

**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL**

**Development Control Committee**

**14 December 2011**

**OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE PREPARATION OF THE MAIN  
AGENDA**

**ITEM 12**

**ITEMS FROM SITE INSPECTION**

Item No	Application No	Address	Page No
01	11/02432/OUT	Land Rear of Holly Farm, Brookside Drive, Farmborough	57

**Further consultation response:**

**Farmborough Parish Council:** Further comments have been received from the Parish Council. These can be summarised as follows:

There is concern with the potential for the access from Tilly Lane for construction vehicles. The Parish Council have been made aware of a strong objection by the residents of Tilly Lane. This option would inevitably transfer the disruption to those in the Cold Bath area of Tilly Lane. These concerns are raised due to the limited space in a single carriageway, lack of pedestrian walkways and poor road state. Access to the construction site remains a major concern.

The Parish Council note that the number of houses is not regarded as a reserved matters in the report. The Parish Council reiterate that overdevelopment of the site, not in line with the character of the surrounding area.

**Further representations**

6 further objection comments have been. The content can be summarised as follows:

- General disruption and danger from construction traffic if Tilly Lane is to be used
- Tilley lane is single track
- Tilly Lane has no pedestrian pavements and is used daily by walkers often with small children, pushchairs and dogs together with horse riders, cyclists etc.
- Front doors of a number of properties exit directly onto Tilly Lane
- Tilly Lane has not been engineered for use by regular heavy goods vehicles.
- There are no passing places apart from private drives.

- Damage to residents driveways from HGVs – cost to occupiers
- Substandard access at the junction of Tilly Lane and the A39 which is unsuitable for larger vehicles
- Safer options that Tilly Lane for construction access available.
- Lack of consultation for the residents of Tilly Lane
- Tilly Lane is poorly lit
- Number of house proposed is too many
- Article 8 of the human rights act (the right for private and family life at home) and related privacy issues.

### **ITEM 13**

#### **ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Application No</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No</b>
<b>01</b>	<b>11/04166/FUL</b>	<b>Gammon Plant Hire, Rock Hall Lane, Combe Down, Bath</b>	<b>86</b>

#### **Further Information:**

##### **Viability**

The developer has now confirmed that they are willing to enter into a S106 Agreement to secure financial contributions as requested by Childrens' Services in line with the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. The third reason for refusal relating to this issue therefore no longer stands and can be omitted from the Committee Report.

It should be noted that the Homes and Community Agency procurement process (i.e the allocation of funds) is not material to planning. In this case, there are no financial benefits other than the contribution to children's services, so who funds the scheme is not relevant.

##### **Ecology**

The need for the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to consult Natural England has been questioned by a third party. However, as the LPA have concluded that there will not be a significant impact upon the SAC or SSSI, there is no statutory requirement for this body to be consulted. Following receipt of additional information prepared by the Agent's bat consultant, Natural England have confirmed that they are satisfied that they do not need to be consulted on the development as proposed. Policies NE8 and NE10 of the Local Plan have been considered.

#### **Further representations received**

4 further supporting comments have been received. The comments can be summarised as follows:

- The legacy of the stone mines and stabilization project should be remembered through a purpose built centre in the village and this is the opportunity to achieve that goal.
- The plans are attractive and will be a great improvement on the buildings currently on the site whilst providing much needed housing in the village
- The use of the basement for heating/services and storage/archive is a great advance on the original scheme
- The schools and many local organisations have looked forward for some years to the development of a Centre as a much needed venue. Though its dimensions are less than was hoped for, it is the best the community are going to get.
- Exemplar of good modern architecture with particularly well designed sustainable environmental features only opportunity for its fulfilment.

Supplementary objection comments from third parties that have already objected have been submitted, many of these comments expand on previous points raised. The additional comments can be summarised as follows

- The buildings have yet to be formally assessed for designation. The absence of designation for such heritage assets does not indicate lower significance and they should be considered subject to the policies in HE9.1 to HE9.4 and HE10
- The maltings and brewery equally form part of the sites history and that of Combe Down. To demolish these heritage assets is to erase this era of history from the site completely.
- The existing buildings are correct in terms of scale, proportion and materials.
- The applicants have not provided any additional information which materially alters or justifies the proposals or takes into account comments made by various parties, and this application should be refused
- PPS5 assessment is required evidence for consideration by statutory consultees and the public, and material evidence for the Committee Report
- The assessment as presented does not satisfy the requirements of PPS5. It does not describe or assess the significance of existing heritage assets (HE6.1), ignores evidence from the applicant's own Historic Building Report and Structural Survey, fails to demonstrate that the existing fabric could be used within a mixed development, makes unsubstantiated claims about the benefit of the proposed development and attempts to justify demolition on the grounds of the financial viability of an apparently pre-ordained scheme

#### Officer Comment

The information submitted at the time the planning and conservation area consent applications were registered and the information submitted shortly after was in line with the provisions of PPS5 and allowed the case officers to understand the potential of the proposed development on the significance of the historic assets.

Item No	Application No	Address	Page No
02	11/04167/CA	Gammon Plant Hire, Rock Hall Lane, Combe Down, Bath	104

## REPRESENTATIONS

A further seven letters of objection have been received since the original report was prepared (two from the same objector).

The maltings and former shop are built from local materials and form part of the heritage of Combe Down; they should be restored.

The descendants of miners and masons who built this site still survive in Combe Down and the objections to demolition expressed by the Heritage Watchdog are fully supported (see below).

The buildings have yet to be formally assessed for designation. The absence of designation for such heritage assets does not indicate lower significance and they should be considered subject to the policies in HE9.1 to HE9.4 and HE10

The maltings and brewery equally form part of the sites history and that of Combe Down. To demolish these heritage assets is to erase this era of history from the site completely.

The existing buildings are correct in terms of scale, proportion and materials.

PPS5 assessment is required evidence for consideration by statutory consultees and the public and material evidence for the Committee Report. The assessment presented does not satisfy the requirements of PPS5. It does not describe or assess the significance of existing heritage assets (HE6.1), ignores evidence from the applicant's own Historic Building Report and Structural Survey, fails to demonstrate that the existing fabric could be used within a mixed development, makes unsubstantiated claims about the benefit of the proposed development and attempts to justify demolition on the grounds of the financial viability of an apparently pre-ordained scheme

Criticism is also made of the proposed funding arrangements which are skewing the proposals (Officer comment: issues surrounding probity in relation to HCA funding are largely beyond the scope of the issues to be considered as part of this application for Conservation Area Consent. The applicant has not sought to justify the scheme in terms of enabling development, and there are no financial benefits other than a contribution offered to children's services under the parallel planning application. How the scheme might be funded is not relevant to the merits of the application for CAC).

The applicant notes that other parties have considered the option to retain the existing buildings but fails to present these or assess this possibility

despite being advised by the Planning Department that “The absence of any such justification is potentially a reason for refusal in its own right”.

The new information provided by the applicant does not satisfy the requirements of PPS5. The scheme should be rejected and the applicant invited to submit a well-reasoned proposal that respects the existing historic setting that works with it to deliver the best to the local environment, local community, and future residents.

#### The Bath Heritage Watchdog

Maintain strong objection to demolition. As regards the discussion concerning the E.I.A. the site not only has connections to the construction of the WHS, it is located within the WHS itself. The impact of the proposals will be wider than the localised effect claimed by the applicant.

The so-called PPS 5 assessment submitted by the applicant is clearly in conflict with the PPS5 HE9. The fact the buildings are not listed does not mean they are not of significance. All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including surviving physical remains of past activity whether visible or buried etc. with significance are assets that should be retained.

The brief prepared for the Interpretation Centre is also in conflict with Policy HE9 as this contains a presumption in favour of conserving heritage assets. Whilst the inclusion of an Interpretation Centre is a positive aspect it totally ignores the malting and brewing part of the site's history.

The threat of what might happen to the site if consent is not granted is merely scaremongering.

The applicant's comments on the contribution of the existing buildings clearly demonstrates a lack of understanding of the conservation area. Any negative aspects are due to a lack of maintenance; this does not mean the buildings are unusable or un-repairable. The existing buildings are correct in terms of scale, proportion and materials something the proposed replacement buildings are not.

Attention is drawn to an English Heritage survey for Industrial Heritage at Risk- 71% of the population believe industrial heritage sites should be re-used whilst preserving their character. The following is taken from English Heritage Strategy for Historic Industrial Environment Report no. 1 “Even maltings which are not worthy of listing may form an important part of the landscape, urban or rural and its history. Too often when it comes to maltings there is a comment that there is nothing left in the building but open space as all the machinery is gone. This shows a total lack of knowledge of the malting process which does not require a lot of open floor space.”

Although the applicant is claiming consideration of options this is at odds with the submitted notes from the pre-application meeting that recorded

“The proposals require demolition of existing buildings and there are significant concerns with this aspect of the development. It is felt to be ironic that a scheme aimed at interpreting local history should request the removal of a real part of the area’s heritage. Such losses should be regarded as a last resort.”

#### LISTED STATUS OF THE BUILDINGS

The site lies within the Bath Conservation Area, and where consent is required for the demolition of buildings. On the 12<sup>th</sup> December officers received notification that an application had been sent to English Heritage to have the buildings listed as having architectural or historic interest. English Heritage has confirmed this is the case and that there had been no prior application for a Certificate of Immunity from Listing.

The case will be assessed and a formal decision will be issued in due course. Typically this can take a number of months but usually priority is given to cases where a current planning application is pending. In the event that the building becomes listed, listed building consent will be required for its demolition.

Item No	Application No	Address	Page No
03	11/04300/OUT	Parcel 0006, Maynard Terrace, Clutton	114

The applicants have submitted additional information with regards to this application. The amendments include alterations to the proposed access and the internal layout of the roads and further information following the consultation responses. This includes the following;

- Further highways information following the consultation response
- Landscape and visual comments
- Ecology protected species survey
- Response to housing consultation
- Drainage and Flood Risk addendum
- Public access consultation response
- Cover letter including response to planning policy comments

#### Consultation Responses

BUILDING CONTROL – no comments received

HIGHWAYS – Object to the proposal and raise the following points:

- The parking levels have increased to provide at least two parking spaces for each dwelling.
- The location of the parking spaces relative to the dwelling has been improved and most have a better relationship to their parking spaces.

- Plots 21 and 22 do not show a rear access to provide easy access to their parking areas
- There is a lack of suitable turning areas for the parking areas for Plots 26, 27 and 28, such that it could result in vehicles reversing over a long driveway distance. Similarly, there is no appropriate turning facility for Plot 33.
- The layout has also been amended to ensure only 5 dwellings are served by a private drive, and additional areas are now shown to be offered for adoption, although in the case of the access road to Plots 12-14 and 23-25, the arrangement does appear to be contrived.
- The layout is intended to provide a 2m wide footway fronting the development to the new access road, but Plot 1 would appear to form an obstruction to such a route, which would also affect the available visibility from the junction.
- The Transport Consultant has prepared a plan (Figure 4.1 Rev A) to indicate a revised alignment for Maynard Terrace where it forms a junction with the site access road, which pulls the junction further away from the Station Road/Clutton Hill junction, and shows an improvement to the visibility to the east for the private access lane which runs to the rear of the Maynard Terrace dwellings. Whilst this does provide some improvement to the existing and originally proposed layout, the layout will still result in a lot of vehicular activity centred around one junction, and does not, in my view, achieve an acceptable arrangement.
- The Transport Consultant's plan also shows alterations to the junction of Maynard Terrace with Station Road/Clutton Hill with an extension of the footway from Maynard Terrace around the radius into Station Road. This would appear to pull the stop line from the junction out into Station Road, but with no continuation of footway along Station Road. This layout is also in conflict with the proposed site plan numbered 0392-1005 Rev A.

HIGHWAYS DRAINAGE – no comments received

CONTAMINATED LAND – no further comments

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION – no comments received

PLANNING POLICY – no further comments

PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY – no further comments

LANDSCAPE – no further comments

ARBORICULTURE – no further comments

ECOLOGY – Object to the proposal and raise the following points

- Concerns remain about the remaining ecological survey required for the development site area
- incomplete ecological assessment and mitigation details

- The assessment does not provide the quantitative and qualitative detail required to fully assess habitat impacts and losses, and on which to base proposals for retention, compensation and mitigation. This requirement was set out in point 3 of the Ecology comments 8<sup>th</sup> Nov 2011.
- More detailed mitigation and compensation proposals at this stage would also usually be expected, to demonstrate that it is feasible to provide measures to address ecological impacts within the proposed scheme, rather than attempting to build them into an approved scheme afterwards.
- With incomplete survey, ecological assessment and insufficient mitigation proposed at this stage, the proposal does not demonstrate that it is able to compliance with policies NE9, 10, 11 and 12.

URBAN DESIGN – No further comments

HOUSING – Provide the following further comments

- The application offers a higher than policy requirement contribution of affordable housing, and in principle this is a position that we would support, especially with the involvement of a Registered Provider such as Somer Community Housing Trust. However, the higher than policy contribution must be considered on its merits and in terms of the evidence submitted in support of the application.
- An offer of additional affordable housing although welcome cannot be supported simplistically on this basis but must be considered in detail. If the application is determined to be acceptable in planning terms, Housing Services response should be considered as in support but with some reservations which are recommended to be included as conditions to be addressed within the Reserved Matters.
- The application has made claims that it is a development opportunity that would support the growth and housing needs of Clutton however the evidence supplied has identified market housing demand gaps that were omitted within the proposals.
- The application refers to partnership with the landowner and consultation with the local community. However there is little actual evidence in how local consultation has helped to inform and shape the proposals and it appears that Parish Council do not support this scheme.
- Clutton existing affordable housing stock is already heavily skewed to three bedroom houses, and the applicants' own information has shown there are only four one bedroom flats currently available, with no turnover of these units for some considerable time; we must add to this that some 35% of households on the Councils waiting list for Clutton are requiring one bed accommodations. Strategically I consider that this demand for one bedroom accommodation is actually disproportion to sustainable needs and would recommend that a balanced provision should be based upon 20% of the affordable dwellings.
- Within the district's rural area the SHMA illustrated that market house prices and rents were higher than average and therefore 80% market rents need to be applied with caution on affordability grounds.



Therefore some effort is required of the applicant to demonstrate to the Council that the affordable rent tenure is genuinely within reach to those on local incomes.

- Within the district's rural area the SHMA illustrated that market house prices and rents were higher than average and therefore 80% market rents need to be applied with caution on affordability grounds.  
Therefore some effort is required of the applicant to demonstrate to the Council that the affordable rent tenure is genuinely within reach to those on local incomes

ARCHAEOLOGY – no comments received

PARKS AND OPEN SPACES – no comments received

CHILDREN'S SERVICES – no further comments

CLUTTON PARISH COUNCIL – no comments received

ENVIRONMENT AGENCY – no comments received

WESSEX WATER – No further comments received. The published report states that Wessex Water has no objection subject to condition but the response refers to the signing of various Agreements relating to the sewerage. These agreements relate to legislation outside of the planning process and as such, the previous comments stand.

REPRESENTATIONS – 6 further letters of objection received, raising the following points;

- Support is based on people being told that if this application gets permission, the site at Church Farm will not get consent
- The revised information does not alter my objection
- The revised alterations does not alter the fact the proposed development would introduce a large number of cars onto the narrow and dangerous roads through Clutton in both directions
- Such traffic flows will inevitably result at both peak times and throughout the day in a far more dangerous environment both car users and pedestrians
- It is of no surprise that the residents of Maynard Terrace, who experience this road on a daily basis, are much more aware of how perilous the walk to school or the post office is and that they avoid personal injury or worse regularly. My children have been narrowly missed on a number of occasions
- I think it is telling that only just over half of the objections came from Maynard Terrace – this shows significant objection from elsewhere in the village
- Further, I think it curious to observe that whilst both the Parish Council and the Rural Clutton Campaign consultations (the latter independently verified) both concluded that such development was not backed by the community, the proposal finds a cluster of supporters, many of whom I

understand may have responded in the hope of stopping alternative proposals at the top of the village

- I am unsure if those who used to live in the village or have relatives in the village constitute 'local community support'.
- I am not certain, but there also appears to be some inaccuracies within the spatial distribution maps as a brief glance suggests some objectors may not have been included. Perhaps this is due to the time lag between posting objections and their being uploaded especially towards the end of the original consultation process?
- I am still unaware of any assessment as to the need for this development
- I have serious concerns regarding the transparency and underhand methods used leading up to and during this planning application, I am sure that all information that has been accurately provided by Council Officers in their responses will be clearly presented at Committee, and any inaccurate information that has been provided as part of the application is highlighted, so that decisions can be made on facts rather than any miss leading information that may been provided during any lobbying behind the scenes, running up to and during this application.
- There are pages of arguments regarding the unidentified local need, but the fact is, as confirmed by the Development Officer that there is no local needs survey or identified local housing need, apart from 20 people on the housing register wanting to live in Clutton, no detail of priority or their needs or if they have a local connection to Clutton.
- That summary of support/objection is biased, it could also be summarised as 100% of people directly affected and living adjacent to the development object to the proposal and that 42% of the objectors do not live adjacent to the site but elsewhere in the village.
- The individual objection responses have not been summarised correctly or accurately identified on the map.
- The support for the scheme is a summary of the 6/7 standard letters worded by the agent/applicant/landowner? Signed following verbal lobbying door to door on the application, not individual responses.
- There are also letters included from people saying they live at home with parents, when they are actually currently adequately meeting their own housing needs within the village.
- There is no record of those who opposed the plans whilst the agent/landowner was lobbying support door to door - do we assume all those households with no dot on the map are opposed to the scheme?
- I note the comments on the New Homes Bonus that the Council will receive if the application is approved. This would also be available on the brownfield sites within the boundary.
- No identified local need.
- It is clearly documented in the housing statement, included in the standard support letters and poster put up in the village all produced by the applicant/agent that there will be a local connection in place for the affordable homes. However, the Housing Development Officer confirms in his statement that the Council will have full nomination rights to

people in greatest need from the Housing Register, there is no mention of priority to local people (with mention to this being a growth site, not a rural exception site, due to its size and as the due process for rural exception sites not being followed).

- I would also like to add an objection on ecology grounds, over the years I have personally seen many slowworms, an adder, door mice, toads, frogs, song thrushes, wrens, sparrows, herons, sparrow hawks, owls, bats nesting/using the trees and hedgerows within the site boundary.

## ADDITIONAL OFFICER ASSESSMENT

**HIGHWAYS:** The proposal has been amended to increase the amount of parking and this has resulted in the proposed level and location of parking being an improvement on the previous layout. However, there is a lack of suitable turning areas for the parking areas for Plots 26, 27, and 28, which could result in vehicles reversing over a long driveway distance. There is no appropriate turning facility for Plot 33.

The proposed layout has been amended to ensure that only 5 dwellings are serviced by a private drive and there are additional areas that are being offered for adoption. Whilst this is welcomed, it has resulted in the access roads to Plots 12-14 and 23-25 having a rather contrived appearance.

The proposal revises the realignment for Maynard Terrace where it forms a junction with the access road. This pulls the junction further away from the Station Road/Clutton Hill junction, and shows an improved visibility to the east for the private access lane which runs to the rear of Maynard Terrace. Whilst this is an improvement on the original submission, it still results in a lot of vehicular activity centred around one junction and does not achieve an acceptable arrangement.

The Transport Consultant has submitted a plan which shows alterations to the junction of Maynard Terrace and Station Road/Clutton Hill but this layout is in conflict with that shown on the proposed site plan (0392-1005 Rev A).

**ECOLOGY:** The applicant has submitted further ecology information but this assessment does not provide the quantitative and qualitative detail required to be able to fully assess the habitat impacts and losses, and on which to base proposals for retention, compensation and mitigation.

The hedge along the northern boundary is a species rich hedgerow. As part of the proposed layout, the hedge will either be lost or incorporated into gardens in a reduced form. This is likely to have a significant adverse impact on this habitat feature. The ecological assessment would need account for and to address every such impact, and has not done so – the loss of this northern boundary hedgerow is not noted. This impact needs to be acknowledged, and ideally the layout revised to enable the retention of this hedgerow with a buffer strip to separate it from residential gardens and

safeguard it in the long term. Quantified assessment of impacts on habitat is needed with proposals for how impacts will avoided, or compensated.

With incomplete survey, ecological assessment and insufficient mitigation proposed at this stage, the proposal does not demonstrate that it is able to compliance with policies NE9, 10, 11 and 12.

**HOUSING:** The Housing Development Officer has responded to the additional information submitted by the applicant and this is summarised above. In view of this, it is still not considered that the proposed development meets the local needs as detailed in the published report and the assessment as made in the Officer report remains.

With the exception of the sections detailed above, the remainder of the report is as per the Officer report in the previously published agenda.

#### REVISED PLANS LIST

This decision relates to drawings numbered 0392/1000/1, 0392-1000-2, 0392-1004, and 0392-1006 and related Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement, Preliminary Utility Study, Transport Assessment, Housing Statement, Arboricultural Report, Ecology and Protected Species Survey, Statement of Community Involvement, Flood Risk Assessment, Drainage Strategy, and Phase I Geo-environmental assessment, received by the Council on 4th October 2011 and Landscape and Visual Appraisal, received by the Council on 5th October 2011, and drawing numbered 0392-1005 Rev A, Ecology and Protected Species Survey, Landscape and Visual comments, Housing Paper, and correspondence from GL Hearn and Clark Bond, received by the Council on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2011.

Item No	Application No	Address	Page No
04	11/04325/FUL	Land at rear of 2-20 High Street, Keynsham	139

**Keynsham Civic Society:** Object to the application on the basis that this is overdevelopment of the site and the loss of this car park will seriously reduce the available long stay parking for workers as well as the taxi company which have recently moved to this site, causing them to park illegally in the High Street. Taxis will continue to use this location and operate into the night and are likely to cause disturbance to new residents, leading to conflict.

I resident has objected on the grounds that they have always been used to the openness at the rear of their house reducing space and light at the rear of their property. The building will be too high, and they don't want it to come around the corner of the road.

1 resident has commented on the basis of the validity of this proposal and its effect on the high street area and associated immediate roads. I would not

support the creation of this number of dwellings or the changes to the current car parking.

Amended drawings have been received. These revise the application as follows

1. The southern elements of the building have been brought further forward toward the street.
2. The undercroft parking has been revised by removing one space and providing more manoeuvring space.
3. The adjacent small area of car parking has been turned through 90 degrees.
4. More direct pedestrian routes through the car park to the rear of the public house are indicated.
5. Additional tree planting is proposed.
6. Hard surfacing now runs into the building along the west façade with all planting and boundary walls removed. Railings replace the front boundary walls.
7. A new space is proposed at the corner with tree planting. The hard surfacing will again run through to the building. A rubble surface finish to this area is being indicated partly to discourage people walking close to the building.

The applicant has now submitted a draft Unilateral Agreement to cover the sums required to contribute toward highway works and green space.

**OFFICER RESPONSE:** The land currently has an element of formalised parking taking place in connection with High Street Business Uses. That parking (comprising of 23 car parking spaces) will be re-provided within the site and therefore there will be no negligible impact from those arising. Unauthorised parking or other activities taking place on the site will be displaced however in the case of those activities they could be prevented from access to the site in any event and that would not warrant rejection of the proposal. Taxis and the waiting locations of those operating outside of the site cannot be controlled through this application however there is considered to be no conflict specific to this site that are not common in all town centre locations. The proposed residential parking at a ratio of 1 per unit is more than adequate in this sustainable location.

The applicant has met with the highway officer and urban design officer and the drawings have been amended in line with their requirements and as specified within the main agenda. The amendments made are set out above and are considered satisfactory. The amendments are largely detailed and make no significant change in terms of overall mass or height of the buildings. In this regard the amended drawings would not have any greater impact on residents but would improve the overall development in respect of design, highway manoeuvring and pedestrian movement.

## RECOMMENDATION

Subject to A) no new material planning matters arising from re-advertising of the amended plans, and B) confirmation from the Planning and Environmental Law Manager that a satisfactory signed Unilateral Agreement has been received

Authorise the Divisional Director for Planning and Transport Development to PERMIT subject to conditions as included in the main agenda and any other conditions as appropriate.

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Application No</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Page No</b>
<b>05</b>	<b>11/03843/OUT</b>	<b>Fairash Poultry Farm, Compton Martin Road, West Harptree</b>	<b>151</b>

Further comments have been received from the environmental health officer they are as follows:

"I have considered the Environmental Noise Survey which places the site into NEC B of PPG 24.

I would suggest that standard thermal double glazed units with trickle ventilation would provide the necessary acoustic protection for future occupiers and therefore have no objections to these proposals."

The above comments remove the environmental health objection to the application. The comments do not outweigh the objections raised within the report and the application is still recommended for refusal.