

**EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
ON 5 SEPTEMBER 2018**

UPDATE REPORT

Item No: (1) **Application No:** 18/01516/HOUSE **Page No.** 39-52

Site: Grimms Dyke, Aldworth

Planning Officer Presenting: Mr Bob Dray

Member Presenting: N/A

Parish Council Representative speaking: N/A

Objector(s) speaking: Mrs Tracey Godsmark
Mr Clive Sturgess
Mr David Sheppard

Supporter(s) speaking: N/A

Applicant/Agent speaking: Mr Shinkwin

Ward Member(s): Councillor Alan Law

1. Additional Consultation Responses and Representations

Archaeology

Following queries at the committee site visit, the Council's Archaeological Officer has provided the following consultation response:

Although the house is named Grim's (or Grimms) Dyke, the linear earthwork with the name Grim's Ditch is not within the site, and the proposed house extension is more than 100m away from the scheduled parts of the monument. Grim's Ditch is an enigmatic feature, suggested to be a territorial boundary rather than anything defensive; possibly near the De La Beche farm, parts of it may have formed part of a deer park. The De La Beche site itself is of historical interest, being a probable

medieval manor as well as a historic farmstead, but 'Grimms Dyke' is a relatively recent building, on land which was used as a poultry farm from the later 20th century (the farm is shown on the 1973 5th Epoch OS mapping but not before, when the adjacent house now named Foxborough was called 'Grimsdyke'). Were a new house to be proposed now on land close to a scheduled monument we would probably request a field evaluation, but as this land has already been disturbed by the poultry farm and by the construction of the later Grimms Dyke, I do not believe this would be worthwhile. I think it is unlikely that the erection of the garden/quiet room will have a major impact on any features of archaeological significance.

In light of the above consultation response, and having regard to Core Strategy Policy CS19 and the heritage guidance within the NPPF, it not considered necessary to require any further archaeological assessment of the site.

Public Representations

Several items of correspondence have been received since the publication of the committee report. Interested parties have raised the following points:

1. It has been questioned whether Policy C6 of the HSA DPD is relevant to the proposed development. [Officer note: Policy C6 is considered relevant to the proposed development]
2. It must be made clear to the Committee that the proposed building is detached from the main house; it is not an attached extension.
3. It has been suggested that the intended use of the proposed building is not for purposes ancillary/incidental to the residential use of Grimms Dyke.
4. Clarification has been received that the loss of mature vegetation in Spring 2015 constituted a breach of Condition 7 of Application 153378, rather than Condition 2 of 15/02915/HOUSE as stated in paragraph 6.5.10 of the committee report.

2. Appeal Decision (Application 16/01049/HOUSE)

Following a request at the committee site visit, copies of the appeal decision and plans for the above refused application are attached for information.

3. Use of outbuilding

It has been alleged that the outbuilding may be put to use for purposes which are not ancillary/incidental to the residential use of Grimms Dyke. Condition 4 of the recommendation addresses this concern.

4. Landscaping

Condition 7 of Application 153378 provides the following restriction on the application site:

The existing trees and shrubs on the site shall not be lopped, topped, felled, lifted, removed or disturbed in any way without the prior written permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

A significant amount of mature vegetation was removed from the application site in spring 2015 without permission. This constituted a breach of Condition 7. This matter was investigated at the time without establishing the need for formal action. It is acknowledged that a new boundary hedge and a cordon of beech trees have already been planted.

However, the proposed level of landscaping indicated on the Block Plan is considered to go beyond what is necessary to simply mitigate the impact of the proposed development, and therefore enhances the existing situation in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS14. This in turn will help mitigate the criticised removal of mature vegetation in recent years.

The landscaping shown on the Block Plan is insufficiently detailed to secure an enforceable landscaping scheme. For this reason, condition 7 of the recommendation requires the prior approval of a detailed landscaping scheme, complete with planting schedules and detailed plans before any development takes place. Subject to this condition, it is considered that the proposed development would respect and enhance the character and appearance of the area, and incidentally help ameliorate the criticised removal of mature vegetation.