

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P22/S1007/HH and P22/S1054/LB</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	HOUSEHOLDER and LISTED BUILDING
<b>REGISTERED</b>	14.3.2022
<b>PARISH</b>	HENLEY-ON-THAMES
<b>WARD MEMBERS</b>	Ken Arlett Kellie Hinton Stefan Gawrysiak
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mrs Marisa Bucknall
<b>SITE</b>	11 Thameside Henley-On-Thames, RG9 1BH
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	The existing linear modern rear extension proposed to be widened to provide a direct connection between the drawing room and the rear extension. Existing kitchen to be converted into a study, entrance hall to be sub-divided to create new washroom/utility room and new bathroom.  (Amended plans received 06/05/2022 - change to roofing material of proposed extension). (Amended plans received 03/08/2022 - air source heat pump omitted).
<b>OFFICER</b>	Lillian Duffield

---

**1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 Officers recommend that planning permission and listed building consent is granted for the reasons set out in this report. The applications have been referred to Planning Committee because they have been called in by Cllr Ken Arlett.

**The Site**

- 1.2 The application site is shown at **Appendix 1**. The site is located within the built up area of Henley-on-Thames, on the western side of Thameside. 11 Thameside is a two-storey residential dwelling set within a terrace facing the River Thames. It is Grade II listed. The listing description is as follows:

*Early C19. Rebuilt red brick facade with old tiled roof above wide eaves. Unusual stepped 3 stacks on northern side (possible remnants of larger stacks). Brick and stone string course between storeys. 2 storeys, 2 windows, sashes with glazing bars and cambered head linings. Southern windows with margin lights. Side door and central modern door. Flood levels of 1809 and 1894 marked in wall tablets. Grade II for group value here.*

*No 9 (Baltic House) forms part of a group with the listed buildings on Friday Street and also with Nos 10 to 12 (consec) Thameside.*

- 1.3 The building has its origins in the C19 however it was substantially rebuilt and the roof raised following severe flooding in 1894 and the remaining structure is almost entirely from that date. The property has a single storey rear extension dating from the 20<sup>th</sup> century constructed from brick with glazed doors and a tile roof which runs east west against the southern boundary wall. There is a garden to the rear of the property.
- 1.4 The site is located within the Henley Conservation Area and an area of archaeological constraint. It lies within flood zone 3. There are other listed buildings in the vicinity of the site including 12 Thameside adjacent to the north (Grade II), 10 Thameside (The Old Granary) adjacent to the south (Grade II) and numbers 57 – 71 Friday Street to the south west (all Grade II).

### **The Proposals**

- 1.5 The proposed plans are shown at **Appendix 2**. The planning and listed building consent applications are for the replacement of an existing extension and internal works to the listed building. The proposed extension will be approximately 0.4m wider than the existing extension at its western end and 2.1m wider at its eastern end. It will be 0.7m taller on the side adjacent to the wall and 0.35m taller on its eastern side. It will sit 0.9m below the top of the adjacent wall. The extension would have full height glazing with a part flat part sloping zinc roof. It would have a linear form. The existing ground floor double door opening on the rear elevation of the dwelling will be used to access the extension and a door inserted in the passageway to the south of the main building.
- 1.6 No changes are proposed to the front elevation of the building. Internally, it is proposed that the existing entrance hall on the ground floor is sub-divided with the addition of new stud walls to create a new washroom/toilet/utility room. No changes are proposed on the first floor. On the second floor the insertion of a bathroom is proposed within an existing storage area.
- 1.7 The plans have been amended in response to comments regarding light spill. The roof of the proposed extension is now fully zinc rather than part zinc, part glass as originally proposed. An air source heat pump has also been omitted.
- 1.8 This application follows the planning and listed building consent applications P20/S2809/HH and P20/S2812/LB submitted in 2020 for:

*'alteration of existing modern extension to widen its footprint and conversion from single to double storey (glass and metal cladding) plus addition of adjacent single storey glass extension. Internal floor plan alterations to install a new stair, removal of c20 staircase, new partitions at first floor level and opening up of rear elevation at g/f and 1/f levels for proposed rear extensions. Removal of existing staircase, fireplace and modern internal partitions. Retrospective application for sub-division of roof space into one large room plus small storage room and internal staircase, involving removal of internal section of chimney. Provision of two rear dormer windows in the rear roof. (as*

*amended by plans received 17 December 2020 reducing size of rear extension and providing additional supporting information)*

1.9 The proposed plans for the previous scheme are shown at **Appendix 3**. These applications were dismissed at appeal in 2021. The Planning Inspector set out the main issues for the appeal as:

- (i) whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed 11 Thameside and its setting;
- (ii) the effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, and in particular those of 12 Thameside, in terms of outlook and whether it would result in an overbearing effect; and
- (iii) the effect on the setting of various Grade II listed buildings in proximity to the appeal site and on the Henley Main Conservation Area.

1.10 In respect of these matters the Inspector concluded:

- (i) The proposal would, within the terms set out in the Framework, represent less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (11 Thameside)
- (ii) the proposal would result in acceptable living conditions for adjoining occupiers and would comply with Policy DES6 of the SOLP.
- (iii) The settings of all these listed buildings would be preserved. As small external alterations the proposal would also preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

1.11 Overall, when assessing the planning balance, the Inspector concluded that the public benefits did not outweigh the less than substantial harms to the designated heritage asset – 11 Thameside. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations sufficient to outweigh the presumption in favour of determining the proposal in accordance with the plan.

1.12 The current applications are different from the 2020 applications in the following ways:

- Internal alterations – The majority of the previous internal changes including the replacement stair are now omitted. Internally, the current proposals are for the sub division of the entrance hall and the insertion of a bathroom in the attic only.
- External alterations – two first floor rear dormer windows are no longer proposed, the existing rear wall of the dwelling is retained.
- Scale of extension – the replacement extension is now single storey rather than two storey and is lower in height. It no longer spans the full width of the rear elevation of the main property.
- Roof of extension - proposed to be fully zinc rather than part zinc, part glazed

- 1.13 The proposed extension is still larger than the existing extension. It will still be contemporary in form, with glazing and a full zinc roof.

**2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

- 2.1 Henley-on-Thames Town Council (1) – Objection. Proposal and light omitted would harm the character of the listed building and Conservation Area and have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. No public benefits to outweigh harm to designated heritage assets.  
Henley-on-Thames Town Council (2) Objection. Amended proposal does not answer the concerns raised previously.

County Archaeological Services (SODC) (1) - The site is located in an area of archaeological interest however the development is of a relatively small scale and as such there are no archaeological constraints to this scheme.

County Archaeological Services (SODC) (2) - The submitted amendments do not alter original comments.

Drainage - (South&Vale) (1) – No objections

Drainage - (South&Vale) (2) - Satisfied that EA Standing Advice has been addressed and as such – would have no objections to planning permission being granted

Conservation Officer – (South and Vale) (1) – No objection subject to conditions. Satisfied that the proposed internal alterations do not harm the significance of the listed building and that the proposed rear extension would not harm the architectural interest of the main building or character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conservation Officer – (South and Vale) (1) – No objections to amended plans removing the glazing from the proposed roof and instead proposing a fully zinc roof.

The Henley Society (Planning) – Objection. Proposals would have a detrimental impact on the setting of both 11 and 12 Thameside and would create the potential for intrusive light pollution at neighbouring properties in Thameside and Friday Street.

Henley Archaeological and Historical Group – Objection. Light pollution and noise impacts. The proposal is not acceptable as it would be detrimental to the setting of an important group of Listed Buildings in the core of the medieval town, including the riverside C.A. as well as to the quiet enjoyment of their occupants. County Archaeology needs to be consulted.

Neighbours – two objections

- Not in keeping with the historical character of the surrounding area and would adversely alter the heritage of this important riverfront enclave in Henley.
- Increased sense of enclosure and urbanisation, and being glass would emit unacceptable amounts of light which will affect the neighbouring properties

- The increased height of the extension would be visible from 12 Thameside and have a negative impact on the rear environment.
- The glass extension would be out of keeping
- Would reduce the existing garden to no. 11, detracting from what is currently a good sized attractive amenity area for the house.
- The amount of glass is contrary to the character of the Heritage Asset and Conservation Area, and would cause light pollution affecting the aspect to the rear of 12 Thameside and other neighbours.
- No community benefits of the proposal

### **3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

**3.1** [P20/S2812/LB](#) - Other Outcome (09/12/2021) - Appeal dismissed (08/12/2021)  
To rear of listed building, alteration of existing modern extension to widen its footprint and conversion from single to double storey (glass and metal cladding) plus addition of adjacent single storey glass extension. Internal floor plan alterations to install a new stair, removal of c20 staircase, new partitions at first floor level and opening up of rear elevation at g/f and 1/f levels for proposed rear extensions. Removal of existing staircase, fireplace and modern internal partitions. Retrospective application for sub-division of roof space into one large room plus small storage room and internal staircase, involving removal of internal section of chimney. Provision of two rear dormer windows in the rear roof. (as amended by plans received 17 December 2020 reducing size of rear extension and providing additional supporting information)

[P20/S2809/HH](#) - Other Outcome (09/12/2021) - Appeal dismissed (08/12/2021)  
To rear of listed building, alteration of existing modern extension to widen its footprint and conversion from single to double storey (glass and metal cladding) plus addition of adjacent single storey glass extension. Internal floor plan alterations to install a new stair, removal of c20 staircase, new partitions at first floor level and opening up of rear elevation at g/f and 1/f levels for proposed rear extensions. Removal of existing staircase, fireplace and modern internal partitions. Retrospective application for sub-division of roof space into one large room plus small storage room and internal staircase, involving removal of internal section of chimney. Provision of two rear dormer windows in the rear roof. (as amended by plans received 17 December 2020 reducing size of rear extension and providing additional supporting information)

[P20/S2992/LB](#) - Approved (27/01/2021)  
Replacement of existing single pane sash windows on front facade with double glazed sash windows with like-for-like materials and appearance for frames. Replacement of existing timber doors on front facade with new flood resistant timber doors. (as amended by additional information received 17 December 2020).

[P20/S1518/PEO](#) - Advice provided (14/07/2020)  
Rear extension and internal alterations.  
Follow up Pre-App to P19/S3424/PEO.

[P19/S3424/PEO](#) - Advice provided (09/01/2020)  
Proposed double storey rear extension and re-modelling of internal spaces in the existing main house.(as amended by drawings & Heritage Appraisal received 9 December 2019)  
**\*\*SITE MEETING\*\***

**4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 Not applicable to this application.

**5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE**

**5.1 Development Plan Policies**

**South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 (SOLP) Policies:**

DES1 - Delivering High Quality Development  
DES2 - Enhancing Local Character  
DES6 - Residential Amenity  
DES8 - Promoting Sustainable Design  
ENV6 - Historic Environment  
ENV7 - Listed Buildings  
ENV8 - Conservation Areas  
ENV9 - Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments  
EP4 - Flood Risk  
H20 - Extensions to Dwellings  
HEN1 - The Strategy for Henley-on-Thames  
STRAT1 - The Overall Strategy

**5.2 Neighbourhood Plan**

**Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan**

DQS1 Local character

**5.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents**

South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Joint Design Guide 2022 (JDG)

**5.4 National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance  
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

**5.5 Other Relevant Legislation**

Human Rights Act 1998

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

Equality Act 2010

In determining this planning application the Council has regard to its equalities obligations including its obligations under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

**6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

**6.1 The relevant planning considerations are the following:**

- **Design and Character**
- **Whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed 11 Thameside and its setting;**
- **The effect on the setting of the Grade II listed buildings in proximity to the site and on the Henley Main Conservation Area.**
- **Residential amenity - the effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, and in particular those of 12 Thameside, in**

**terms of outlook and whether it would result in an overbearing effect;**

- **Other Matters – archaeology, drainage and sustainability**

**The relevant consideration for the listed building consent application is:**

- **Whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed 11 Thameside and its setting;**

### **Design and Character**

- 6.2 Policy H20 of the SOLP states that extensions to dwellings will be permitted provided that adequate and satisfactory parking is provided, and sufficient amenity areas are provided for the extended dwelling. Development should have regard to the advice within the South Oxfordshire Design Guide (now the JDG).
- 6.3 Policies DES1 and DES2 of the SOLP seek to ensure that all new development is of a high quality design and respects the local context.
- 6.4 The proposed extension would replace an existing extension in the same location. There is no objection to the removal of the existing extension which was built in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and is not of historic interest.
- 6.5 The proposed extension would be slightly wider and slightly taller than the existing extension as set out above but would have a similar linear form. The proposed extension remains set down below the adjacent wall, by approximately 0.9m. The extension would be connected to the main building by the opening in the rear elevation and would not span the full width of the property. The extension is considered to be sufficiently subservient to the existing building which remains the visually dominant element. The form of the extension is simple and uncomplicated.
- 6.6 While the existing extension uses traditional materials – brick and tile which match the existing property, the proposed extension would be more contemporary with full length glazing along its elevation with a part flat part sloping zinc roof. The use of contemporary materials is considered to be appropriate in this instance and will differentiate the proposed extension as a new phase of development to the listed building. Overall, the proposed extension is considered to be an appropriate design response which accords with advice set out in the JDG and respects the character of the listed building.
- 6.7 The extension does not result in an unacceptable loss of outdoor amenity space as a reasonably sized main garden to the rear of the property is retained. There are no changes proposed to the parking layout.
- 6.8 The proposed development is acceptable in design terms and therefore complies with the policies set out above.

**Whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed 11 Thameside and its setting**

- 6.9 11 Thameside is a Grade II listed building situated in the Henley Conservation Area overlooking the river. The building has its origins in the C19 however it was substantially rebuilt and the roof raised following severe flooding in 1894 and the remaining structure is almost entirely from that date. The building is a pleasant Victorian house the interior of which is not particularly striking or a distinct example of the period although the cellular layout and central stair of that date remain legible; unlike it's neighbour there is no timber framing exposed or legible within No.11. To the rear is a single storey C20 extension that extends along the southern side of the courtyard garden. The front elevation retains the clearest references to its historic character and previous association to the neighbouring No.12. This can be seen in the remaining service door to the side passageway and the wider windows referencing the former shop/commercial function it served. There is no doubt the attractively detailed Victorian frontage makes an important contribution to the Conservation Area.
- 6.10 Policy ENV7 sets out that proposals affecting a listed building must conserve, enhance or better reveal those elements which contribute to the heritage significance and/or its setting; respect any features of special architectural or historic interest; and be sympathetic to the listed building and its setting.
- 6.11 The proposed extension would be larger than the existing but is in the same location and has a similar linear form. It is considered that it would be subservient to the existing building. It would have contemporary materials – glazing and a zinc roof. The extension would be linked with the house through an existing opening and so there will be no significant loss of historic fabric on the rear elevation. The main issue is the relationship of the extension to the main building and how it effects the setting of the main building.
- 6.12 The Conservation Officer has been consulted on the application and their comments are included in the text below.
- 6.13 The Conservation Officer has no objection to the proposed widening of the existing rear extension. The existing extension is architecturally contrasting with the original design of the main house. The narrow, lean-to design is taken off the garden wall rather than the wall of the main house and continues the former integrated rear access alleyway rather than a natural cell of the house. The proposal is to widen the footprint of the extension in a contemporary finish rather than materials that match the existing. Given the unusual form of the extension the Officer considers that contemporary and modern materials are an acceptable option here to make this later addition distinct from the historic part of the house.
- 6.14 The Conservation Officer has no objection to the use of a zinc roof with high levels of glazing; this approach has been used elsewhere in the town to successfully differentiate old and new. The applicant made an amendment to



change the roof so it was fully zinc to seek to address concerns about light spill and the Officer has no objection to this change.

- 6.15 The previous scheme also used zinc and glazing as its main materials. It is noted in the 2021 appeal decision that the Planning Inspector states at paragraph 30 that ‘Concern has been expressed about the use of zinc and glass as materials for the rear extensions of the proposal. In this regard I am satisfied that the use of such contrasting materials would readily show that these works represented a discrete intervention into the building, would work satisfactorily within the urban context and enhance the listed building and its setting’.
- 6.16 The Conservation Officer concludes that the proposal would result in a contemporary extension to the listed building that would not detract from the historic character of 11 Thameside and the enclosed nature of the site would mean that the character and appearance of the conservation area would not be impacted. The extension would sit within the existing plot and represents a subservient and ancillary addition to the main house.
- 6.17 The application includes internal changes to the ground and second floor of the listed building. On the ground floor the entrance hall would be subdivided to create a bathroom. This would involve the insertion of partition walls and plumbing to serve the bathroom. No historic features would be removed or obscured. The changes at ground floor level preserve the historic layout of the house and its fabric and it is a change that could be reversed in the future.
- 6.18 On the second floor, an existing storage room will be converted into a bathroom. This does not require any work to the roof and the beams and posts present will be retained. It will involve the installation of bathroom fixtures and fittings and plumbing.
- 6.19 The Conservation Officer has no objection to the proposed internal alterations and they are considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building. It is further considered that the proposal better responds to the significance of the remaining fabric and layout of the listed building, in accordance with the noted elements of special interest by the Appeal Inspector in the determination of the appeals last year. A planning condition is recommended to require the details of the service routes for plumbing of the new bathrooms at ground and attic levels, including the routes for SVPs and external vents.
- 6.20 The proposal would not harm the historic significance of the listed building and would preserve its historic and architectural interest. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and policies ENV6 and ENV7 of the SOLP.

**The effect on the setting of the Grade II listed buildings in proximity to the site and on the Henley Main Conservation Area**

- 6.21 The site is located within the Henley Main Conservation Area. Policy ENV8 of the SOLP states that proposals for development within or affecting the setting

of a Conservation Area must conserve or enhance its special interest, character, setting and appearance. The significance of this part of the Conservation Area relates to the historic links with the River Thames and the high quality but varied architecture of the buildings and the historic street pattern. The site contributes to this through its architecture and its history.

- 6.22 The site is located within close proximity to several listed buildings, as set out above. Policy ENV7 sets out that proposals affecting a listed building must conserve, enhance or better reveal those elements which contribute to the heritage significance and/or its setting; respect any features of special architectural or historic interest; and be sympathetic to the listed building and its setting. The significance of the listed buildings lies in their architectural interest and value as a group, and their historical uses and association with the River Thames.
- 6.23 There are no changes proposed to the front elevation of the listed building which is considered to be the aspect of the building which contributes the most to the character and appearance of the Conservation area.
- 6.24 The removal of the existing extension which is not of historic interest is not considered to harm the significance of the Conservation Area or surrounding listed buildings.
- 6.25 The proposals involve the replacement of the existing extension with a slightly larger extension in the same location, with a contemporary design. It is not considered that the increase in size is such that it would start to dominate the plot or negatively affect the setting of the surrounding buildings through competing with the primacy of these buildings. The extension will not be significantly more prominent in views than the existing extension due to the enclosure of the site with high boundary walls. The site layout comprising the main building and a subservient extension set within a rear garden is unchanged and the relationship with surrounding buildings will be very similar to the existing situation. The contemporary materials and design ensure that the extension represents a distinct phase in the development of the site. The site remains in residential use.
- 6.26 The Conservation Officer has been consulted and did not identify any harm to these heritage assets. The historic and architectural interest of the surrounding listed buildings would not be affected by this proposal and their setting will be preserved. The character and appearance of the Conservation Area will also be preserved.
- 6.27 The Planning Inspector concluded that the previous proposals would preserve the settings of the surrounding listed buildings and would also preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As the current proposal is considerably scaled back from that scheme and would arguably have less of a visual and non-visual effect. I can see no reason to conclude that it would harm these heritage assets.

- 6.28 The proposal is considered to preserve the settings of the surrounding listed buildings and would also preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and as such is in accordance with policies ENV6, ENV7 and ENV8 of the SOLP.

**Residential amenity - the effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, and in particular those of 12 Thameside, in terms of outlook and whether it would result in an overbearing effect**

- 6.29 Policy DES6 of the SOLP sets out that development proposals should demonstrate that they will not result in significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring uses, when considering both individual and cumulative impacts. This includes factors such as loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight; dominance or visual intrusion; noise or vibration; smell, dust, heat, odour, gases or other emissions; pollution, contamination or the use of/or storage of hazardous substances; and external lighting.
- 6.30 There are residential properties to the south of the site – 10 Thameside (The Granary), Timbers (67-69 Friday Street), and Friday Cottage (71 Friday Street) all share a boundary with the application site. The wall along this boundary is 4.8m in height. At its closest point, and at its highest, the extension would lie approximately 0.9m below the top of the boundary wall with these properties to the south and slopes down away from the boundary. It would not be seen from ground floor level or from the outdoor amenity areas of these properties due to the height of the existing wall. It may be visible from the upper floors of these properties, but it would be beyond the wall and lower than it and would not be harmful. As such it is not considered that there would be any adverse impacts to these properties in terms of loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, dominance or visual intrusion.
- 6.31 12 Thameside, a residential property lies to the north of the site. It has a small courtyard garden to its west bounded by walls on all sides which is adjacent to the boundary with 11 Thameside. The proposed extension is single storey and replaces a structure in the same location. It will be larger, and the roof of the proposed extension would be seen from the garden of 12 Thameside. In contrast with the previous proposal, no built form is proposed directly adjacent to this boundary, and there is no first floor element or first floor windows facing 12 Thameside. It is not considered that the proposals would cause any loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight. There will be a change in outlook as more of the roof structure will be visible, however this will be seen against the backdrop of the existing wall and is not considered to have a dominating effect.
- 6.32 To the west of the application site is a car park with offices beyond and it is not considered that there would be any adverse impacts on the amenity of these neighbouring uses.
- 6.33 Several of the objections to the proposals raise concerns about increased light spill from the proposed extension. The existing extension has several full length openings and windows across its elevation and the proposed extension would have full height glazing right across its elevation, all at ground floor level. In

response to concerns raised, the applicant amended the plans from a part glazed, part zinc roof to a full zinc roof to reduce potential light spill from the roof. The extension is set within a walled courtyard, within a town centre location with a mix of commercial and residential uses. It is considered that any increased levels of light from the ground floor of the proposed extension would be largely blocked by the surrounding high walls to the site. The level of light reaching other properties from the extension is likely to be very low and not harmful to the amenity of these properties. In addition, given the location of the site, in the wider town centre context which has artificial street and commercial lighting the proposal would not contribute significantly to light pollution.

- 6.34 There is an existing extension in this location, and it is not considered that the replacement extension would cause such an increase in activity that would result in harmful levels of increased noise to surrounding properties.
- 6.35 The Planning Inspector for the 2021 appeal relating to the previous scheme concluded that it would result in acceptable living conditions for adjoining occupiers and comply with policy DES6. The current application is significantly smaller, and officers consider that it would not be harmful to the amenity of neighbours.
- 6.36 Officers consider that the proposal would not result in significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and as such the proposed development complies with policy DES6.

**Other Matters – archaeology, drainage and sustainability**

- 6.37 The property is in an area of archaeological constraint, however the County Archaeological Service is satisfied that there are no archaeological constraints to this scheme. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policy ENV9.
- 6.38 The site is located within flood zone 3. The Council's Drainage Engineer has been consulted and confirms that the measures set out in the Design and Access Statement address the EA Standing Advice for minor extensions.
- 6.39 Given the modest scale of the proposal (<100sq.m), officers do not consider it reasonable in this instance to require the submission of further information demonstrating that the proposal meets the energy performance aspirations for new development set out under SOLP Policy DES8.

**Community Infrastructure Levy**

- 6.40 The proposed development is not liable to pay CIL as the net increase in floor space does not exceed 100sqm.

**7.0 CONCLUSION**

**7.1 Planning application P22/S1007/HH**

The proposed development is in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan and national planning guidance. The design of the new dwelling is appropriate to the site and surrounding area and will not harm the

heritage significance of the relevant heritage assets. Officers are satisfied there are no neighbouring amenity, archaeology, or drainage issues.

**7.2 Listed Building Consent application P22/S1054/LB**

The proposal complies with the relevant development plan policies, and it is considered that the proposed works are acceptable in terms of their impact upon the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

**8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**That application P22/S1007/HH is approved subject to the following conditions:**

- 1 : Commencement of development within 3 yrs**
- 2 : Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans**
- 3 : Schedule of Materials to be agreed**

**That application P22/S1054/LB is approved subject to the following conditions:**

- 1 : Commencement of works within 3 yrs**
- 2 : Works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans**
- 3 : Schedule of Materials to be agreed**
- 4 : Details of the service routes for the new bathrooms including details of SVPs and external vents/flues to be agreed**

**Author:** Lillian Duffield

**Tel:** 01235 422600

**Email:** [Planning@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:Planning@southoxon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank