

PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE

UPDATE SHEET

12 October 2016

Section 1

Item 6 –16/P/0032/O Tickenham Garden Centre, Clevedon Road/Church Lane, Tickenham,

Additional information from the applicant

The applicant has written in response to the assessment made in the Committee report. This indicates that:

- The footprint of the existing buildings is 4562 sqm whilst the footprint of the proposed development equates to 3331 sqm. It is contended that the reduction in footprint with a dispersed built form is better than the current grouping of glasshouses present on the site, which because of their reflective nature are visible over a wider distance.
- The main glasshouses have a ridge height of 4.7m which is material when assessing the openness of the Green Belt
- Construction of new buildings only where the glasshouses currently sit would compress the development and result in a high density form of development
- The areas of hardstanding without buildings were used for vehicle parking and building dwellings in this location is a better solution for the Green Belt
- Financial contributions towards the provision of school transport and new bus stops help to mitigate against the isolated rural location
- The repositioned site access is an improvement for highways safety
- The proposed development is potentially very attractive and the density of 16 dwellings per hectare is not overdevelopment
- The reduction in the extent of hardstanding will help create a far more rural landscape character and provide a flood risk betterment
- The proposed housing picks up the rural character of the area and provides much need accommodation for empty nesters. The 3-bedroom dwellings proposed will contribute positively to the housing mix of the area in accordance with Policy CS15 and achieving sustainable development

Officer comments:

There is an error in the wording of the committee report on page 9 (paragraph 3) where reference is made in the paragraph to the footprint of the development being greater than the current buildings. For clarification this should read floorspace rather than footprint. Accordingly, whilst it may be the case that the footprint of the buildings does reduce, the overall scale of the proposed development both in terms of floorspace and extent of the developed area is larger than that of the existing buildings on the site. This is material in the assessment of whether a proposal has a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The impact of the additional floorspace to be created together with the greater spread of the built form over a substantial proportion of the site which is currently free from any buildings or structures is addressed in the report.

PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE

UPDATE SHEET

12 October 2016

It is noted that the glasshouses have a ridge height of up to 4.7m dropping down to an eaves height of between 2.5m and 2.85m. The benefits that would accrue to the openness of the Green Belt by the removal of these buildings from part of the site has to be weighed against the impact on the openness of the Green Belt that would result from the proposed residential and commercial development extending across a greater area.

The provision of financial contributions towards school transport and provision of open space with a water meadow and play area would mitigate some of the impacts of the development and have been taken into account in the assessment of the development. The issue of “planning gain” has to be considered in the context of the guidance for seeking planning obligations.

The repositioning of the site access onto Clevedon Road does improve the visibility splay and this in turn changes the vehicle access from one which is substandard to a vehicle access which is considered to be adequate. The scheme does not however address the concerns in terms of lack of safe pedestrian and cycling routes which are part of the consideration of the sustainability of a site.

The applicant states that the proposal meets the terms of policy CS15 of the Core Strategy. This policy seeks to ensure there is a genuine mix of housing. In reducing the proposal from 41 to 32 dwellings the amended scheme has focused only on the provision of 3 bed dwellings with the target market of ‘empty-nesters’. This has been achieved by reducing the number of smaller, more affordable units. The applicant has also indicated an intention to use the combined internal area of the glasshouses to offset the requirement to provide on-site affordable housing or off-site financial contributions through the vacant building credit