

Ref: 17/502386

### **Representation**

Further representations have been submitted which state that the various layout plans show land which is not within the applicant's ownership within the red line and raising the issue of the Eastern boundary not being the original boundary of the site.

### **Officer comments**

As indicated within the report and for clarity purposes, the layout plan shown upon drawing number 17/1074A has been superseded by drawing 17/1075B, which does not now show a portion of land to the west as within the site area (as the original layout plan did). The site location plan has also been amended to remove the said land from within the red line site area. (Unfortunately the plan within the agenda incorrectly outlines the portion of land to the west and an amended plan is therefore attached showing the corrected area.)

The issue of the additional land to the east being used as garden land is addressed within the officer report at paragraph 6.05.

Finally, it is also recommended that an additional condition seeking ecological enhancements be attached in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Recommendation**

Remains unchanged, with the addition of the following condition:

The development hereby permitted shall include the incorporation of bat tubes and/or bird bricks being built into the fabric of the building;

Reason: in the interests of biodiversity.