

ITEM 8

APPLICATION NO.	11/02249/CAWN
APPLICATION TYPE	CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT - NORTH
REGISTERED	07.10.2011
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs Dique Li
SITE	Lorien, Goodworth Clatford, Andover GOODWORTH CLATFORD
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing bungalow and double garage
AMENDMENTS	
CASE OFFICER	Mr Gregg Chapman

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is referred to Planning Control Committee (PCC) as it is linked to application 11/02248/FULLN that is being reported to PCC.

1.2 Following a verbal update at the Northern Area Planning Committee (NAPC) from the Head of Planning and Building to recommend refusal of the application, following the resolution of application the Northern Area Planning Committee (NAPC) on application 11/02248/FULLN, the NAPC deferred to PCC to refuse the application for the reason:

There are no approved detailed plans for the replacement of the building. The demolition of the building with no satisfactory replacement would leave the site in a condition which would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The proposal is contrary to policy ENV14 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan.

1.3 A copy of the NAPC agenda report is attached at **Appendix A**.

1.4 A copy of the NAPC update paper is attached at **Appendix B**.

2.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 Policy ENV14 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 only allows for the demolition of a building within a Conservation Area if there are approved and detailed plans for the building's replacement.

2.2 The application that concerns plans for the replacement of Lorien has been referred to PCC (application 11/02248/FULLN). It is considered necessary to report this application to PCC also as it is a linked application. Should application 11/02248/FULLN be approved by PCC there would be detailed plans for the replacement of the building, and consequently, it is considered, for the reasons as set out in **appendix A**, that this Conservation Area Consent application should be approved. Should the PCC resolve to refuse the application, then the resolution of the NAPC, to refuse the application would be appropriate.

**3.0 RECOMMENDATION OF NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
REFUSE for the reason:**

- 1. There are no approved detailed plans for the replacement of the building. The demolition of the building with no satisfactory replacement would leave the site in a condition which would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The proposal is contrary to policy ENV14 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan.**

4.0 RECOMMENDATION OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING

A. In the event the Planning Control Committee refuse application 11/02248/FULLN, then REFUSE for the reason:

- 1. There are no approved detailed plans for the replacement of the building. The demolition of the building with no satisfactory replacement would leave the site in a condition which would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The proposal is contrary to policy ENV14 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan.**

B. In the event that the Planning Control Committee grant Permission for application 11/02248/FULLN, then CONSENT, subject to:

- 1. The demolition works hereby consented to shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2. The demolition hereby granted consent shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made and planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment for which the contract provides. The redevelopment shall commence within one month following the completion of the demolition work unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To prevent the premature demolition of the building in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 policy ENV14.

- 3. The demolition shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in Section 6 of the Chalkhill Environmental Consultants (September 2011) report.**

Reason: To avoid impacts to legally protected species, in accordance with policy ENV05 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006.

- 4. Notwithstanding the submitted details, no demolition shall take place (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until a scheme, detailing how the Scots Pine and Birch are to be protected, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include a plan showing the location and specification of tree protective fencing. Such fencing shall be erected prior to any other site operations and**

at least 3 working days notice shall be given to the Local Planning Authority that it has been erected.

Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 policy DES08.

- 5. The demolition hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details set out within the Arboricultural Report by SJ Stephens Associates (project no.246) dated 20 July 2011, other than in respect of condition 4 above.**

Reason: To ensure the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 policy DES08.

Notes to applicant:

- 1. The decision to grant conservation area consent has been taken because the demolition of the bungalow and flat roofed garage is acceptable given that they are of no special architectural interest and are not considered to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The application has been made alongside a proposal for the replacement of the existing dwelling with two detached dwellings. The proposal is in accordance with policy ENV14 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan. This informative is only intended as a summary of the reason for grant of conservation area consent. For further details on the decision please see the application report which is available from the Planning Service.**
 - 2. Please ensure that all works complies with the approved plans. Any changes must be advised and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before they are carried out. This may require the submission of a new planning application. Failure to do so may result in enforcement action/prosecution.**
-

APPENDIX A

Officer’s Report to Northern Area Planning Committee – 24 November 2011

APPLICATION NO.	11/02249/CAWN
APPLICATION TYPE	CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT - NORTH
REGISTERED	07.10.2011
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs Dique Li
SITE	Lorien, Goodworth Clatford, Andover, GOODWORTH CLATFORD
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing bungalow and double garage
AMENDMENTS	
CASE OFFICER	Mr Gregg Chapman

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to the Northern Area Planning Committee at the request of the two local ward Members. The reason given by the Members is, significant public interest in this very sensitive site in the centre of Goodworth Clatford.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is located at Goodworth Clatford within an area designated as a policy infill frontage, and within the Conservation Area. There is currently one chalet bungalow on the site, with a single storey garage building. The site is slightly elevated from the highway, and is marginally higher to the northern part of the site. The land to the rear of the site is notably higher than the site. There is some domestic planting to the front of the property, and in addition to this planting there is one protected tree to the front of the property, and one to the side/rear of the property.

3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Demolition of existing bungalow and double garage..

4.0 HISTORY

- 4.1 TVN.05743 – Erection of 2 chalet dwellings with new vehicular access following demolition of existing dwelling – Refused, 2nd November 1989.
- 4.2 TVN.CA.00020 – Demolition of existing dwelling – Refused, 3rd November 1989.
- 4.3 11/01025/FULLN – Erection of 3 bedroom dwelling – Refused, July 2011.

- 4.4 11/01655/FULLN - Erection of two 3 bedroom dwellings on site of existing dwelling and garage – Withdrawn, August 2011.
- 4.5 11/01695/CAWN - Demolition of existing bungalow and double garage – Withdrawn, August 2011.
- 4.6 11/02248/FULLN - Demolition of existing dwelling and double garage and erection of two detached 3 bedroom dwellings – Pending Consideration.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Conservation – No objection:

- Although not considered of particular architectural importance Lorien does have an interesting history. Lorien was originally built because the previous dwelling suffered bomb damage during the Second World War as a result of a flying bomb. A recording condition to photograph the dwelling could be considered.
- Lorien is not necessarily inappropriate to the character and appearance of the conservation area being fairly unassuming, however it could potentially be improved upon in respect of its design.
- There is no objection to the principle of demolishing Lorien providing there is a recording condition placed on the permission and a suitably sensitive scheme is submitted.

5.2 HCC Ecology – No objection, subject to condition.

6.0 REPRESENTATIONS

6.1 5 letters – Objection:

Dovecott House, Winchester Road, Goodworth Clatford (Chairman of Clatford's Village Store); Morningside, Goodworth Clatford; Forge Bungalow, Goodworth Clatford; Avondale, Goodworth Clatford; Old Rose Cottage, Goodworth Clatford.

Principle of Development

- Blatant attempt at garden grabbing. Last year Councils were given new powers to prevent unwanted garden grabbing and we consider this planning application to be just such a case, which would severely blight the character of the village.
- Debate there is a need for two bulky three-bedroom homes in Goodworth Clatford. Currently there are two new homes under construction in the village with a third new-build yet to be sold as well as several existing properties up for sale.

Character and Appearance

- Applicant states that: *"Clearing the whole site of the existing dwelling and garage provides the opportunity to enhance this part of the village with traditional forms of buildings."* Would not necessarily disagree with this statement but would stress that two houses on this site is gross over-development which will not enhance this part of the village which is a conservation area.

- Two houses on the site of the existing single dwelling and garage would be introducing built form at first floor where currently none exists. A point made by the planning officer in his report about the last planning application for this site. Loss of space at first floor which contributes to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area makes this application unacceptable.
- Both of the proposed dwellings markedly contrast in character and appearance with both our bungalow and neighbouring Morningside, in terms of materials, eaves height and ridge height.
- Plot 1, which lies nearest to our bungalow (Forge Bungalow) now given a 7.5% smaller footprint, but we would contend it is still inappropriate in size and scale for the site and its neighbours.
- Developer argues that traditional elements of the design and the careful choice of materials are in accordance with the Goodworth Clatford Village Design Statement, quoting, “*Roof lines should be kept low to remain in proportion to existing properties*”. The roof lines for these two homes will not be in proportion to their neighbours, surrounded as they are by bungalows.
- The difference in design from our bungalow (Forge Cottage) (and other properties in the area) also make these two dwellings out of keeping, particularly so as this site is so prominent within the conservation area. i.e. it is one of the first views seen by visitors to the village.
- If first application - in essence providing two houses - was rejected what is different about this application? There is no improvement in the current application to answer any of the points leading to that refusal, so it should also be refused. End result will be the same; two houses on the plot which – overdevelopment and inappropriate.
- Developer argues that the design of the two homes is “*A deliberate departure from the designs in the immediate vicinity.*” Would argue that this clash does nothing to enhance the conservation area.
- Disagree that proposed dwellings will improve the character of the centre of the village. Will make the centre of the village feel cramped. Such high density development is out of keeping with the village. Longstock Road consists of, almost exclusively, single homes verging onto the road.
- Debate suggestion that Lorien is out of character. It is unique which is part of its charm and adds character to the village.
- Description that replacing Lorien with two modest traditional-style dwellings is something we would strongly take issue with. They will be very substantial homes by comparison to their neighbours. To build two new homes which will tower above the surrounding, existing bungalows is totally out of keeping.
- The statistics on village frontages and ‘built footprint to plot area’ are, we suggest, misleading. Manipulated statistics can be made to prove anything, or nothing. There is nothing to explain the criteria used. Morningside’s ‘frontage’ for instance is inaccurate. The figure of 6.95metres refers only to the width of the driveway which exits onto Longstock Road and leads to a much wider parking area actually in

front of the bungalow. Baffled as to why the ‘built footprint to plot area’ is included. What relevance is it to this application? Do figures of 20.24 and 20.54 refer to each home and its percentage of the whole plot, in which case they are misleading because the whole plot will have two homes on it.

Residential Amenity

- We dispute the contention that our bungalow (Forge Bungalow) would not suffer from overshadowing if a two-storey dwelling were built near to the boundary which is closest to our home. Any house built that close will by its very design be dominant and overbearing.
- Dispute the notion that any two-storey dwelling will not impact on our privacy (Forge Bungalow). By its design the privacy we currently enjoy will be destroyed by overlooking.
- We consider this application would also increase the noise we would experience, as one of the proposed homes is so much nearer our bungalow.
- Trees and a Lawson cypress hedge are proposed for removal. This would alter the character of the plot, exposing the school buildings, and making the view much ‘harder’ in landscape terms.
- A second house will affect my evening light (Old Rose Cottage).
- All the noise, dirt, lorries, etc. that would come about and disturbance to a normally peaceful area would to say the least, be no more.

Highways

- The creation of two new homes would exacerbate existing traffic problems within the centre of the village, creating further traffic congestion next to the school which already suffers badly from congestion.
- Access to our house is 12 meters from the intersection/staggered cross roads in Goodworth Clatford on which there is a pub, a school, and the Clatford village store and post office. Site is at heart of village. The junction becomes quite congested and is hazardous when the school buses turn up with small children, as well as parents in cars bringing their small children to school (a majority now arrive by car). Also a time when people are going to work, picking up post and papers and in addition the shop receives bulk deliveries from heavy lorries. Causes problems which have required the attendance of the Community Policy. Often find my own access blocked by traffic parked and also quite legitimately trying to negotiate what is a congested junction.
- Junction has become a ‘rat run’, with a marked increase in commuter traffic from the A3057 to Barrow Hill and beyond with drivers showing little comprehension of the gentle nature and road manners required in our village.
- Proposal is for two houses rather the current one house. If the 2001 Hampshire County Council car census remains relevant, then 35% of house owners have 2 cars per household and 10 % have three or more.

It would not be outrageous to assume that being an area of above average affluence this could bring three cars per house, on a regular basis to an already congested junction. Not apparent if there is provision for off street parking. On street parking is already a serious issue. If no off street parking, this will raise the potential for congestion and accidents to an unacceptable level. Even with off street parking there is still the problem of cars negotiating what is a congested junction at the most hazardous times of the day.

- Given that 27% of traffic accidents are due to roadway situation & driver (Wikipedia stats), I would like to see this development turned down for over development, exacerbating traffic issues and consequential safety ramifications in an area of high pedestrian density, where the pedestrians are young and vulnerable; and also aged and vulnerable.
- Objection relates to the availability of parking for contractors vehicles during the building process should planning permission be granted (Clatford's Village Store). Village shop continues to struggle to survive in the demanding retail conditions we are experiencing. Vital that the limited parking available for the shop opposite Lorien is safeguarded. If planning permission is granted please would you compel all contractors to park on site and positively prevent them from parking on either side of the Village Street.
- The proposal is an over-development of the site so gross that the on-site parking will be reduced at the same time as the occupancy doubles. This will inevitably lead to further on street parking close to what is already a potentially dangerous junction.

Other Matters

- Proposal would destroy our existing, open view across the back gardens of homes in Longstock Road.
- Crime and Community Safety.
- This is at least four times this application has been submitted and as a result I am suffering from depression.

7.0 **POLICY**

7.1 Government Guidance - PPS5 (Planning for the Historic Environment), PPS9 (Biodiversity & Geological Conservation).

7.2 South East Plan - NMR5 (Conservation & Improvement of Biodiversity), BE6 (Management of the Historic Environment).

7.3 The courts have clarified that the Governments intention to abolish the South East Plan 2009 is a material planning consideration.

7.4 Test Valley Borough Local Plan – Policies: ENV05 (protected species), ENV14 (demolition in conservation areas).

7.5 Village Design Statement – Goodworth Clatford.

8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning consideration is whether the demolition of the chalet bungalow and garaging is acceptable having regard to its contribution within the Conservation Area and the detailed plans for its replacement.

Demolition of the Building

8.2 Policy ENV14 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan seeks to retain buildings within the Conservation Area which are of historic or architectural interest or which contribute to the village scene. It is considered that the demolition of the chalet bungalow and flat roofed garage is acceptable given that it is of no special architectural interest and cannot be considered to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The application has been made alongside a proposal for the replacement of the existing dwelling with two detached dwellings which are considered to be of higher architectural quality than the existing. It is considered that the replacement can be seen as an improvement to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the proposal is in accordance with policy ENV14 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan.

Trees

8.3 The application is supported by a tree survey. The two TPO (Scots Pine and Birch) trees are to be retained, and, subject to conditions to secure a scheme of tree protection, would not be affected by the proposed development. It is considered that the trees that are to be removed (fruit trees, ash, hazel, holy, and Lawson cypress hedge) are not worthy for retention from a public amenity perspective. The tree officer confirms no objection subject to conditions to safeguard the trees to be retained during demolition.

Protected Species

8.4 The application is supported by a Protected Species Survey. No protected species were found, although recommendations were made in respect of bats, reptiles, and breeding birds in terms of times and procedures/methods of working. Subject to these recommendations, it is considered that the proposed demolition would not result in any harm to protected species or their habitats. The County Ecologist confirms no objection.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The demolition of the bungalow and flat roofed garages is considered to be acceptable given that they are of no special architectural interest and are not considered to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The application has been made alongside a proposal for the replacement of the existing dwelling with two detached dwellings. The proposal is in accordance with policy ENV14 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

CONSENT subject to:

- 1. The demolition works hereby consented to shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The demolition hereby granted consent shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made and planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment for which the contract provides. The redevelopment shall commence within one month following the completion of the demolition work unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent the premature demolition of the building in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 policy ENV14.

3. The demolition shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in Section 6 of the Chalkhill Environmental Consultants (September 2011) report.

Reason: To avoid impacts to legally protected species, in accordance with policy ENV05 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006.

4. Notwithstanding the submitted details, no demolition shall take place (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until a scheme, detailing how the Scots Pine and Birch are to be protected, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include a plan showing the location and specification of tree protective fencing. Such fencing shall be erected prior to any other site operations and at least 3 working days notice shall be given to the Local Planning Authority that it has been erected.

Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 policy DES08.

5. The demolition hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details set out within the Arboricultural Report by SJ Stephens Associates (project no.246) dated 20 July 2011, other than in respect of condition 4 above.

Reason: To ensure the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2006 policy DES08.

Notes to applicant:

1. The decision to grant conservation area consent has been taken because the demolition of the bungalow and flat roofed garage is acceptable given that they are of no special architectural interest and are not considered to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The application has been made alongside a proposal for the replacement of the existing dwelling with two detached dwellings.

The proposal is in accordance with policy ENV14 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan. This informative is only intended as a summary of the reason for grant of conservation area consent. For further details on the decision please see the application report which is available from the Planning Service.

- 2. Please ensure that all works complies with the approved plans. Any changes must be advised and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before they are carried out. This may require the submission of a new planning application. Failure to do so may result in enforcement action/prosecution.**
-

APPENDIX B

Update Report to Northern Area Planning Committee – 24 November 2011

APPLICATION NO.	11/02249/CAWN
SITE	Lorien, Goodworth Clatford, Andover, GOODWORTH CLATFORD
ITEM NO.	16
PAGE NO.	206 – 221

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 A Viewing Panel was held for this application on 23 November 2011. Members in attendance were; Cllrs Lynn, Andersen, Bird, Flood, Hawke, Long, Lovell, Neal and J Whiteley.

2.0 REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 Parish Council – Objection:

- Lorien was originally named “The Shingles” because of the type and nature of its construction. Lorien is a unique building in the centre of the village, during World War II a flying bomb demolished the original Royal Oak Public House, the School and a number of neighbouring properties, including the Old Forge and Lorien was built.
- Very few of these types of houses remain and could be put in the same category as “pre-fabs” for their uniqueness and some Local Authorities are seeking listed status for post war timber built houses. Lorien is a focal point in the village centre being at the main intersection of the Village Street and Church Lane, all within the village conservation area. As you enter the village the first house you see is Lorien.
- An application was made in 1989 to demolish Lorien and put 2 chalet style houses on the site. The application was refused on several grounds including; overdevelopment of the site, unsatisfactory plot sizes, congested layout – adding that the development would neither enhance or preserve the character of the conservation area, parking provision inadequate, inadequate visibility splays at the junction of the access to the highway (would cause danger and inconvenience to the adjoining highway, inadequate provision for rear loading and parking would interfere with the free flow of traffic on the C17 road to the danger of road users.
- See no changes in the current application to demolish Lorien that alters the previous grounds for refusal.
- The location plan given shows the driveway to Morningside, the bungalow to the north of Lorien, whose drive runs alongside the southern boundary fence between the two properties. The driveway owned by Morningside, is private and no right of access exists over or on this driveway to access Lorien.

2.2 **2 letters** – Objection

The Laurels, Village Street, Goodworth Clatford; Chilland, Barrow Hill, Goodworth Clatford.

The following are additional matters to those raised by the third party objectors as set out in the main agenda. Further comments were made by these objectors that made the same points as those already raised by other third parties, as set out in the agenda report:

Principle of Development

- Past proposals for planning applications turned down.
- Only change to new applications would appear to be the removal of the proposal for a single garage. Is essentially the same as the previous, withdrawn application.

Highways

- No provision is made for garaging, which implies further congestion and unsightly parking at the front of houses.
- Pedestrians cross the road in all directions at this intersection. Any further vehicle movements only increases the danger to pedestrians as well as cyclists, school children, pub and shop visitors as well as residents and through traffic.
- Both Village Street and Church Lane often have cars parked on them at the junction. Further on street parking will be hazardous, particularly when the shop or pub are taking deliveries, or recycling is being collected
- Village traffic is already high. Roads and intersections were not designed for a high level of traffic. Intensification of housing within the village will only lead to increased road use.

Other Matters

- The application is opposed. It is a smokescreen to create an eyesore in the heart of the conservation area, which would leave the Council with no choice but to grant development permission to prevent the site being misused for other purposes – parking, fly-tipping, etc.
- This is almost a re-run of a previous application (TVBC 11/01695), which was rightly refused. Separating the applications into one to demolish and another to develop is clearly a strategy allowed by Planning Law, but in essence it is a re-run in an attempt to circumvent the wishes of the Council when previous similar schemes over many years have been refused.
- The application is clearly intended to create a scenario which would out manoeuvre those who work hard in this village to maintain its fabric.
- Although, perhaps not a planning consideration, the applicant is fully aware of the feelings of many villagers, particularly those who live in the immediate vicinity, none of whom wish to see this site overdeveloped for housing due to its location in the heart of the conservation area, its proximity to the school and shop and because of traffic issues. When the applicant was alerted to these views at a recent Parish Council meeting, he walked out of the meeting.

2.3 **1 Letter** – Comment:

30 Brook Way, Anna Valley (on behalf of the governors of Clatford Primary School)

- Should permission be granted would request a restriction should be placed on movement of plant, equipment, deliveries, etc. around the start and end of the school day. Lorien is adjacent to school entrance, and a restriction for half an hour either side of the school start/end times would help to reduce the risk to children and the build up of traffic in the vicinity of the site.

3.0 **POLICY**

3.1 On the 10th November the Council agreed to publish for public consultation the draft Core Strategy and Development Management DPD and the Designation DPD. Public consultation will be undertaken from 6th January to 17 February 2012. At the present time the document, and its content, demonstrates the direction of travel of the Borough Council. Officers have considered the content of the Draft Core Strategy and the recommendation remains unchanged.

4.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

4.1 The application is an application for Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the dwelling and garaging. The main planning consideration is whether the demolition of the chalet bungalow is acceptable having regard to its contribution within the Conservation Area, and the detailed plans for its replacement.

Previous Applications

4.2 The Parish Council make reference to the refused full planning application from 1989. The relevant application to the Conservation Area Consent application was application TVN.CA.20. This refused the then application for the demolition of the dwelling on the basis that *“No satisfactory proposals have been made for the replacement of the building and in the absence of such proposals the creation of a gap in the street scene would be detrimental to the character of the area.”*

Other Matters

4.3 A third party objector considers that the submission of an application for Conservation Area consent for the demolition of the dwelling is a tactic, to break an application for demolition works, and rebuilding into two applications. It is the case that Conservation Area consent is required in its own right for the demolition of the property. A full planning application can not grant conservation area consent for demolition.

5.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

No change from agenda report.