

# Planning & Regulatory Committee 17 March 2021

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	<p><b>Planning Application No. 20/P/2327/FUL:</b> Change of use of land and extension of existing steel-framed barn for personal hobby use for storage of heritage buses. Slimeridge Farm, Links Road Uphill Weston-super-Mare BS23 4XY</p>	<p><b>Against the proposal:</b> Uphill Village Society <b>(statement to be read by Michele Chesterman)</b></p> <p><b>For the proposal:</b> Jonathan Jones- Pratt, applicant <b>(statement to be read by Hazel Brinton)</b></p>
07	<p><b>Planning Application No. 20/P/2447/FUL:</b> Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2no detached dwellings with ancillary works at 234 Down Road, Portishead, BS20 8HU</p>	<p><b>Against the proposal:</b> Tina Mason <b>(statement to be read by Michele Chesterman)</b></p> <p><b>For the proposal:</b> Davies Architectural Services, agent on behalf of the applicant <b>(statement to be read by Hazel Brinton)</b></p>

Statement in objection from Leigh Morris on behalf of Uphill Village Society

Re Planning Application No. 20/P/2327/FUL

Dear Committee

In the light of information received from the applicant yesterday, 15 March we would like to withdraw our letter of 28th October 2020 and replace it with the following.

1 If the applicant has been able to satisfy the authority that the vehicles being garaged at Slimeridge Farm are a private collection and do not form part of or are used by Crosville Vintage Ltd this would alleviate our original concern as to a conflict with the supporting statement lodged with the application.

2 We are concerned that if the vehicles in question do form part of Crosville Vintage Ltd in addition to being a private hobby collection this could see an increase in movement to and from the farm as the website for Crosville Vintage Ltd does not suggest that it only operates during a limited part of the year or impose any limitation on the number of events that buses can be hired for.

3 The supporting statement's case for approval states that the proposal contributes positively to, inter-alia local tourism and rural enterprise. This might suggest that the change of use is for business/tourism purposes and not simply to house a hobby.

4 We would ask that the committee consider the visual impact of the proposed development.

**Written Statement by the applicant Mr Jonathan Jones-Pratt, Slimeridge Farm, Links Rd, Uphill  
in support of the following application**

Application ref 20/P/2327/FUL - Change of use of land and extension of existing steel-framed barn  
for personal hobby use for storage of heritage buses

I have been collecting, vintage buses and steam engines since I was 16 yrs old. This is my passion and whilst some people may think I am rather strange with my extensive collection there are many who have seen or been able to tour with us absolutely love and value the vintage collection.

At the moment these busses are spread across 5 different thoroughly unsuitable locations as far away as Coventry. This application for an extension to the existing barn would allow the most valuable buses of the vintage fleet to be maintained and stored in a controlled environment in one place here in North Somerset.

We already have a change of use permission to store some of the vintage fleet in this existing barn which along with this proposed extension is difficult to see from the village or the highway.

The planning officer accepts and concludes that the development will have insignificant impact on the countryside, insignificant impact on residences along links road and insignificant impact on the listed building and scheduled monument.

The report argues that the flood risk sequential test has not been passed. This assessment is incomplete.

Government guidance on sequential tests allows for extensions to existing buildings to pass the sequential test given the physical constraint that they are attached to existing building and are extensions of existing uses. This is made clear in our statement. The planning officer makes no reference to this element. The proposed extension is located outside the flood defence bund and will not increase flood risk to anyone other than myself –we have detailed the mitigation to limit that risk.

The officers report dismisses or is silent on the stated benefits of this application which have not been properly weighed. The stated reasons for refusal are far outweighed by the benefits:

- The heritage bus collection is a tourism asset that forms part of the Weston Super mare offer, as acknowledged by Weston town council.
- The restoration and maintenance of this private collection costs many thousands per month. All spent locally and equating to employing 8 full time specialists and engineers.
- This project helps to fund and provide the necessary training for important engineering skills. The suppliers we are employing several apprentices as part of their teams. We are in discussion with Weston College to provide variety of vehicle types to maximise the learning opportunities but this needs the collection in one location.
- The majority of neighbours and locals in our community love to see the buses when they are on parade, there is recognition of the importance of preserving and show casing our engineering legacy.

I ask you to consider both the submissions missed in the officer report and to weigh these benefits when making your assessment.

JJP 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021

I live at 236 Down Road and I **OBJECT** to the application.

### 1. Outlook and Character

The area of Down Road to which this application relates is almost exclusively of bungalows and chalet style houses, with the exception of 232/232A - substantial townhouses. The recommendation to accept is seemingly based on the proposed development being in keeping with the 232 development, which has had a significant adverse impact on the character of the street due to the substantial size of these houses on the half size plots.

The bulk, scale, mass and the proximity of the two proposed units to each other would result in overdevelopment, appearing incongruous and out of place, even taking into account the existing dwellings at 232.

If 232 is used as a precedent, other developers will build enormous houses on small plots ruining the character of the area, increase housing density, causing congestion and reducing light. Of the 28 objections to this application (per the recommendation document), the vast majority reference the adverse impact 232 has had on the road.

### 2. Overwhelming size

The bulk and scale of the proposals means they are overbearing and create a harmful sense of enclosure to 236. The proposed property will impact use of our ground floor deck and first floor balcony, creating a sense of enclosure.

The recommendation proposes the development be approved on the basis that it complies with the RDG1 test in terms of depth, width and height. The balcony shown in diagrams 1 and 2, **omitted from the developer's plans**, is set further back into the dormer **and may not meet the 45 degree rule**. The balcony is clearly visible in the plans for 236 on the council website.

The dwellings would be some ~2m in height higher than 236. The roof at 236 Down Road starts at the top of the ground floor and is pitched away from 234.

### 3. Driveway

Highways have stipulated an 8 degree angle on the driveway. The drop from the pavement to the property level is approximately 1.8m. It has not been demonstrated how turning/parking on a two level driveway could be achieved.

I respectfully request that the planning committee agrees with the stated position of Portishead Town Council, the local people and in line with your Local Plan and refuses this application. Thank you for your time.

Statement in support 20P2447FUL 234 Down Road, Portishead – agent for applicant

The proposals at 234 Down Road provide two new dwellings on an existing site within the settlement boundary, which is strongly supported by planning policy at local and national levels, as well as across the political spectrum. The principle of developing a brownfield site for intensified residential use is reinforced by the Core Strategy, with Central Government refocusing on the importance of increasing densities in urban areas, as they are sustainable locations for housing.

Placing development here is a key benefit of the scheme as it provides residents in a location where they are able to walk, cycle or use public transport to access everyday facilities. Providing housing within the settlement boundary takes pressure off the need to develop greenfield sites, as well as boosting housing supply, which is particularly needed in North Somerset at the current time.

We acknowledge local concerns raised which were related to the street scene, parking, overlooking and overbearing. However, during the application we have addressed these issues by making amendments to the proposals.

This has included reducing the scale of the dwellings so that they match the building line of the neighbouring properties; removing the cycle/bin store from the front; lowering the ridge height; replacing the original balconies with Juliet balconies; removing the raised decking to the rear; and amending the site access and parking.

Whilst the proposals are very similar to the neighbouring site which was granted permission by members in 2018, we believe that they represent an improvement over what was permitted at number 232, as the proposed design bridges the gap between the more historic properties found in Down Road and the newly implemented scheme on the adjacent land.

Since the adjacent application was granted permission, there have been no significant changes in planning policy that would warrant a different conclusion being reached. It would therefore be unreasonable to dismiss this application on the grounds of design, layout or character.

Officers have also considered the potential impact from overbearing on the adjacent properties, including number 236 Down Road. Whilst concerns have been raised about loss of light into their kitchen, it has been concluded that the scheme is compliant with the Residential Design Guide, because it does not affect the primary source of light into this habitable room.

We have worked positively with officers and have addressed public comments as far as possible, which has resulted in a scheme which responds to the local context more appropriately. We therefore respectfully request that members approve the proposals in line with your officer's recommendation.

