1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report contains two recommendations for applications seeking planning permission and listed building consent. Both applications are recommended for approval.

They are referred to Planning Committee for a decision at the discretion of the Development Manager due to the significant level of public interest in the proposals.

1.2 The application site comprises 4 Market Place, Wallingford. The Market Place frontage building is grade II listed and was historically an C18 house which is now in use as a bank.
To the rear are a number of C20 additions which extend through the historic burgage plot to Wood Street. The entire site is in the Wallingford Conservation Area.

A plan identifying the site is attached as Appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL
2.1 The two applications are for the demolition of a range of additions to the rear of 4 Market Place and the erection of new buildings to accommodate 8 new dwellings.

2.2 There have been a series of amendments to the applications since they were originally submitted. This has included most notably the increase to the floor area of the existing ground floor unit of 4 Market Place currently occupied by Lloyds Bank (as opposed to the original intention of reducing the space) the reduction in the development by losing a single unit taking the scheme down from 9 to 8 proposed units. An ecology report and a noise assessment were also submitted. Various design changes to the external appearance of the building have also been made.

2.3 Reduced copies of the plans accompanying the application are attached as Appendix 2 to this report. All the plans and representations can be viewed on the council’s website www.southoxon.gov.uk under the planning application reference number.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS
3.1 Wallingford Town Council - No objection subject to the acoustic reports recommendations being enforced and that the conservations officers recommended conditions being imposed.

Neighbour Responses – P17/S3579/FUL

There have been objections to the application made individually and in the form of a petition. Subsequent amended plans have generated additional comments from original objectors.

Individual objectors – 754
The contents of the objections cover the following issues;
- The creation of new residential properties may result in complaints about noise and potentially jeopardise the future of The Corn Exchange.
- The design and scale of the building harms the setting of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- Access to the roof of The Corn Exchange will not be possible.
- Insufficient parking and traffic congestion.

Number of signatures on petition against the development - 757
The stated concerns of all those who signed the petition are as follows;
- The creation of new residential properties may result in complaints about noise and potentially jeopardise the future of The Corn Exchange.
- Concern over access to the roof of The Corn Exchange.
- The style of the new properties does not mix with the Victorian buildings in the vicinity.
- Concerns over access and traffic congestion.
Neighbour responses to P17/S3580/LB –

Although neighbour representations are not sought on listed building applications members of the public can still comment and 66 objections were received covering the same issues set out above for P17/S3579/FUL.

Theatres Trust – Object
- The creation of new residential properties may result in complaints about noise and potentially jeopardise the future of The Corn Exchange.

Sinodun Players – Object
- The creation of new residential properties may result in complaints about noise and potentially jeopardise the future of The Corn Exchange.

Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society – Object
- Concern about the height of the roof protruding above the height of The Corn Exchange.
- Concern over the use of the flat roof in a conservation area.
- Objected to the original rounded dormer windows.

Historic England (South East) - No objection following the most recent amendment and plans now being considered as part of this recommendation.

Oxfordshire County Council Archaeological Services – No objection subject to conditions.

Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) - No objection subject to conditions regarding vision splays and retention of parking and manoeuvring areas.

Environmental Protection Team Noise - No objection subject to a condition that the mitigation measures set out in the acoustic report are undertaken.

Environmental Protection Team Air Quality - No objection to conditions relating to electrical charging points and gas-powered boilers.

Countryside Officer - No objection.

Conservation Officer - No objection subject to conditions relating to materials, details and methods of any necessary works to repair to the wall of The Corn Exchange and details of the repair and materials to the garden folly.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY
4.1 P17/S2008/DIS - Approved (29/08/2017) – The Corn Exchange
Discharge of conditions 4 (Internal Structure), 6 (Glazed roof), 7 (temperature control mechanisms) & 8 (Internal Finishes) on Listed Building Consent P17/S0006/LB

(New roof coverings, new roof mounted vents, new internal steelwork and minor associated alterations).
P17/S0006/LB - Approved (20/03/2017) - The Corn Exchange

New roof coverings, new roof mounted vents, new internal steelwork and minor associated alterations. As amended and supported by Agent's email, revised plans and supporting document received on 23 February 2017.

P17/S0005/FUL - Approved (20/03/2017) - The Corn Exchange

New roof coverings, new roof mounted vents, new internal steelwork and minor associated alterations. As amended and supported by Agent's email, revised plans and supporting document received on 23 February 2017.

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) Policies
CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
CSH4 - Meeting housing needs
CSEN3 - Historic environment
CSEM1 – Supporting a successful economy
CSEM4 - Supporting economic development
CSQ3 - Design
CST1- Town centres and shopping
CSWAL1 - The Strategy for Wallingford

South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP 2011) policies;
C8 - Adverse affect on protected species
CON3 - Alteration to listed building
CON5 - Setting of listed building
CON7 - Proposals in a conservation area
D1 - Principles of good design
D2 - Safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles
D3 - Outdoor amenity area
D4 - Reasonable level of privacy for occupiers
EP1 - Adverse affect on people and environment
EP2 - Adverse affect by noise or vibration
G2 - Protect district from adverse development
H4 - Housing on sites within the built-up areas of towns and villages
T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users
T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016)

Wallingford Conservation Area Appraisal

5.2 Paragraph 48 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF.

Emerging South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2034
The council has submitted the Local Plan 2034 to the Planning Inspectorate for an independent examination following public consultation. It holds limited weight in the determination of planning applications.
Emerging Wallingford Neighbourhood Plan
The site is located within the Wallingford Neighbourhood Plan Area and the Plan is currently in the preparation stage and as such it currently holds very limited weight in the decision process.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
6.1 Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application and to any other material considerations.

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires where regard is to be had to the Development Plan, applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The relevant parts of the Development Plan in terms of this proposal are the overarching policies contained within the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 (SOCS) and the saved policies contained within the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP).

6.2 The main issues to consider in relation to the application for planning permission and against development plan policies are as follows;

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character and appearance of the Wallingford Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings
- Impact from the development to the Corn Exchange
- Impact on protected species
- Impact on archaeology
- Housing Mix
- Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties
- Amenity and parking and highway impact
- Air quality
- CIL

6.3 The main issues to consider in relation to the application for listed building consent and against development plan policies are as follows;

- Impact on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building

6.4 ASSESSMENT OF THE PLANNING APPLICATION
Principle of development.

Policy CSWAL1 of SOCS specifically relates to development in Wallingford. It takes a permissive stance to infill development and redevelopment in terms of housing within the town.

This site is contained within the town centre and is a previously developed site. I am satisfied that this proposal constitutes redevelopment and therefore the principle of creating new dwellings in this sustainable location is acceptable.
If a proposed housing development is acceptable in principle, then the detail of the proposal must be assessed against the criteria of Policy H4 which deals with new housing. These are:

(i) An important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost, nor an important view spoilt.
(ii) states ‘the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development are in keeping with its surroundings.’
(iii) states that the ‘character of the area in not adversely affected.’
(iv) there should be no overriding amenity or environmental or highway objections.

The following sections of this report cover the various aspects of the Policy H4 criteria.

6.5 Impact on the character and appearance of the Wallingford Conservation Area and setting of the listed buildings.

Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides:

In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Section 72 (1) must also be considered alongside relevant policies contained in the NPPF.

Paragraph 192 states that in determining applications LPA’s should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of the heritage assets and putting them to viable use consistent with conservation, the positive contribution that conservation deals within the impact of a proposed development on the “significance” of a 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.

Paragraph 193 requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 196 goes on to say that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Policies CSEN3 and CON1-CON16 of the Development Plan are also relevant.

In this case the designated heritage assets are the Wallingford Conservation Area and the adjacent Grade II listed building, Wallingford Corn Exchange, and 4 Market Place.

6.6 The proposed design has been revised over the course of the applications. The latest revised design, appended to this report, has improved the appearance of the scheme in
relation to the main listed building and the wider conservation area. The revised proposed floor plans have also addressed concerns about the possible impact on the neighbouring use of the Corn Exchange. The ongoing use of the Corn Exchange is obviously important to the long-term preservation of the adjacent listed building.

The Council’s Conservation Officer considers the impact upon the adjacent listed building at the Corn Exchange is acceptable provided the environmental health officers are satisfied the acoustic insulation proposed will protect occupants of the new flats. On that basis they have no objection to the principle of the use.

6.7 There remain some compromises to the design, specifically the wide flat roof in order to accommodate 8 residential units in a subservient structure. However, this will be barely perceptible from street level and the overall elevation treatment of the buildings is more consistent with the character of the area.

This scheme results in an intensification of the use of the former burgage plot site with the scale and massing of the buildings being proportionately larger than other examples of rear domestic development behind the Market Place frontages. The design of the buildings has gone some way to address this by breaking up the built form with linking sections and referencing the traditional pitched character of the buildings in this part of Wallingford. As such, the Conservation Officer considers that the scheme would constitute a low level of harm to the character of the area resulting in the erosion of the historic burgage plot. This is judged to be less-than-substantial against the tests of paragraph 196 of the NPPF and at the lower end of the test of harm.

6.8 Because a degree of harm has been identified it necessary to be satisfied that this harm, albeit low, is outweighed by public benefits.

6.9 In my view the public benefits comprise the following;

- The provision of 8 flats within a sustainable town centre location contributing towards an identified need for new housing in the district;
- Given its town centre location it could have been argued that this scheme could be car parking free due to the comparatively good access to public transport and facilities. However, 9 car parking spaces are provided on site;
- A planning condition is proposed to provide electricity charging points for vehicles which is an environmental benefit;
- The development also provides for the repair and retention of the historic garden folly within the site

6.10 The level of harm to the designated heritage asset, in the form of the Wallingford Conservation Area, to the burgage plot is low level especially when development in depth along the plot already exists. I am satisfied that the benefits set out above outweigh this low level of harm.

I am of the view that the development therefore accords with the requirements of Policy CSEN1 and Policies CON2, CON3, CON5 and CON7 of SOLP.

6.11 Impact from the development to the Corn Exchange.

Paragraph 183 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities (such as places of worship, pubs, music venues and sports clubs). Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the
operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or ‘agent of change’) should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.

6.12 Policy EP2 of SOLP states that proposals which would, by reason of noise or vibrations, have an adverse effect on existing or proposed occupiers will not be permitted, unless effective mitigation measures will be implemented. In addition, noise sensitive development will not be permitted close to existing or proposed sources of significant noise or vibrations.

Paragraph 182 of the NPPF requires that the applicant as ‘the agent for change’ should provide for suitable mitigation before the development is complete.

6.13 The overwhelming number of objectors to this development are concerned that the siting of new residential property abutting the Corn Exchange will mean that the noise generated by the Corn Exchange will have an adverse impact on the new residents. As a consequence, the occupants could submit noise complaints to the Council’s Environmental Health Team and they fear would potentially put the future of the Corn Exchange at risk.

6.14 The reason the application has been ongoing for so long is, in part, due to a noise assessment being undertaken. The assessment has been done with cooperation between the applicants and The Corn Exchange with their respective acoustic specialists and with input from the Council’s Environmental Health Officer. A report was submitted to the Council and forms part of this application.

6.15 The reports detail the investigation that has been undertaken in the potential transmission of noise between the Corn Exchange and the existing building at 4 Market Place which would help inform one potential noise transmission to the proposed units.

The results show that when music is played at its maximum representative levels in the theatre, it is audible within the existing building, especially at first floor. Music noise levels within the existing building would also exceed the criteria as set out in the British Standard BS 8233:2014 and would result in levels greater than existing background noise.

The conclusion of the report therefore is that this site is only suitable for residential development if adequate mitigation measures are provided within the design of the building to reduce these levels to an acceptable degree.

6.16 The report sets out the mitigation measures which includes a new wall forming part of the new building as part of the new building. This includes separation down to the foundations which will attenuate structure borne noise.

The rear wall of the new building, as shown on the amended proposed floor plans, has been increased in depth and an independent separate ceiling would be installed to improve airborne sound insulation to the second storey rooms.

The dormer windows on the south side of the building facing The Corn Exchange are there to allow light in and the report states that these should be permanently closed and fixed shut.

The layout of the internal spaces has been altered through the course of the application and as a consequence of the noise assessment. This has involved moving the most
noise sensitive rooms (i.e. bedrooms) to the front of the building and away from the wall adjacent to The Corn Exchange.

6.17 The Council’s Environmental Health Officer has independently assessed the plans and the noise assessment. After very careful consideration and lengthy negotiation the Environmental Health Officer has concluded that providing the properties are designed, constructed and maintained in line with the recommendations made within the report then the internal noise levels of the new dwellings will meet the standards specified within the British Standard BS 8233: 2014.

6.18 I am recommending three planning conditions in relation to noise. The first is that the development shall be carried out and completed in line with the recommendations in the report. The second reinforces one of the requirements which is that pre-completion testing is carried out after construction but before occupation. The third is to ensure that the south facing dormer windows are fixed shut.

6.19 Your officers are satisfied that all reasonable efforts have been made to reduce the impact from noise generated by The Corn Exchange to the occupants of the new properties. The applicants, as the agent for change, have undertaken assessments and design work to address this in line with paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

Whilst is always going to be possible for any new occupant (as it is with any existing or new resident in nearby properties) to make a noise complaint about The Corn Exchange, your officers are satisfied that all reasonable steps have been taken to reduce the likelihood of this happening.

6.20 Impact on protected species.

Policy CSB1 of SOCS states that a net loss of biodiversity will be avoided and opportunities to achieve a net gain across the district will be actively sought, It goes on to say that damage to protected or priority species will be avoided unless the importance of the development outweighs the harm and the loss can be mitigated to achieve a net gain in bio diversity.

Policy C8 of SOLP states that development that would have an adverse effect on a site supporting a specially protected species will not be permitted, unless damage to the ecological interest can be prevented through the use of planning conditions or planning obligations.

6.21 The ecological information originally submitted with the application concluded that the structures on site have a high likelihood of supporting roosting bats. Access was not possible to all roof areas and as such, the preliminary roost assessment was not considered to be adequate to support this planning application.

As recommended by the project ecologist, further bat activity surveys were required to fully assess this application. Without this further information it was not possible to make an informed judgement on the impact of the proposed development on protected species, whether a derogation licence from Natural England is required or what mitigation/enhancement should be implemented on site.

The Council’s Ecologist commented that this application should not be determined without this information being available and as the bat active season had finished at the point when the application was submitted in 2017, the required bat activity surveys could not be undertaken until the following year and will need to be completed during the active season.
6.22 A bat activity and survey report was received in February 2019 and the Council’s Ecologist assessed its findings. He concluded that, subject to a condition that required the development be implemented in accordance with the recommended measures stated in the Section 4.2 (table 5) of the Bat Survey Emergency and Activity Surveys report and Section 4.2 (table 8) of the originally submitted Bat Survey - Preliminary Roost Assessment report, the development is acceptable and will accord with policies CSB1 and C8 of the development plan.

6.23 **Impact on archaeology.**

Policy CON11 of SOLP states that there will be presumption in favour of physically preserving nationally important archaeological remains.

Policy CON13 of SOLP states that wherever practicable and desirable, developments affecting sites of archaeological interest should be designed to achieve physical preservation in situ of archaeological deposits. Where this is not practicable or desirable, conditions will be imposed on planning permissions, or planning obligations sought, which will require the developer to provide an appropriate programme of archaeological investigation, recording and publication by a professionally-qualified body.

6.24 This proposal is located within the historic core of Wallingford. Wallingford was a significant settlement in Saxon times, a defended Burh. Several archaeological investigations in the centre of the town have revealed that in many areas below-ground archaeological deposits relating to Saxon and Medieval Wallingford are well preserved. 12th/13th century pottery has been recovered from the site and medieval pits have been recorded 20 metres to the south. Other medieval pits have been recorded in the vicinity and Saxon features have been found 50 metres to the south east.

6.25 The Oxfordshire County Council’s Archeologist has considered the proposal and concluded that subject to planning conditions he has no objection.

The first condition states that prior to any demolition and the commencement of the development a professional archaeological organisation acceptable to the Local Planning Authority shall prepare an Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation, relating to the application site area, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The second conditions follows on from the first and states that following the approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in the first condition, and prior to any demolition on the site and the commencement of the development (other than in accordance with the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation), a staged programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation shall be carried out by the commissioned archaeological organisation in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The programme of work shall include all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication which shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Subject to the imposition of these conditions I am satisfied the development will accord with Policies CON11 and CON13 of SOLP.
6.26 Housing Mix.

The SOCS Policy CSH4 requires developments providing market housing to demonstrate an appropriate housing mix.

The Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) on which the policy CSH4 was based has been updated by the SHMA 2014, which provided an updated assessment of the housing needs for the district. It is important to note that the SHMA identifies that when applying the housing mix targets regard should be had to “the nature of the development site and character of the area, and to up-to-date evidence of need as well as the existing mix and turnover of properties at the local level.” This means that there will inevitably be some diversion from the SHMA targets.

As a starting point the mix of units should reflect the SHMA as set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 bed</th>
<th>2 bed</th>
<th>3 bed</th>
<th>4+ bed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHMA</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The split between bedrooms from the permissions for housing in 2017/2018 for market housing is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 bed</th>
<th>2 bed</th>
<th>3 bed</th>
<th>4+ bed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHMA Target</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It shows that against the SHMA target there have been a larger proportion of 4 bed units permitted.

6.27 The proposed mix for this development is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 bed</th>
<th>2 bed</th>
<th>3 bed</th>
<th>4+ bed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHMA</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scheme would provide smaller units in a sustainable location and could be argued to help redress some of the current imbalance. On those grounds I think that there is justification to have a mix that is not strictly SHMA compliant in this case.

6.28 Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.

Policy D4 of SOLP states that all new dwellings should be designed and laid out so as to secure a reasonable degree of privacy for the occupiers. Development will not be permitted if it would unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight. Impact on residential amenity is normally considered in terms of whether a development results in material harm by way of overlooking, loss of sunlight or being so large and close that it is considered oppressive and overbearing.

I have considered the development in light of these three aspects.
6.29 The most affected property is 71 Wood Street to the north. However, the level of overlooking of that property is not in my view materially different than the existing situation from the buildings that are to be demolished.

The increase in height of the buildings would increase the impact over the existing situation. However, I am of the view that the distance from the building to the boundary is sufficient to ensure that development would not result in a significant loss of sunlight or an oppressive or overbearing appearance.

The impact on the properties on the opposite side of Wood Street would not in my opinion be material when taking into account that the proposed new building on the frontage is not significantly different in its scale and openings to the existing building that will be demolished.

Overall, I do not conclude that this development is unneighbourly.

6.30 **Amenity and parking and highway impact.**

Policy D3 of SOCS seeks to ensure that new dwellings should provide adequate private outdoor space. The amount of land to be used for garden or amenity space will be determined by the size of the dwelling and the character of surrounding development. The South Oxfordshire Design Guide advises that a 2-bedroom property should provide at least 50 square metres and for a 1-bedroom property should provide at least 35 square metres. It indicates that for flats it is acceptable for this to be amalgamated into a single communal space.

6.31 In this instance the flats comprise 2 x one bedroom flats and 6 x two bedroom flats which would call for 375 square metres of amenity space. The development does not provide for any private amenity space within the site. However, regard must be had to the central location of the site, within the town with good access to services and where not all flats would expected to have private amenity area. I am mindful of a recent appeal decision where an Inspector did not support the Council’s concerns about a deficit of amenity space. Taking into account the sustainability of the site and relatively easy access to open spaces I am of the view that this deficiency and conflict with Policy D4 and guidance with the SODG is acceptable in this instance.

6.32 The Council’s maximum parking standards would require 2 spaces for the six 2-bedroom units and 1 space for each of the 2 x one-bedroom units.

The development provides for 9 spaces which is below the maximum levels the Council would expect. However, this is a central location where the Council could consider a car free development. However, in this instance spaces are being provided and the number is considered acceptable in the context of this sustainable location.

The access onto Thames Street is relatively unaltered and in conjunction with the fact that there is restricted parking in the area the Highway Authority has not raised any objection on the grounds of parking provision or highway safety.

6.33 **Air Quality.**

The site is not located within the Wallingford Air Quality Management Zone which includes sections of the High Street, Castle Street and St Marys Street but it is within the wider town centre area affected by air quality issues.
Policy EP1 states that proposals which would (by reason of smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust, grit, or other forms of polluting emissions) have an adverse effect on people and other living organisms, the atmosphere, the land, underground water supplies or watercourses will not be permitted, unless effective mitigation measures will be implemented.

6.34 The Council’s Air Quality officer has considered the impact of this development and suggested a series of planning conditions which will assist in mitigating the impact of this development to an acceptable extent. This includes the provision of electric vehicle charging points, the provision of cycle facilities and stipulating that the gas fired boilers meet a minimum standard.

Given the sensitivity of the site and proximity to the AQMA I conclude that such conditions are reasonable and necessary, and they form part of this recommendation.

6.35 **CIL.**

The development is liable to pay CIL which amounts to £36,252.00.

6.36 **ASSESSMENT OF THE LISTED BUILDING APPLICATION**

Impact on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that, in considering whether to grant listed building consent or planning permission for works/development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Paragraph 132 of the NPPF reflects this requirement, stating that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. CON5 of SOLP is the relevant local plan policy used to secure appropriate development within the setting of listed buildings.

Policy CSEN3 of SOCS is concerned with the protection of heritage assets Policy CON3 of SOLP aims to ensure that alterations would not harm the special historic and architectural interest of listed buildings.

6.37 The listed building consent application covers the alterations to the existing Grade II listed 4 Market Place, the Corn Exchange next door and the curtilage listed garden folly.

6.38 The works to the garden folly are welcomed as this is to be retained and repaired. A condition of the listed building consent requires the garden folly to be repaired in accordance with the submitted condition survey and the replacement fabric and alterations to the door will need to be agreed with the Council first.

6.39 The works to the rear of 4 Market Place are to modern additions and their removal is not considered to result in the loss of the listed building’s historic fabric.

6.40 Once the existing buildings are demolished there is the possibility that the wall to the Corn Exchange may require repair. If this is necessary, any repairs to the wall must be completed in appropriate materials and need to be as per details and a schedule of repair that must be submitted to the Council for approval before such works are undertaken and the new wall constructed.
6.41 The proposed conditions will ensure that the proposed works do not harm the special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**
7.1 The development provides for 8 new units within a sustainable town centre location. Whilst the scheme results in some low level harm to the conservation area that is outweighed by the benefits the development will bring. Providing that the development is carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures proposed in the acoustic report the impact of noise from The Corn Exchange will be mitigated to acceptable levels. Conditions relating to archaeology, parking, and ecology will ensure that the impact of the development will be acceptable. As such the proposal accords with the relevant development plan policies.

7.2 The proposed works, in conjunction with the details that are secured via conditions relating to details of any necessary works of repair to The Corn Exchange wall following the demolition of the existing building and details of the works and materials for the repair of the garden folly, will ensure that the special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings are preserved. As such it is recommended that both planning permission and listed building consent are granted.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**
8.1 That planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions;

1. Commencement three years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Schedule of Materials
4. Noise Mitigation as per acoustic report
5. Post construction sound testing
6. Dormer windows to be non-opening
7. Vision splay protection
8. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained
9. Construction Traffic Management
10. Wildlife Protection (mitigation as approved)
11. Electrical charging points
12. Gas fire boilers to an approved specification
13. Archaeological Watching Brief
14. Implementation of Programme or Archaeological Work

8.2 That listed building consent is granted subject to the following conditions;

1. Commencement three years - Listed Building Consent
2. Approved plans (listed building)
3. Submission of details of repair to the Corn Exchange wall
4. Submission of details of repair to the garden folly

**Author:** Mr. P Bowers  
**E-mail:** paul.bowers@southandvale.gov.uk  
**Contact No:** 01235 422600