

# Planning & Regulatory Committee 16 September 2020

Requests to address the Committee received in accordance with the Standing Orders

**Public Participation under Standing Order No. 17 (up to a maximum of five minutes per speaker - this section should not exceed thirty minutes):**

Name	Subject

**Public Speaking on applications for planning permission under Standing Order 17A (up to a maximum of three minutes per speaker - this section should not exceed thirty minutes):**

Agenda Item No.	Application	Statement (s)
06	<b>Planning Application No. 20/P/0605/R3</b> Erection of an up to 85 place, single storey Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties School (use class D1) for 3yrs to 19yrs including classrooms, recreation hall, dining hall, hydro-therapy pool and therapy rooms plus external play areas, parking and amenity space on land adjacent to Brookfield Walk, Clevedon, BS21 6YG	<b>Against the proposal:</b> Jakobus van Blerk  <b>For the proposal:</b> Ed Bowen Roberts and Kenton Mee

<p>07 and 08</p>	<p><b>Planning Application Nos. 19/P/2298/FUL</b> Erection of a terrace of 3no.dwellings (1 x two-bedroom, 2 x three-bedroom) and 1no. detached four bedroom dwelling with associated parking, refuse storage and landscaping following demolition of the existing garage and warehouse (Resubmission) Stafford Garage 1 Woodlands Road, Clevedon</p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Planning Application Nos. 19/P/2313/FUL</b> 19/P/2313/FUL – Demolition of existing garage to form amenity area and storage to proposed development of four dwellings 1 Woodlands Road, Clevedon</p>	<p><b>Against the proposal:</b></p> <p><b>For the proposal:</b> Clare Hillier-Brown, agent for the applicant</p>
<p>09</p>	<p><b>Planning Application No. 20/P/0725/FUL</b> - Retrospective application for the change of use from care home to 10 bedroom HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) (Sui Generis Use) 15 Clarence Road East, WSM</p>	<p><b>Against the proposal:</b> Julia Kendrick</p>

## **Statement from Jakobus van Blerk objection to 20/P/0605/R3**

Currently there are over 1075 online objections to this application not forgetting the 358 written objections which makes up 35% of the east ward of Clevedon. The local town council objects. The civic society object, the environmental agency objects. The people want to know what the point is in participating in the planning process and how their voices are respected.

The people of Clevedon has informed the council that the location for the school is wrong for many reasons.(green belt , loss of public open space, distance from town centre, outside settlement boundary, noise and pollution form M5 , traffic and social impacts)

We want to know who makes the decision to go against the council's own regulations in deciding that a community of over 4551 should lose over 90% of its open space. Leaving one of the most deprived communities in NS even more disadvantaged. The social implications of this decision will have a big impact on Clevedon for a long time to come.

It is imperative that the information presented to the planning comity is accurate and correct especially if NSC is the applicant. So that the people who participated have confidence in the process and don't feel disenfranchised.

The council still states Local green space has higher protection then Green belt which is incorrect.

The council still stated the land is 2 hectares when it is less than 1.8 Hectares including the trees and hedgerows

The facts are important because in the sifting process all land smaller than 2 hectares was discounted.

Distance to town centre is 1,2km. So not walking distance as claimed

There are no amenities in walking distance from Brookfield walk.

What has happened to the caring council that wants to build healthy communities that encourage the people to explore and enjoy open spaces? A council that refuses to use Mark Canniford's plan B on a site that has already had a 210-place school application approved back in 1992. A council that turns down the offer from the MP to work with the council and the school to find a solution to the location and funding problem. If this application gets approved today, when the council has not answered any of the questions the public raised, it puts its credibility at stake and gambles that the Secretary of State also ignores the unanswered question. In the formal appropriation process the council will have to prove that the public open space is no longer needed. With all the evidence presented how can that be proved?

## **Statement in support of the planning application to expand Baytree School onto a second site located at Brookfield Walk, Clevedon**

Baytree School serves children in North Somerset with very profound and complex additional needs, including children who are non-verbal and non-ambulant. This need is growing, with projections indicating significant increases in children with an Education, Health and Care Plan in the coming years.

The delivery of these plans, increasing the number of school places from 72 to 120 across two sites, will ensure that children have access to a learning environment meeting their learning, health and wellbeing needs fully, while remaining part of the North Somerset community.

- Baytree provides education and support for children with complex needs from age 3 to 19, continuity which is greatly valued by families. These plans enable more children to benefit from this essential support.
- Baytree is already over capacity, with spaces for September 2021 limited. This will mean further children are either placed in a setting which cannot fully meet their needs or are transported out of North Somerset to receive education.
- Suitable alternative provision may involve vulnerable children undertaking significant daily travel (eg. to Bristol or Bridgwater). This has the potential to impact on their education, physical health, emotional health and wellbeing and family life.
- Such placements and associated transport also incur considerable costs for the Council.
- The support of a wider community of parents and carers is critical to families of children with complex needs. Local school provision fosters this community and enables this support to continue.
- Attending a local school enables parents and carers to participate fully in their child's education, something which is challenging if children are educated elsewhere.
- The plans offer additional potential to deliver therapies and health interventions on-site, reducing children's travel and ensuring they spend less time away from school.

The plans to build a second site expanding Baytree School are widely supported by families and professionals in education, health and social care. The identified location in Clevedon enables Baytree to be part of a supportive local community, while bringing more children in North Somerset closer to the support they need and ensuring that families in the north of the district can access the same high-quality support as those in Weston and Worle.

We would urge you to approve this application, and to share in our commitment to meeting the complex needs of these local children and young people. Any further delay in progressing these plans will impact the most vulnerable children in our area greatly.

**Ed Bowen Roberts**  
**Headteacher**  
**Baytree School**

**Kenton Mee**  
**Chair**  
**North Somerset Parent Carers Working Together**

## **Development Control Planning Committee – 16<sup>th</sup> September 2020 @ 2:30pm**

### **Agenda Items 7 & 8**

#### **Application No's: 19/P/2298/FUL and 19/P/2313/FUL**

I speak on behalf of the applicant in support of the applications and to address matters raised by Members during their site visit made on the 8<sup>th</sup> September.

- The owner of the site has the benefit of the use of the lane but no legal right to its upkeep. The applicant will use their 'best endeavours' to ascertain the legal ownership of the service yard to enable discussions with respect to tarmacking part or all of the access road.
- The trees identified at the members site visit are self-seeded and outside the applicants redline boundary. Officers have not raised this as an issue during the extensive application process.
- The applicant's architect has reviewed the potential to further reduce the ridge height of Plot 4. Currently in the position of Plot 4 are two 'sheds' of no architectural quality, one having a ridge height of 19.030 and a larger one having a ridge height of 21.18.

Both sheds will be removed if consent is granted, and Plot 4 will be constructed in broadly the same location but with a smaller footprint.

The maximum height of Plot 4 will be 19.030, that is to say, to match the lower of the ridge heights of the existing buildings in that location. The situation, if anything, we will remain as currently experienced.

- The proposed development will connect to the existing drainage features within the lane. The drains once constructed will be adopted.

The result of the ongoing engagement with officers, is a well-conceived, spacious scheme of high architectural quality, which creates a net enhancement, respects the conservation area, listed buildings and neighbouring dwellings.

The proposal does not constitute overdevelopment.

Access and parking arrangements marked out prior to the members site visit are considered acceptable by officers.

Whilst no evidence of bats using the buildings was found, a recommendation for avoiding impacts on bats has been identified and includes the buildings with low suitability being demolished under an ecological watching brief in the presence of a licenced ecologist.

A condition is proposed requiring bird and bat box features to be installed in each of the proposed dwellings prior to occupation.

The officer recommends the applications be approved subject to conditions after 2 years of the applicant actively working with officers and we therefore urge members to grant consent.

## **Statement from Julia Kendrick in objection to Planning Application No 20/P/0725/FUL**

The main objection to the planning concerns the demography of the area of Clarence Park. In the immediate roads surrounding both of the parks are a number of care and nursing homes for the elderly. Properties in between are, in the majority, occupied by the retired. There is also a large Pegasus Court property and Clarence House, both occupied by able bodied elderly residents. This area is very unique to other areas of Weston super Mare in having a very high population of vulnerable residents. Both parks are visited daily and enjoyed by these residents and by visiting families with young children. The application to turn no. 15 into an HRMO with 10 rooms for assisted drug and alcohol people is not suitable for this area. The Clarence Park vulnerable residents are concerned for their safety, property and the park. There is also a possibility that the park could easily attract small groups of drug or alcohol assisted people. This is already happening to other parts of the town and would certainly detract from the everyday enjoyment of residents using the park.

One local resident was personally attacked by an assisted person in Whitecross Road, even though a carer was with the assisted person concerned at the time. This resident is, obviously, very concerned over the planning application and all residents have commented that they would not hesitate in calling the police should any issues arise from this planning application being approved.

Residents have also voiced concerns over the parking. One area which was defined as not being an issue during the application process. There has been a natural increase of cars in Clarence Road East over the last few years and what with the Doctors Surgery now being a new care home for mentally and psychologically assisted, there will be staff cars as well as visitors cars. This will be the same for no.15. In fact, it could result in an increase alone of 10 cars for the no.15 property. There is only space for 3 cars at this actual property, so this would result in parking issues.

Another resident has voiced that favouritism has played a part in this application.

Finally, as per the planning objection comments raised and in summary, if due diligence has been actioned for the demographics of the immediate surrounding Clarence Park areas, the committee can only conclude that this area is just not deemed suitable for an HRMO for drug and alcohol assisted residents.