backs onto the modern Warner Mews development opposite a terrace of two storey houses built in the 1990s with an access road also serving a two storey apartment building to the immediate west of the appeal site and located around 1m from the appeal site boundary. There is a horse chestnut tree located in Warner Mews close to the appeal site boundary.

1.4 The Warner Mews housing development which comprises 7 terraced houses at the rear of the appeal site and a two storey 4 unit apartment building with two flats on the street frontage replaced a former oil and fuel storage yard and is also in the Conservation Area.

1.5 Much of the land to the east of the appeal site comprises the rear yards to commercial retail properties that front the High Street and are used for deliveries accessed via Warner Mews and contain a number of functional free standing storage buildings linked to those shops.

1.6 None of the buildings on or immediately around the appeal site are listed. Apart from No 34 located, some distance to the east of the appeal site, and the Bugle Inn at No 10 High Street, the rest of nearby listed buildings are on the opposite (south) side of the High Street.

1.7 The scale design and massing of the existing frontage development in the High Street is typical of many similar market towns and the buildings at the rear are also typical of the rear of commercial premises in similar locations.

The appeal site

1.8 Both commercial and residential two storey properties immediately front the appeal site on the High Street frontage with a narrow vehicle access on the west side leading into the appeal site. This presently contains a number of brick and timber storage, some used as a service yard for outboard motors, as well as garage and workshop type buildings and openly parked vehicles and collections of disused material equipment and items together with some of the garden areas to the frontage residential dwellings – Nos 18 and 20A.

1.9 No 18 is a terraced two bedroomed rented house with a ground floor access from the frontage and both ground floor accommodation at the rear and first floor habitable accommodation. It has a relatively long rear garden on the east side of the appeal site. No 20 is a lock up shop – once a butchers shop with an adjoining store and office in No 18 and a freezer and cold-store in the timber shed behind. No 18 is now a cycle shop. No 20A is a semi-detached rental building whose first floor flat goes with No 20. It has a small undefined rear garden area.

1.10 Nos 18-20a need to be read together as there are a number of parts under or above adjoining properties in this short run of properties all rented out by the Appellant company.

Pre planning application

1.11 A pre application enquiry was made to the Council in October 2014. This set out that at that time the former butchers shop was vacant and the site owner – the Appellant – wanted to undertake a comprehensive scheme dealing with the whole property including the now appeal site at the rear. That would have involved refurbishment of the frontage properties and bridge link over the passageway to the side of No 20 with car access to the rear.

1.12 This was responded to by the Council at the end of December that year. Apart from directing attention to relevant policies in the development plan, and the need to respect the Conservation Area, the response noted the need to meet both residential amenity and parking standards. It was suggested that balconies might help with the external amenity issue and good quality landscaping might help to give an attractive outlook to flats. Trees would need to be retained if they were worthy of that.

1.13 Parking to standard might require between 9 and 12 spaces for the development scheme for six units suggested at that time.

1.14 However the planning officer considered that the principle of redeveloping the site was acceptable but that the density and other constraints required a lesser development.

1.15 A planning application (C/16/7777) for demolishing the single storey outbuildings and constructing 3 x 2 storey dwellings and garages in the courtyard was submitted in November 2015 following further discussions with the Council. However further concerns were raised by the Council and eventually that application was withdrawn in March 2016.

1.16 Preliminary drawings for the application which is the subject of this appeal were submitted to the Council in June 2016 for comment. At the request of the planning officer an arboricultural assessment was carried out in respect of the trees on the site and the horse chestnut tree located in Warner Mews.

1.17 That assessment is included in the submitted documents with this appeal and that Horse Chestnut tree (T1) tree was considered to be Category B – of moderate quality with an estimated life of 20 years. The root area on the appeal site was already covered by buildings. Consideration was given to repositioning one of the proposed buildings to take it out of the root protection area but that would tighten unreasonably the spacing between buildings. It was then agreed with the planning officer that as the issue related more to impinging on the tree canopy rather than the root area and that pruning the tree would be a satisfactory compromise.

1.18 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment concluded that the Horse Chestnut tree does not present a significant constraint to the development proposals and that a Method Statement be presented to deal with root protection.

1.19 Comments from the planning officer on the layout and building proposals which were to become the planning application noted that the proposals had the potential to be a 'nice scheme' although there were concerns about amenity space, light and impact on outlook to the frontage properties which would need attention.

The planning application

1.20 The planning application which is the subject of this appeal was then submitted on 5 August 2016. In processing the application it was proposed to the Planning Officer that a Method Statement be prepared by way of condition to deal with tree roots and digging foundations and laying drainage to the proposed buildings.

1.21 The application was subject to consideration by the Eastleigh Design Review Panel in September. The Panel considered that the development was appropriate in principle but there was concern about the level of detail and that it might be too cramped

1.22 The application was refused for a number of reasons by a Decision Notice dated 3 October 2016. This Statement of Case will address the individual reasons for refusal in turn

2. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

2.1 The application proposals are subject to consideration in relation to both national planning policies as set out in the NPPF and to local planning policies in the LPAs development plan and other development plan documents.

National planning policies

2.2 We do not propose to reiterate policies in the NPPF, but simply to highlight a few matters.

2.3 At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework it is well known that there is a **presumption in favour of sustainable development**, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For **plan-making** this means that: local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area.

2.4 Local Plans should meet objectively assessed housing needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or specific policies the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

2.5 For **decision-taking** this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

2.6 The footnote to Para 14 lists examples of such restrictive policies including those relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, within a National Park, designated heritage assets.

2.7 The NPPF also requires in para 47 that LPA should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.

2.8 In relation to housing provision it is a requirement in the NPPF that LPAs identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.

Local Planning policies

- *The adopted Local Plan*

2.9 The Council adopted the current Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) in May 2006. But policies in that Plan expired 3 years after adoption although in May 2009 The Secretary of State issued a Direction to save the majority of the policies as requested by the Borough Council. The saved policies of the adopted Local Plan are supplemented by more detailed guidance in adopted SPGs and SPDs.

2.10 Because of its age and status the 2006 Local Plan must carry only limited weight in the absence of any more up to date set of local plan policies.

2.11 A number of saved policies from that Plan are cited in the reasons for refusal. These are largely saved policy 59.BE which covers promoting good design and requires development proposals to take full and proper account of the context of the site and including the character and appearance of the locality and are appropriate in scale mass, layout, design etc. It also requires making the most efficient use of the land. The policy lists other requirements, all of with which we consider we comply.

2.12 Saved Local Plan Policy 169.LD covers applications in conservation area and follows statutory requirements and the normal approach, and saved Policy104.T covers parking provision. The appeal scheme complies with all of those policies.

- *The emerging Local Plan*

2.13 The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 – 2029 was initially submitted to the Secretary of State for formal Examination in July 2014. An Inspector to undertake an independent examination into the soundness of the Plan.

2.14 Following the hearings later in 2014, the Inspector provided his preliminary conclusions that the Plan was not sound because it did not provide sufficient housing, expressing particular concerns about affordable housing. The scale of the additional housing that he considered necessary was such that the Plan could not be amended while the examination was suspended. it requires a new local plan.

2.15 The Borough Council has concluded that work should commence on the preparation of a new local plan rolled forward to 2036, in line with the emerging review of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) South Hampshire Strategy. A new local development scheme (the programme for preparing the local plan) has been published.

2.16 The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036 is currently being developed and will form part of the Development Plan when adopted, replacing the saved policies of the 2001-2011 Local Plan.

2.17 The Council has consulted on a fresh Issues and Options document and is currently considering comments and possible options. It expects to publish its preferred options in May 2017 and to consult on a pre submission Local Plan in June 2017 with submission to the Secretary of State in September.

2.18 An examination is scheduled for October 2017 – January 2018 and adopting presently proposed for June 2018.

2.19 The emerging Local Plan is thus over a year away for adoption and emerging policies can only be accorded limited weight.

- ***Five year Housing Supply position***

2.20 In relation to the 5 years supply of housing land the Council have published a Position Statement on Housing Land Supply prepared by GL Hearn in December 2016 which is attached to this Statement.

2.21 That Statement indicates that the Borough only has a 4.23 year supply of housing land much less than the necessary 5 years supply.

2.22 It remains the position in our view that the current local development plan is out of date pending the preparation of new pre submission Local Plan later in 2017 and cannot demonstrate that it has the required supply of housing land to meet its needs.

2.23 We do not say that on their own those matters should override other matters involved with considering context impact on adjoining properties and on heritage assets etc. However we do say that those matters need to be also weighed in the balance along with the high level of sustainability with the appeal site location in the centre of Botley village.

3. IMPACT ON HERITAGE ASSETS

3.1 A Heritage Statement was submitted with the planning application. The appeal site is located in a conservation area and the proposals include the removal of a collection of storage etc buildings that have developed on the site over years. There are no listed buildings impacted by the appeal proposals.

3.2 Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering applications for development within conservation areas the local authority must ' pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.' That is a statutory requirement for the decision taker.

3.3 In relation to heritage assets, including conservation areas, national policy is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). At Paragraph 131 it sets out that, in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of –

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and,
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

3.4 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. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

3.5 At paragraph 134, the NPPF states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal.

3.6 Not all elements of a Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 133 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 134, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area as a whole.

3.7 We contend that the appeal proposals would amount to a less than substantial impact on the heritage asset of the Botley Conservation Area.

3.8 Moreover having regard to the requirements under the Act of 1990. We consider that the appeal proposals will positively and materially enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and conserve its character far more than the present use of the site and the more modern development in Warner Mews at the rear.

4 ADDRESSING THE REASONS FOR REFUSAL

Reason No 1

1) The proposed development, by virtue of its layout, form, scale, design, appearance and quantum of development would result in an unacceptable overdevelopment of the application site which fails to take sufficient account of the site constraints, surrounding context and Conservation Area, to the detriment of neighbouring occupiers and uses, as well as the character and appearance of the Botley Conservation Area. As such the application is considered to be contrary to saved Policies 59.BE & 169.LB of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policies DM1 & DM10 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014 and the Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document.

Response

4.7 This reason for refusal focuses on what the LPA regard as an overdevelopment of the site arising so they believe from the layout, form, scale, design and amount of development proposed in the appeal scheme. The LPA allege that that the scheme fails to take sufficient account of the site constraints, surrounding context and Conservation Areas. As such it is asserted that the the development would be detrimental to neighbouring occupiers and uses as well as the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset.

4.8 We have set out at the beginning of this statement how the appeal scheme has evolved with a number of iterations and concluding in one that had a large measure of support from the planning officer before submission.

4.9 Botley High Street has much in common with many towns and villages throughout Britain. Its charm and architectural quality are acquired over many centuries and decades of growth, providing a mixture of heights styles and materials, a cacophony of buildings in juxtaposition to form a homogeneous street scene. There is no dominant architectural “style” and indeed individually the architectural quality is generally only given attraction by its age.

4.10 As the Inspector will see, the site is an area of mainly derelict land and disused buildings at the rear of 18-20A High Street. The site area is approx 0.06 hectares and amounts to a moderate development opportunity in the Conservation Area which is also a commercial area with retail, office and leisure uses in buildings on the High Street frontage.

4.11 As with any area functioning as that the rear of those commercial frontages – as on the south side of the High Street comprise a mix of buildings in various locations and of varying scale and forms often performing secondary or ancillary functions. The typology of such locations show an eclectic mix which adds significantly to the character and appearance of a conservation area.

4.12 At the rear of the site (north) is Warner Mews private road serving comparatively modern terraced housing together with a small apartment block similar in size and scale to the two buildings proposed in the appeal scheme. Again to the west is a more recent development off Warner Mews, which is accessed from the High Street. To the east frontage development of various ages continues with miscellaneous undefined backland.

4.13 The appeal proposals have not only evolved in close consultation with the Council but also having a very clear and serious derivation from the character and appearance of the overall context of the site. Apart from the brick outbuilding at the rear of the site which backs onto Warner Mews, and which was probably an original outbuilding, the other outbuildings on the appeal site have probably developed over many decades and mostly before it was included as part of the designated conservation area. The use of the yard has clearly also developed with a number of uses – now largely defunct – separately from the frontage uses.

4.14 This is a site that needs to be developed to enhance and conserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It does nothing for the area as it is. Indeed it has a major negative impact both on the buildings and uses at the front but also on the Area as a whole.

4.15 In our view, the appeal scheme would positively enhance the general character of the Conservation Area, and compared to the previous proposals now has a reduction in density, an increase in open space and employs what we regard as local sustainable materials, which in our opinion can only enhance the site and Conservation Area.

4.16 The scale massing and design is to form a “mews” type court between the existing retained buildings on the High Street frontage, the Warner Mews development with the modest apartment building next to the appeal site and the “L” shaped footprint of the development.

4.17 Whilst we do not wish to achieve a form of pastiche we have endeavoured to provide accommodation for current residential requirements respecting the shapes and tradition of the past and the area.

4.18 The design concept is to provide an ‘L’ shaped mews courtyard at the rear of the existing properties, utilising the present access but with a variety of hard and soft townscape.

Reason No 2

(***2) The proximity of the proposed development to the rear elevation of No.18 High Street, together with its height, form and scale would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook from the rear of No.18 and loss of light to the rear of the property, to the detriment of the residential amenity of occupiers of No.18. As such the application is considered to be contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014 and the Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document.***

Response

4.19 We repeat that the character and appearance of a village centre and commercial area such as this is made up of a mix of typology which means that in some cases buildings are much closer to some existing habitable accommodation than would be the case in a normal housing estate on the outskirts of a town.

4.20 The fundamental test in such cases is whether the proximity of one building to another would adversely impact on the living conditions that occupiers of the residential accommodation might reasonably be expected to enjoy in such a location.

4.21 In this case the proposed two storey apartment building in the appeal scheme does side on to the reduced rear garden to No 18. The Inspector will see that the present garden to No 18 is heavily overgrown leaving only a useable space of around 6-7m directly at the rear of the back of that rented accommodation.

4.22 The end wall of the new apartment building is located a similar distance from the back of No 18 and would be articulated with vertical landscaping on the wall supported by trellis and a glazed blockwork slit window. The roof would be set back with a half hip.

4.23 We consider that taking into account the general context of the site in a village centre and commercial focussed Conservation Area, the amenity of No 18 for its occupiers would be entirely appropriate and acceptable. The rear of No 18 faces north and both the east and west aspects are not affected.

Reason No 3

(3) The orientation and proximity of the proposed development in relation to existing properties would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy between No.20a High Street and the proposed Unit 3, to the detriment of the amenity of occupiers of both the existing and proposed properties. As such the application is considered to be contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014 and the Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document.

Response

4.24 We reiterate that taking account of the general context of the appeal site and the buildings around it the proposed development would have limited impact on the amenity of residents in No 20a. There is adequate distance across the courtyard between the two properties and the rear garden to no 20a can be enclosed and planted by way of a planning condition to further minimise any impact.

Reason No 4

(4) The layout and design of the development, by virtue of the quality and single aspect outlook of the proposed units would result in a poor quality living environment for future occupiers of the development, to the detriment of the residential amenity of these occupiers. As such the application is considered to be contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014 and the Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document.

Response

4.25 The single aspect of the proposed apartment buildings responds both to the characteristics of the site and its context, but also respects the adjoining properties.

4.26 Consideration must be given in this matter to the adjoining modern apartment building (Nos 15-18) in Warner Mews which is largely single aspect and sited only 1m from the appeal site boundary.

4.27 The buildings proposed in the application building, replace the current single storey set of buildings currently on the site.

4.28 The proposed apartment building containing apartment 3 over the garage spaces would be set at right angles to Nos 15-18 Warner Mews, and would have only very limited impact on that building and its outlook. The aspect of the living room in the apartment in that building is largely over the courtyard and towards the High Street access point and is well spaced away from the rear of No 20a. the flat would have a balcony with a southern aspect.

4.29 The two apartments in the second building would face west and again over the courtyard area. There is some soft and hard landscaping in front and the aspect would not impinge on the amenity of other properties around.

4.30 The vertical glazed slit windows on the elevation provide both relief to the elevation but also some additional light to the rear access corridor to the living accommodation.

4.31 These three apartments together will provide high quality accommodation in a distinct location and positively enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reason No 5

(5) The proposed development fails to provide adequate off-road parking provision for both the existing and proposed development, or give sufficient detail as to how the development would be serviced, which would likely lead to further parking issues in the local area to the detriment of the amenity of existing surrounding uses and residents. As such the application is considered to be contrary to saved Policies 59.BE & 104.TC of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policies DM1 & DM24 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014 and the Council's 'Quality Places' and 'Residential Parking Standards' Supplementary Planning Documents.

Response

4.32 The appeal proposals would provide adequate parking provision both for the proposed apartments and the two residential properties in the frontage buildings. The six spaces proposed are entirely workable.

4.33 The LPA raise concerns about servicing but that servicing would be little differ to the existing properties. It is anticipated that residents in the new apartments would need to take their bins to the High Street frontage on appropriate days and bring them back into the area set aside for the bins between the two buildings.

Reason No 6

(6) Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in harm to the Horse Chestnut Tree adjacent to the site which is a third party tree and forms an important natural visual amenity feature of the immediate area and the wider Botley Conservation Area. As such the application is considered to be contrary to saved Policies 59.BE & 169.LB of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011), Policies DM1 & DM10 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014 and the Council's 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document.

Response

4.34 As we have stated earlier and submitted with the appeal documents the Appeal site has been the subject of a full Tree Survey and Impact Assessment and a Method Statement has been proposed to be submitted by way of an appropriate condition.

4.35 It is a conclusion of that report that the proposed development will have no adverse impact on the Horse Chestnut tree subject to that Method Statement setting out in consultation with the LPA how that tree can be pruned and the footings of the building closest to that tree can suitably constructed to minimise root damage in the RPA.

Reason No 7

(7) The proposal fails to make contributions towards the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project, the need for which will increase as a direct result of the cumulative impact from recreational pressure derived from the additional development proposed. The proposal is therefore contrary to Supplementary Planning Document 'Planning obligations', saved Policy 25.NC of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001- 2011), Policy DM37 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, and paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Response

4.36 Policy 25.NC refers directly to any nature conservation interest on the site itself – not to a much wider project such as the SDMP. We do not consider that the development of the appeal proposals will have any cumulative impact on recreational pressure in the area.

4.37 Applicants may propose alternative measures to mitigate the direct impact of their development on the Solent SPA, but the LPA consider the simplest way of mitigating will be through the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project.

4.38 We may make a financial contribution of £181/dwelling either before planning permission is granted or by completing the SDMP Agreement and sending the completed form along with mitigation contribution to the Planning Agreements Officer at the Local Planning Authority.

4.39 The requirement is not founded in any adopted Local Plan and therefore we do not believe can be the subject of a S106 Obligation.

4.40 We are quite prepared to complete a SDMP Agreement in the event that planning permission is likely to be forthcoming and would have done so had the LPA not taken a sudden and comprehensive view of our proposals by contrast to the earlier positive feedback that we had had for the appeal scheme.

4.41 This matter can be the subject of a planning condition requiring completion of that Agreement.

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 The appeal proposals represent a modest scheme to positively improve the current character and appearance of the appeal site and to enhance and conserve the heritage asset of the Conservation Area. They have evolved through close consultation with the LPA.

5.2 The form, scale, mass, design and appearance of the proposed new buildings in the appeal scheme reflect the typology of the area and buildings around the site.

5.3 Both the design of the new buildings and the space and orientation between both existing and proposed buildings will minimise impact on amenity for both existing and future occupiers given the particular distinctiveness of the appeal site and its setting.

5.4 We respectfully request that the appeal be allowed and planning permission be granted with appropriate conditions.