I wish to submit the following supplementary comment in relation to application 2026/91484.

Having undertaken a more detailed comparison of the original approved plans and the revised proposals, I consider that the principal planning issue is not necessarily the overall quantity of Public Open Space (POS), but the significant change to its purpose, function and public value.

The applicant states that the proposal maintains the overall provision of Public Open Space. Even if the gross area of green space remains broadly similar, that does not mean the amended scheme delivers the same planning benefits as the approved development.

The approved scheme deliberately created a publicly accessible landscape centred around the two retained oak trees and associated dry stone feature. The two trees, which stand in such close proximity that they read as a single mature landscape feature, formed the focal point of a connected area of public open space. This space was designed to be experienced and accessed via a dedicated pedestrian pathway which curved through the centre of the green, encouraging movement, appreciation of the retained landscape features and informal recreation.

The current proposal fundamentally changes that concept. The pedestrian pathway has been removed entirely and the introduction of plots 27 and 27a changes the relationship between the retained trees and the surrounding public space. The remaining POS becomes a differently configured landscape rather than the integrated public amenity that was previously approved.



This is therefore not simply a question of whether a similar amount of green land remains. The relevant planning question is whether the revised layout continues to provide an equivalent level of public benefit in terms of accessibility, connectivity, landscape character, recreational value and placemaking.

The original approval was supported by landscape, ecological and design documents that consistently promoted the retention of this area around the oak trees as an important component of the development. The revised proposal departs from that original design approach. In my view, the Council should therefore assess not only the quantity of Public Open Space, but also whether the amended scheme delivers the same quality and planning function that formed part of the justification for the original permission.

I respectfully request that these matters are fully considered when determining the application.