

Planning Advisory Committee

5th September 2019

No	Application No	Proposal	Location
35	19/01936/FULL	Proposed stables, associated yard and adjustments to existing drive way	Kemps, Potters Lane, Hawkhurst, Kent TN18 5BB
<p>Background: <i>Driveway alteration is to allow access to the stables and parking for a trailer. No comments from neighbours.</i></p> <p>Comments and Recommendation: The proposed stables will be located well away from the listed house behind an existing tractor store, so will have little if any impact on the house.</p> <p>The alterations to the driveway will enhance access and prevent damage to the thatched cottage.</p> <p>The stables will not be visible from the road and will not impact on neighbouring properties. Whilst the site is outside the LBD and within the AONB, it seems appropriate to build stables next to a paddock.</p> <p>We support this application.</p>			
36	19/01937/LBC	Listed building consent: proposed stables and associated yard and adjustments to existing driveway	Kemps, Potters Lane, Hawkhurst, Kent TN18 5BB
<p>Listed building consent is not required.</p>			
37	19/02025/Hybrid	Hybrid application: Demolition of existing clubhouse, squash courts and ancillary structures, and redevelopment of Golf Course. Full planning permission sought for new relief road and associated earth works and junctions with the A268 and A229. Outline planning permission (all matters reserved for future determination) sought for residential development of up to 417 dwellings a C2/C3 care home, class D1 facilities such as a doctors' surgery and / or community hall, public car park, public park and associated parking, servicing, utilities,	Hawkhurst Golf Club, High Street, Hawkhurst, Cranbrook Kent Tn18 4JS

footpath and cycle links, formal and informal open space and recreational facilities, ground and infrastructure works.

Background:

Objections - 358, plus CPRE, Woodland Trust & High Weald AONB Unit

Support - 3

Neither - 2

Comments:

The number of objections (358) reveals the strength of feeling against this development. Numerous reasons are given for these objections including but not limited to the impact on the AONB, local wildlife, and the environment; traffic congestion; concerns over access by emergency vehicles; impact on residents who will no longer be able to use the Cranbrook Road to access facilities in the village; huge increase in housing for a village the size of Hawkhurst (an increase of 20%); no need for these houses when properties from other recent development are still vacant; impact on conservation areas; permanent impact on the character of the village; inability of Hawkhurst's infrastructure to support this application etc.

These are very real concerns. Hawkhurst has seen a great deal of development recently and the infrastructure is already struggling to cope. Much of this is not within the gift of the developer to rectify. For instance, the primary school is nearing capacity. The GP surgeries are full, with residents having to wait significant periods of time for appointments. Indeed, within the objections to this application, one of the GPs has raised concerns about their practice's ability to manage local demand at present let alone with a further influx of residents. Regardless of whether or not a new GP practice is built, more doctors are needed. Two of the local GPs have announced their intention to retire in the near future. It cannot be assumed that doctors will be available to meet the increase in demand.

Equally concerning is the lack of capacity for sewage. We have repeatedly informed TWBC that Hawkhurst's sewage treatment plants are over capacity, resulting in sewage spilling into the streams and a regular requirement for sewage to be taken away from the treatment works by tanker. A recent incident of the sewage treatment works overflowing is currently being investigated by the Environment Agency. Southern Water have recognised that there is insufficient capacity in the public sewer network for this development. In their comment dated 12th August, they state that "as treatment capacity is not available to serve the development, we would regard the development as premature." Therefore, surely permission for this application cannot be granted.

Many residents have raised concerns about flooding and the impact on neighbouring properties, as well as those along the course of Slip Mill Stream. The golf course itself is prone to flooding as is Slip Mill Lane, but there are also several areas of high flood risk to the east of the development, including Ockley Wood, Hartenoak and Water Lane. It essential that further investigations are undertaken to fully consider the potential for flooding caused by this development.

NDP:

This application does not comply with Hawkhurst's NDP. It is a large development and, therefore, would need to comply with HD1(b) which states:

1. *Larger developments of 10 or more houses will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances as prescribed by the NPPF and if it can be demonstrated that their impact on the sensitive landscape setting and the considerable environmental constraints of Hawkhurst can be effectively mitigated.*

There are no exceptional circumstances to justify this development. There is no need for a development of this size in Hawkhurst. The village has exceeded its housing quota set out in previous local plans and the draft Local Plan has not yet gone out for consultation. Both the High Weald AONB Unit and CPRE have raised questions over the accuracy of the Borough's housing numbers, with the High Weald AONB Units stating that these should be tested through the Local Plan examination. The absence of a 5-year supply does not justify this application.

The construction of the "relief" road cannot be considered exceptional circumstances. We do not believe that the road will provide the benefits indicated. A view that is supported by the High Weald AONB Unit and CPRE both of which criticise the application for ignoring the issue of "induced" traffic. Furthermore, the objection by the Campaign to Protect Hawkhurst Village (4.20) provides very detailed analysis demonstrating that this development will have a severe impact on the High Street and crossroads. Even if the "relief" road were to prove effective, the absence of viable transport alternatives to the car means that Hawkhurst cannot be considered an appropriate location for a development of this size.

Moreover, the application has failed to demonstrate that the impact on the sensitive landscape setting and the considerable environmental constraints of Hawkhurst can be effectively mitigated.

2. *Proposals will be subject to the following criteria:*

- (i) *The proposed development contributes to sustainable development - **The proposed development does not contribute to sustainable development**, see below.*
- (ii) *Any application is supported by an assessment of the environmental and visual impact of the proposal and include as necessary appropriate mitigation measures - The landscape and visual impact assessment recognises that there will be an **adverse impact** on the landscape. The High Weald AONB unit considers this to be a **significant adverse impact**.*
- (iii) *The proposal can demonstrate effective physical integration with the existing settlement patterns found in and around Hawkhurst - As indicated in Paragraph 7.7 of Hawkhurst's NDP, the intention of HD1 is to ensure that future housing does not impact negatively on the village's positive relationship with the surrounding countryside and existing built areas. This development would completely change the approach to the village both travelling east on the A268 and south on the A229. It would have a detrimental impact on the conservation areas and would erode the separation between Highgate and Gills Green.*
- (iv) *The proposals demonstrate how they meet the objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan - the application **fails** to do so. The High Weald AONB Unit's objection to this application states that the "**proposal is unjustified major development that will have a significant adverse impact on the AONB, ecological affects and the requirements of the new road, and is therefore contrary to Paragraph 172 of the NPPF and Tunbridge Wells Borough Council's own policies for the AONB set out in the High Weald AONB Management Plan adopted in March 2019.**"*

AONB:

This is an entirely inappropriate development for an area of outstanding natural beauty. This is a view that is shared by CPRE and the High Weald AONB Unit, both of whom object to this proposal. **The AONB is a small-scale landscape suited to small-scale development** - this is not small-scale. In fact, our understanding is that it would be one of, if not, the largest development proposed for the AONB nationally. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF indicates that “great weight should be given to enhancing and conserving landscape and scenic beauty in... Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in these issues.” The paragraph continues “the scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited.”

The planning statement accepts that this development will harm the AONB, but considers that the benefits outweigh the harm. However, we can see little benefit in this application. It will result in increased traffic congestion, worsen air pollution, damage the landscape, impact on wildlife, require significant loss of trees and habitats, result in a loss of sports provision and open space amongst other impacts. Furthermore, the High Weald AONB Unit raise the issue that a roundabout of this size is “totally alien to the character of the AONB.”

Road:

We share residents’ concerns that the road will not resolve Hawkhurst’s notorious traffic problems. At 7m wide, this road is narrower than Highgate Hill. This hardly inspires confidence that the road will provide relief, especially as the bus stops will be on the road itself.

The Transport Assessment explains that HGVs will be redirected to the Flimwell crossroads via signage. However, there is nothing in place to prevent HGVs turning left at the roundabout along the High Street back into the centre of the village and then proceeding to turn right at the crossroads to continue south on the A229 and B2244. This would result in even more congestion at the Hawkhurst crossroads than is currently the case as HGVs will struggle to make the right turn, blocking the junction as a result. However, the alternative for HGVs heading south is to travel a longer distance to join the tailback approaching the Flimwell crossroads before trying to make a near-impossible left turn. Perhaps, the rural lanes of North Hill Road and Delmond Lane will prove to be a more attractive option, neither of which are suitable for HGVs.

Numerous concerns have been raised about the impact that this development will have on local rural lanes. These will continue to be used as rat runs, as they are now. It seems logical to conclude if there are more cars on the roads, then more cars will be using these lanes. They cannot cope with the current level of use, the edges of the roads are collapsing limiting the availability of passing places, the banks are being eroded. Our sunken lanes are a key feature of our landscape and should be protected.

Despite assertions elsewhere that this proposal encourages walking and cycling, the roundabout design does not provide provision for a crossing for pedestrians or cyclists, which is particularly concerning given that there is a school on the opposite side of the High Street to the development. Paragraph 110 of the NPPF notes that applications for development should “give priority first to pedestrians and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas.” This is evidently not the case with this application.

It would appear from the plan that the roundabout “leads” traffic into turning left towards the village. There have also been concerns raised by residents of a neighbouring property that it would appear to incorporate some of their land. We are particularly worried by safety concerns raised by

residents about the proximity of the roundabout to their drives, especially for Falcon House where visibility will be limited. If TWBC were minded to grant this application, further work is required to ensure that the roundabout design will work safely for all users.

It is unacceptable that the accident data utilised in the Transport Assessment is so out of date, especially given that there was a fatal accident at a junction with the High Street very near to the proposed roundabout less than a year ago.

The proposed alterations at the Flimwell junction need further examination. We note the absence of statements from East Sussex and Highways England, which is concerning given that this proposal is reliant on changes to the A21 in East Sussex. A statement from both of these highways authorities is essential.

Sustainability:

There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11 of NPPF). However, this application is **not sustainable**.

This is not a sustainable location for a development of this size. Yes, it is reasonably close to the village facilities at Highgate. But there are very limited local employment opportunities. Existing facilities and services are of a size suitable for a village and will not be able to accommodate such a large influx of residents. Therefore, this development will actually be encouraging the use of private cars.

Table 2.2 of the Transport Assessment provides walking distances, many of which do fall below the 800m limit identified in the NDP (7.17) although notably neither the school or Tesco fall within this limit. This is measured from the roundabout, not from the housing itself, which admittedly would be impossible due to the size of the site. Consequently, the actual walking distance will be well beyond this for many of the potential residents of this new development. Paragraph 2.5.2 of the Transport Assessment recognises that residents will be unable to get to work or secondary education on foot. There are no state schools within walking distance of this development. It is misleading to suggest that these trips could be made by public transport. There is no bus service to the nearest train station. Hawkhurst children attending Cranbrook School are not eligible for a school bus service. The timing and infrequency of buses severely limits the practicality of using buses to get to and from work, for instance, the last bus leaves Tunbridge Wells at 18:33.

The properties at the northern end of the site are not within walking distance of the facilities at Highgate. Recently an application for development in a similar location (19/01313) was turned down on the grounds that it was not considered to comprise a sustainable location, stating that “residents would be reliant on the use of private cars for the majority of trips, which does not support the move to a low carbon future as required by Paragraph 95 of the National Planning Policy Framework.”

The Transport Assessment (2.3.4) asserts that “the local highway network within Hawkhurst is also considered suitable for on-carriageway cycling due to the low-speed environment within the village.” This is so far from the truth. Hawkhurst has a significant issue with speeding and several residents have presented data from the local Speedwatch group to corroborate this. These roads which are “suitable for on-carriageway cycling” are the same roads which are considered to be unsafe for speed checks by the police, the same roads where residents’ parked cars are frequently damaged, the same roads where a speed survey for another proposed development (19/01299/FULL) recorded 85th percentile average vehicle speeds of 39.3mph and 41.4mph in the 30mph limit. Hawkhurst roads are not safe for cycling.

Since current residents of Hawkhurst rely on their cars to access services, it seems highly fanciful to suggest that future residents will not do the same.

Sustainability has three dimensions - economic, social and environmental. In terms of the economic objective, there is no doubt that a development of this size will provide employment opportunities during the construction phase. However, this would apply regardless of where the development occurred. It is highly questionable whether there will be any economic benefit to the village in the longer term. There are concerns that closing the Cranbrook Road will impact on the businesses there, as they will lose passing trade. Given the choice of driving around the "relief" road, joining the queuing traffic back into the shops on the Rye Road, fighting for the inadequate parking spaces or driving to Cranbrook, it seems likely that many residents in the northeast quadrant of the village will opt to shop in Cranbrook. Similarly, many residents in Flimwell currently shop in Hawkhurst. Why would they choose to join the queues into the village centre when they can simply follow the road to Cranbrook?

In terms of the social dimension, whilst the provision of the Village Park is potentially a positive, this comes with the loss of open green space and sports facilities, plus a huge addition to the population that will alter village life irrevocably. It is hard to see how this could be considered a social benefit. The increase in traffic and overdemand for limited resources will do nothing to support our community's health, social and cultural wellbeing.

There is no environmental benefit to this proposal. It will involve the removal of numerous mature trees. Whilst these may not be assessed as particularly good specimens, they still provide valuable habitat for local wildlife. This proposal will impact on numerous species: dormice, bats, badgers, reptiles, newts, eels, birds, hedgehogs, in addition to all of the other wildlife that inhabits this area. This application would result in the bat roosts being removed, slow worms and grass snakes having to be relocated, the loss of dormice habitat and loss of birds' breeding habitat.

Traffic:

Hawkhurst cannot cope with current levels of traffic let alone that which would result from this development. Hawkhurst crossroads is severely overcapacity.

We note that the developers believe that that the new road would result in a betterment in the traffic at Hawkhurst crossroads. However, we have great reservations about the accuracy of the traffic data. Firstly, the traffic surveys were taken in the period between the "Beast from the East" and the "mini Beast from the East" when drivers were being warned of the dangers of driving, and were advised to stay at home. Secondly, no attempt has been made to measure traffic throughout the summer when both the A21 and A268 are heavily congested with traffic heading to the coast. Obviously, to be of value a traffic survey needs to be representative of normal traffic conditions. But as main routes to the coast, the massive increase in tourist traffic is normal and, as a consequence, these roads are just as congested (if not more so) at weekends as on weekdays.

The analysis in Section 6 of the Transport Assessment seems particularly questionable. For example, the exclusion of Hastings as a destination for food shopping reveals a concerning lack of local knowledge, which is particularly troubling when all of the assumptions in this section of the report appear to be based on DHA's "professional experience and local knowledge".

The Campaign to Protect Hawkhurst Village's objection provides detailed information with regard to the traffic impacts (Section 4), most of which are based on the traffic data provided in the application. **The applicant's own traffic data demonstrates that there will be a significant increase in traffic through the crossroads compared to the current situation.** This is despite the fact that it has not allowed for the 10% of induced traffic that can be expected to result from the introduction of the new road. This is a significant increase in traffic through a junction that is already operating over capacity. Table 4-10 of the Environmental Statement demonstrates that the golf course development will result in 96% more traffic approaching the crossroads from the High Street than would be the case if the development and "relief" road did not go ahead in 2033 (this represents a 136% increase on the current situation). The "relief" road will not solve Hawkhurst's traffic problem - it simply diverts it around a longer route.

Residents have raised concerns about the impact of the increased traffic flow on the conservation area at Iddenden Green. In practice, the impact of the increased traffic levels will be felt well beyond Hawkhurst. The Flimwell crossroads is already overcapacity and this development will exacerbate this. It is not uncommon for southbound queues to start at the Lamberhurst bypass (especially in the summer with the traffic for the coast), resulting in traffic diverting through Goudhurst, or via Wadhurst and Ticehurst in an attempt to avoid the queues. The fact that satnavs recommend a diversion route through Tunbridge Wells itself in order to avoid traffic gives some indication of just how severe the congestion is.

We have no confidence that this proposal will improve the traffic situation in Hawkhurst or that the proposed minor alterations to the Flimwell junction will make this a viable alternative route.

Of particular concern is that the "false promise" of the "relief" road will prevent any alternative effective solutions to Hawkhurst's traffic issues being explored.

Environmental Concerns:

None of us can ignore the environmental threats we are facing. Indeed, TWBC has recently declared a climate emergency. In this context, there is no justification for a development of this size in a location so poorly served by public transport. The future occupants of this development will be reliant on their cars for work, shopping, etc. This in itself is contrary to the NPPF which requires that "significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion, emissions, and improve air quality and public health" (para 103). There is no genuine choice of transport modes in Hawkhurst. There is no railway station, buses are infrequent and there is no bus service to our nearest station at Etchingham. But more than this, the congestion on the local roads within the village, the neighbouring junction with the A21 at Flimwell and on the A21 itself result in even more emissions.

In light of this, there cannot be many locations in the Borough that are less suited to a development of this size than Hawkhurst. There is simply no viable alternative to using a car!

It is our belief that the air pollution levels in Hawkhurst are unacceptably high. This has been monitored for the past year and we should have data available later this month. The additional cars associated with this development will result in even greater air pollution. Of particular concern is the section of road along the High Street from the proposed roundabout to the centre of the village. The pavement here is below the level of the road, so any pedestrians' heads are level with the exhausts. There will be a significant increase in traffic on this route (136% of current traffic levels) as not

only will it have to accommodate the traffic travelling east/west along the A268, but also all of the re-routed traffic that currently travels on the A229 north/south.

Coupled with this increase in traffic congestion is the removal of 154 individual trees and 17 groups of trees - just for the road. At this stage, there is no indication of how many further trees will need to be removed for the housing. Not only will this development add to the level of air pollution in our village, but it is also reducing the trees which are the "lungs" of our village.

The Woodland Trust objects to this application on the basis of potential deterioration and disturbance to two areas of ancient woodland; a concern which is shared by many Hawkhurst residents. Their objection is based on the fact that there is no wholly exceptional reason for the development as would be required by the NPPF (paragraph 175).

Summary:

The much-touted relief road proposal proves to be a disappointment. We suspect many villagers had anticipated something more akin to the Lamberhurst bypass. It is still questionable whether this would have been worth sacrificing such a beautiful and sensitive site, but at least it would have provided hope that our ongoing traffic woes might have been resolved. Instead, we have a proposal that simply reroutes the existing traffic, together with adding a further 800+ cars as well as opening the village up to further development - at least until it has been proved that the "improvements" haven't improved things at all, by which time it will be too late and our village will have been destroyed.

Recommendation:

We **object** to this application.

We understand that the traffic lights at Hawkhurst crossroads are not currently utilising the most effective technology. We have been advised that the use of Puffin technology would improve the performance of the lights. Surely, this should be implemented before a huge swathe of greenfield land in the AONB is sacrificed.

If TWBC is minded to approve this application, then it is essential that action is taken to change the HGV route (and satnavs) to prevent traffic using the A229 south of this development.

More steps need to be taken to protect wildlife and habitats, for instance ensuring that buffers to the ancient woodland are at least 20m, that appropriate provision is put in place to protect wildlife from the road etc.

Regardless of its objection to this application, Hawkhurst Parish Council will be submitting a Section 106 request. Section 106 obligations are supposed to mitigate the impacts of a development proposal. However, given that HPC has no experience of an application of this size - hardly surprising, given that it is without precedent within the AONB - the Parish Council requires more time to work on this.

Please ensure that HPC has submitted a Section 106 request before an agreement is reached with the developer.

38	19/02124/FULL	Construction of single storey side extension to create a larger kitchen / dining room; new porch; alterations to fenestration	Yew Tree Farm, Slip Mill Lane, Hawkhurst, Kent TN18 5AJ
<p>Background: <i>Materials match host house. No comments from neighbours.</i></p> <p>Comments and Recommendation: This appears to be a modest extension, which will be towards the back of the property. It does not appear to impact on neighbouring properties. It complies with the NDP in that it is sympathetic to the host house and materials have been chosen to match those of the house.</p> <p>We support this application.</p>			
39	19/01725/FULL	Construction of trade effluent Dissolved Air Filtration (DAF) unit, storage tanks, separation and treatment units in sub-basement, with low rise single storey shell building, and associated drainage and groundworks (Part retrospective)	Hawkhurst Station Business Park, Units 8 and 9, Gills Green, Hawkhurst, TN18 5BD
<p>Background: <i>The DAF tanks and treatment units have already been installed without planning permission as it was thought this could be done under permitted development rights. They have actually extended 3.3m outside of the site curtilage and the LBD. No comments from neighbours. Environmental protection have not raised any objections.</i></p> <p>Comments and Recommendation: We note that this treatment plant (already installed) was required by Southern Water.</p> <p>This land is identified for employment use and this is supported the NDP (10.18). The planned single-storey shell building will match the other units on the site. It is single-storey and will not appear out of place. It seems likely that enclosing the treatment plant and the addition of an acoustic fence will be of benefit to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>It is highly concerning that no one involved in the construction of this project checked whether planning permission was required or was apparently aware of limits for development. However, we recognise the necessity of appropriate water treatment. Therefore, we support this application.</p>			

40	19/02175/FULL	Proposed two storey rear and side extension and alterations	5, Lillesden Cottages, The Moor, Hawkhurst TN18 4NS
<p>Background: <i>Properties are within the conservation area. It is a big extension and, although set back from the front of the property, it will be visible from the road. No comments from neighbours.</i></p> <p>Comments and Recommendation: We note that materials have been chosen to match existing and, in this respect, the application does comply with the NDP. However, we have concerns that the extension is not sympathetic to the host house due to its size. Despite being set back, it will be clearly visible from the road and will dominate the property from the rear.</p> <p>As indicated in the heritage statement, these cottages are mentioned in the Conservation Area Appraisal which states “They have considerable impact on the conservation area due to their steeply pitched roofs, the quality of detailing...” None of the other Lillesden Cottages appear to have been altered in such an extensive manner as proposed here.</p> <p>We object to this application as we are concerned that it will have a negative impact on the Conservation Area and the street scene more generally.</p>			
41	19/02304/FULL	Erection of double garage	Silverley, Slip Mill Lane, Hawkhurst TN18 5AD
<p>Background: <i>We objected to the previous application earlier this year because the garage would be sited on raised land, well forward of the line of the other buildings. It was refused by TWBC on the grounds it was not “modest”, did not respect the context of the site, would detract from the character and setting of the dwelling and would have a harmful landscape impact as it would be in a prominent location some distance forward of the host dwelling. It would dominate the view from the road and would interrupt the open nature of the land in front of the dwellings in this location. No comments from neighbours.</i></p> <p>Comments and Recommendation: This site is outside the LBD on a rural lane, other than the introduction of a native species hedge (which is to be welcomed), we cannot see any significant difference to the previous application to which we objected. Therefore, our concerns stand. This remains an application for a garage sited well forward of the line of other buildings and which will impact on the street scene. It remains contrary to HD4 of the NDP (7.31). The Alterations & Extensions SPD indicates that garages should not normally be in front of domestic properties. We cannot see any reason why this should not apply in this case.</p> <p>It appears that the applicant is suggesting that the removal of the “unsightly” unauthorised shipping container is an advantage of this proposal. Surely the applicant should either remove the unsightly shipping container or seek planning permission for it seeing as it has been unlawfully sited at the front of the property outside the LBD in the AONB?</p>			

Section 6 of the planning statement refers to precedents namely Birchside and Sunnymead, and Random Acres. Paragraph 13 of the delegated report for the previous application makes it clear that the garages of Birchside and Sunnymead are not a precedent for this development, that they are some distance from the site and are not seen in the context of Silverley or the houses immediately around it.

This will also apply for Random Acres, which is even further away from Silverley. It should also be noted that there was already a garage at Random Acres and the planning permission given in 2017 was for a replacement garage.

Furthermore, paragraph 13 of the delegated report for the previous application makes the point that planting cannot be used to hide harmful development. Something that is further backed up by the photograph of the garage at Random Acres in the planning statement, in which the garage is very prominent despite the condition requiring the planting of a native hedge (6.3).

We **object** to this application.

42	19/02176/FULL	Demolition of existing garage and erection of proposed garage, workshop and annex.	Little Pix Hall, High Street, Hawkhurst TN18 4XT
----	---------------	--	--

Background:

Proposal is to demolish existing single-storey brick garage and workshop and replace with two-storey garage. The current garage is not deep enough to park cars. The proposed garage will have two secure spaces and two open spaces, plus a workshop area and a small annex on the upper floor. Although house is listed, garage is not mentioned in the listing. No comments from neighbours.

Comments and Recommendation:

This application complies with HD4 of the NDP in that it is proposed to use traditional materials similar to those of the host house and other buildings within the curtilage. The timber cladding will match the barn style of the pool house, and the brick plinths and clay roof tiles match the main house.

The replacement garage will be in broadly the same location as the current garage. It does not appear to be visible from the road or to impact on other neighbouring properties.

The replacement garage will look more like a traditional barn than the existing garage does, but this does not appear out of keeping with its location and the AONB more generally.

The proposed annex is modest: one bedroom, a bathroom and one other room combining kitchen dining and living space. The application states that this will be ancillary to the host house and we would expect to see a condition that ensured this was the case.

We **support** this application, but request a condition that ties the annex to the host house.
