

Western & Southern Area Planning Committee

2 December 2021

Written Submissions

P/FUL/2021/00928 - Land adjacent Buckland House, Buckland House Lane, Buckland Rippers, Weymouth, DT3 4FT

1 John Perrott

Residents or Revenue? That really is the question you are being asked by this planning application. On one side there is the applicant who is seeking to increase the opening times of Buckland campsite to increase his income. On the other you have the interests of the residents who have to endure the adverse impact on residential amenity this campsite is already causing.

Increasing the opening times of the campsite will not bring additional visitors to the area. There are numerous campsites within one mile of Buckland Rippers able to cater for visitors in May and June that are not working to capacity. The Government is no longer instructing you to temporarily support campsites and more holidaymakers are returning to overseas locations. In short there is no real "Need" in planning terms for this development. It does not benefit the community.

And what of the residents? Some of you won't know Buckland Rippers. Buckland Campsite abuts our village and we are a small rural community of some thirty households. All of those households have submitted to the case officer a statement of objection asking that this application be refused. That submission was reviewed and agreed by each household bar one and numerous reasons for refusal were given in its 29 pages.

No reference to our statement nor the fact that the whole community is objecting has been made in the case officers written report.

Furthermore the case officer has not considered all of the objections raised and says the applicant lives on site in Buckland House which he doesn't. The case officers report contains a number of inaccuracies and selectively looks at the history of the site. The case officer comments on how noise and odour pollution were considered in previous applications but makes no reference to the reality – that residents have had to repeatedly complain to the campsite and environmental health over such matters. The report states that the nearest residential properties are 75 metres away. They are if you ignore all the traffic accessing the campsite via the route detailed on the site plan. They are if you ignore the play area and shop (built without planning permission) which aren't detailed on the site plan.

For years the community of Buckland Rippers have been asking for some effective control to be exercised over this development.

You have been elected to represent your wards and Dorset as a whole. A whole community within Dorset is asking you to consider us and to allow us to enjoy and preserve the tranquillity and amenity of our hamlet. On behalf of the Buckland Ripers and Tatton residents group I urge you to refuse this application and not to extend the time when residents have to endure the adverse impact of this campsite.

2 Jeanine Beale

The case officer's report is purely theoretical as it contains a number of discrepancies (particularly 15.9).

The report is based on an assumption. A true judgement cannot be made by outside parties when they are remote from the site.

- 1) The house is NOT occupied by the applicant. The applicant resides a few miles away.
- 2) Amenity-The significant distance of the campsite from residential properties -In the summer of 2021 the closest group of campers were less than 10 metres away from the nearest residential property which DID result in having an adverse impact on our lives. Being so close we suffer significant noise pollution from raised adult voices throughout the day well into the early hours of the morning, which we can clearly hear inside our property. We have contacted Higher Moor campsite and Environmental Health about these incidents on a number of occasions but little action appears to be taken as the noise continued into the early hours. There appears to be NO staff on site during the latter part of the evening.
- 3) Noise from both the toilets and particularly the hand driers are a particular nuisance. The noise can be clearly heard at our property. Can we add that these points have also been made on social media by campers using the site.
- 4) Cooking smells are a particular annoyance throughout the day but as you can imagine most unbearable in the evening when commercial catering companies also visit the site to sell food cooked on the premises from their vans. When the wind carries the smells we can see clouds of cooking fumes passing across our gardens. We also suffer from sewerage smells emanating from the area adjacent to the toilet block. We have reported both of these pollution issues to Environmental Health. Both the noise and air pollution result in such an unpleasant atmosphere at our property. We result to living inside the property and closing the windows to help attenuate the noise and smells. This is a massive loss of our amenity during the months the site is occupied.

Therefore this application needs to be considered carefully. The campsite and activities are NOT contained within the boundaries on the planning application. It has been expanded significantly beyond these boundaries. Therefore the reasons given as to

why the application should not affect resident's lives are not valid and a full and accurate application needs to be submitted.

It has clearly been assumed by the applicant that permission will be granted as the campsite was operational in June 2021 and is already being advertised for June 2022.

We strongly urge you to consider the residents of Buckland Rippers and refuse the application.

3 Mr & Mrs Bonham-Lovett

We ask you, our elected councillors to decide -

- NOT to delegate authority for making this decision; and
- To grant the planning application retrospectively for 2021 ONLY (to help elevate the damage to the economy caused by the COVID-19 epidemic; and
- To refuse the planning application for the future to protect the Natural Environment of Buckland Rippers.

We are asking you not to delegate Your authority because the people of this area elected You to represent us, your Constituents'.

We are sure that you want Your Legacy as a Councillor to be that you did not turn away from making the challenging decisions and that You represented the people of your area to the best of Your ability.

With regard to the application itself –

You will hear from others about the factual inaccuracies contained within the report.

You will hear from others about the wholesale destruction of our natural surrounding and the disruption of our neighbours' daily lives caused by this campsite.

We are appealing to You to give us the voice that we need in the Democratic Process.

The Committee Report gives You the legal framework for making Your decision.

The Committee Report refers to the knowledge of the Planning Enforcement's team of "alleged or actual breaches of planning control" on the site and of the land-owners "non-compliance with other legislation".

You are not "allowed" to consider that. But –

You know what you know.

You may ask yourself if a small financial contribution should be a factor in making a Democratic decision which affects your Constituents'?

You may think that it will cost the council more, in legal costs, to process and reclaim the financial contribution.

You may think that the financial contribution made to the economy by the households of the immediate area is of greater value to the Authority.

We ask you to consider carefully before you give the answer that you may feel you have to give.

You may feel you have “no choice”, that your “hands are tied”, that you “have no power”.

Imagine how we feel.

You could ask yourself “Why did I become a Councillor?”.

Was it to “Make a Difference”. Was it to “to affect change”?

We ask You to make the difficult choice.

Please Support Your Constituents’.

Please protect the natural beautiful area of Buckland Rippers.

Please be our voice.

You can make a difference.

Thank you for your time.

4 Sheila Snuggs

* No necessity to either extend the opening time nor to extend the area of this campsite. There are already many campsites within a short distance of Buckland Rippers and none have ever displayed ‘Campsite Full’ signs, including both sites owned by the applicant. This site is within a residential area, whilst other sites are not so close to habitation.

* To state this extension will help to decrease unauthorised camping is farcical - wild campers do not wish to be surrounded by other campers - many are those walking the S.W. Coastal Path, they are unlikely to venture several miles off the path to pitch up at Buckland Campsite.

* This site does not benefit the local community in any way - campers have little regard for our environment and we residents suffer noise, smells, dog fouling and litter during the summer months.

* This site since opening has been illuminated by powerful lighting 365 days a year, breaching planning conditions, disturbing residents and wildlife. This extension will coincide with bird nesting time.

* The continual development of this site contravenes Article 8, Human Rights Act - the right to respect for private and family life and home. The applicant and many campers have no regard/respect for residents in this rural hamlet.

I consider there are misleading statements in the Officers Report:

* Buckland House is not the applicants home/residence. It was bought after the death of the previous owner and this business venture was set up. He and his family live in Nottingham.

* It is stated that no neighbouring properties share a boundary with Buckland House - there are 9 properties, including my own, sharing a boundary with Buckland House.

* To state that only one property is within 100 metres and therefore there would be no disturbance to properties is misleading - when this site is open there is constant disturbance to residents. Noise can be heard over a greater distance in a quiet area - shouting, a bar and organised entertainment, noise and singing/shouting into the early hours are all very disturbing. This is a rural farming community and many other residents do need to rise early for their daily work.

I urge the Committee to carefully consider the above statements and refuse this extension.

5 Charmaine & Ian Parkinson

My husband and I are wardens at Buckland Campsite - a dream job for us.

As 'tenters' ourselves we know and understand the kind of camping experience like minded people want. The following statement is in support of the above planning application.

Buckland Campsite provides a beautiful location for families to enjoy their much needed holidays in a natural and restorative setting. The campers who stay with us love having a tent and small campervans (with tents or awnings) only campsite. This is unique in the immediate area. It provides a more relaxed and informal setting for holidays. It enables families to meet up and spend precious time together. It is wonderful to see children enjoying being children by playing and making new friends whilst parents are able to relax. As the site is secure we have many families stay with us whose children have additional needs such as autism. It is a lovely location to use as a base enabling visitors to enjoy the stunning beauty of the Jurassic Coast and surrounding area.

Many local businesses benefit from our campers who contribute significantly to the local economy by visiting places such as Nothe Fort and the nearby Swannery and Tropical Gardens in Abbotsbury. Families eat out at local pubs and restaurants such as the nearby Elmtree pub and frequently order local takeaways for their evening meals.

Additionally in the little campsite shop we celebrate local produce from artisanal businesses such as 'From Dorset With Love' jams and chutneys, cheese, butter and milk from Craig's Dairy and sausages and bacon from Lyme Regis Butchers. Dorset Tea, Moores Biscuits, Purbeck Ice cream and many others are sold.

Local taxis benefit from extra business regularly. A local cycle hire company, Weymouth Bike Hire, often drops bikes off for people to explore the local area in a sustainable way.

A local cleaning business cleans the toilet & showers daily.

Maintenance on the site and grounds is carried out by local people employed by the owners.

Businesses like Buckland Campsite bring significant benefits to the local economy. Many businesses are dependent on the local tourism industry throughout the summer months to support their survival in the leaner winter times. This provides an often unseen benefit to local residents by enabling such businesses to remain open throughout the year.

Consequently granting this application to extend the season for an extra 6 weeks will bring additional benefits to the local economy. This is particularly significant currently as local employers and businesses recover from a particularly challenging time during and following the pandemic. The pandemic has increased demand locally for reasonably priced places where families can stay whilst discovering the delights of Dorset.

6 Daniel Smy

The application before you today is only being considered by yourselves following the personal intervention of our local councillors.

You are not being asked to consider anything other than a time extension to help us satisfy overspill demand from our award-winning Higher Moor Campsite which recently won the award of Best Campsite in Channel Four Camping series called The Perfect Pitch which aired this autumn. The Whitsun half term is a busy time for families wanting to come camping and we do not want to lose this valuable business we have worked very hard to achieve.

The campsite has two extremely good wardens on site all the time ensuring the site is managed well. The families we attract enjoy the peace and quiet of the area and also respect the environment they are visiting. We have had no problems from campers in the time we are allowed to open. We are sad that some local residents paint visitors to our area as destructive negative people.

The impact on the local economy in increased employment, supply chain purchases that help improve the local economy and employment.

We tested the running of Whitsun and June last year with the Government's 55 day agreement and opening the site proved very successful. We note that another local campsite at Tatton just less than a mile away is asking to increase its camping pitches with no local objection.

We are happy to continue to work with you and your officers to improve anything you deem might be helpful to ease local concerns and improve the campsite.

The only complaint we have had is a letter from Environmental Health saying a local resident had complained about the smell of BBQ!

Since you approved our last application, we have sadly been subjected to considerable harassment, alarm and distress from a Drone flying over our land and campsite which we know is from a local resident as Mr Dacham has received copies of illegal photographs and coverage. We are also very sad that a few local residents continue to trespass on our private land as if it belongs to them.

More importantly we are deeply concerned at how scarce local government resources are being spent on vexatious complaints with no grounds in an attempt to close the campsite.

We hope you will support your officers and recommend approval and show your continued support to our business.

8 Kevin Flower – Applicant

I would firstly like the committee to understand that my family are residents living within very close proximity to the campsite. My family have farmed for several generations. We care about our environment and take our duty to preserve this wonderful area for our future generations very seriously.

It is important for you to consider that I am only asking for extra time to operate the field for camping purposes. There are no material changes or increased camping pitches whatsoever within this application. It is solely seeking an extra 6 weeks which in 2022 will allow families to celebrate the Queens Platinum Jubilee.

We would like you to be aware that considerable time and expense has been undertaken by independent ecologist Louise Lowans and she has found there will be no detriment to the local land with this extended time application.

We are heartened by lots of local support for our farm diversification. It is important for the committee to understand that not all local residents oppose what we are doing, in fact many local residents support us contrary to the claims being made by a minority of residents.

9 Diccon Carpendale – Agent

Chairman, Members of the Committee

Thank you for allowing us to address you today. You will all be familiar with the site having dealt with the application for the toilet block at the beginning of this year.

As I am sure you will remember, this is a site used solely for camping with tents and the licence restricts it to 45 pitches. Currently it has full planning permission to operate during the months of July and August. This application seeks an additional 6 week period from the middle of May until the end of June for camping on the site. As Mr Smy has already explained this will enable the site to be made available for the Whitsun weekend up until the approved summer months.

I would like to address the comments which have been made with regard to highway safety, noise, smell and impact on wildlife. You will have seen that the competent Highway Authority raises no objection. Similarly, there are no objections from your Environmental Protection Team and your Natural Environment Team has confirmed the additional time applied for will not result in any increase in the impact on the site or protected species.

As Mr Smy has explained the site is carefully managed and this is the best way of controlling noise to ensure that there is no disturbance late in the evening. With respect to barbecues, this must be considered a normal summer smell and it seems most surprising that people take objection to this especially as the site is well away from any houses.

The nearest garden to the site boundary is some 45m away with the nearest dwelling being over 75m from the edge of the site. Because of the position of the toilet block, the tents themselves are set even further away such that there is no camping within 100m of any local residence.

In such circumstances there is clearly adequate separation to ensure that there will be no adverse impact upon the local community.

This is a much valued and well utilised facility enable staycationers to enjoy the Dorset countryside and to have a reasonably affordable holiday.

With there being no objections from statutory consultees, I am sure that you will agree this small extension of the camping season should be wholeheartedly supported.

I trust you will vote in favour of the Officer recommendation for approval.

7 Councillor John Worth (on behalf of Chickerell Town Council)

I wish to object to this application I'm doing this as a representative of Chickerell Town Council, on the following grounds.

This site was originally granted planning permission for a seasonal camp site during July and August, during that time there have been a number of complaints from local residents, concerning noise, excess traffic movements, cooking smells and general disruption to the quality of life for the residents of this rural hamlet.

To grant an extension to the opening times would further impact on the residents lives, who I feel deserve to have some peace and quiet during the summer months.

There is also an impact on the wild life due to the increase in human activity. I would also like to draw the committees attention to the fact when planning permission has been granted for this site in the past the applicant has chosen to ignore some of the conditions imposed and when enforcement has visited, submitted new plans to overturn the conditions.

P/FUL/2021/02048 - Land adjacent 423 Chickerell Road, Chickerell, DT3 4DG

David Glassock - Agent

I am the agent for this application, acting on behalf of Mr and Mrs Craig and Charlotte Pile.

Craig and Charlotte, [REDACTED] hope to build their home on a plot of land which has been in their family ownership for over 40 years.

Craig and Charlotte are not developers, they are a local family who have spent all of their lives in Chickerell. They have their own family run business located a short distance away from the application site at Granby Industrial Estate, [REDACTED]. Chickerell is their family home, as it has been for multiple generations before them.

Full planning permission for a dwelling has already been granted approval on the application site, not once, but twice under application Ref: WD/D/14/002912 and subsequent application WD/D/16/000541.

The adjacent plot was granted permission under application Ref: 15/001123 for a 1 & ½ storey dwelling. This particular plot adjoins no.425 Chickerell Road, which also has received planning approval for a new dwelling.

The proposals under this application will form a new dwelling in a residential area, with properties to both sides and also directly opposite along Chickerell road. In short, this is a plot located in a residential area.

As clearly set out and demonstrated in the Design and Access Statement prepared, the proposals for Craig and Charlottes family home are based upon the footprint, area, form, size and scale of the previously approved scheme.

Contrary to the Parish Councils comments, the revised application actually looks to enhance and improve upon the previously approved scheme, by creating a larger separation between neighbouring properties. This is because the previously approved scheme had the building wall line sat directly along the western boundary where as under this revised scheme, the wall line has been brought in and away from the neighbouring plot. The separation will create a less imposing and over-bearing relationship with its neighbour.

The proposals, by virtue of its design and re-orientation of its gable, will have less impact on the street scene than that of the approved scheme. There will be more visibility through to the coast line and the proposals are a positive impact in terms of the neighbours adjacent across the road.

The application has full Local Authority support, meets policies and is an improvement on the previous planning permission in terms of its scale, mass, form and orientation. It is hoped that the committee team look favourably on Craig and Charlottes application for a new family home.

Thank you for your time.

P/OUT/2021/01128 - Land East of the Paddocks, Mosterton, DT8 3HQ

1 Mrs Nicola Partridge and Mr Philip Partridge

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application.

Although I am not in support of this application, and nor are the majority of the residents of Mosterton village, I can understand that you may well need to give approval because of the requirement for additional houses in Dorset.

The initial plan submitted resulted in many concerns raised: such as flooding on Chedington lane; vibrations from the building works adversely affecting nearby listed buildings; the environmental impact as residents would all need to use cars to commute to work or take children to school; the amount of building that has already occurred in the village, putting pressure on local services and utilities that are already stretched, most particularly the shortage of GPs, and the sewerage system that has needed emergency repairs in the last couple of years; the effect on the enjoyment of local residents who use the footpath through the field to walk their dogs; the lack of pavement on the east section of the main road meaning that children walking to school have to risk crossing the busy road.

The revised plan of only 9 properties west of the footpath is better, and does mitigate most of these. The remaining problem is that the majority of the properties within sight of the proposed development are bungalows, or dormer bungalows, and with the proposed site being on a slight hill, should anything taller than bungalows be built then it will be visually overwhelming, and not in keeping with the rest of the residences at this end of the village.

On a minor note, regardless of what gets built, a popular blackberry picking spot will be lost!

Many thanks for your consideration.

2 Mosterton Parish Council

Mosterton Parish Council objects to this outline planning application.

There is no planned development of the infrastructure of Mosterton, a village which is poorly served by public transport and has little by way of employment opportunities within the village or walking distance, making the development unsustainable.

Properties near to the proposed development site are already experiencing flooding as a result of surface water run off, and this will only increase with additional development.

The mains sewerage system for the village has been operating above capacity for a number of years, causing issues with back flow. The village school is already unable to offer places to children living in the village in some year groups, and is almost full across the board, with no increase in provision likely in the near future.

The village has seen a large amount of development in recent years, with no additional investment in the infrastructure.

Whilst Mosterton Parish Council acknowledges that the village plan indicates the village is open to developments of up to 10 properties, there is a significant concerns that an outline application for 9 properties, will change into a subsequent full application for significantly more properties, bearing in mind that the original application submitted for this site, Application number WD/D/20/000393 was for 40 dwellings.

3 Shaun Travers - Agent

Chairman Members this application has come about as a result of discussions with your officers and the local community over the past couple of years. Initially a more ambitious plan was put forward, but it soon became clear that your Conservation and Landscape Officers had reservations as did, of course, local residents.

As a result of those concerns the earlier scheme was withdrawn and a more sympathetic scheme in tune with the opportunities and constraints of the site was developed. We are pleased to note that this scheme, the revised scheme, has been more favourably received with local objection down from some 40 to 11 and no professional consultee objections.

The proposal now represents a modest extension to the built form of the village as did the adjacent Paddocks development in previous years. In the fullness of time, it will blend well with the village as the Paddocks does today. It is understood that those living nearby in the Paddocks will be concerned however as your Planning Officer notes at para 15.5 of your report *“there is nothing to suggest at this outline stage that the proposal would result in adverse impacts on neighbours and policy ENV 16 of the adopted Local Plan is met”*.

Chairman in short;

- This is a scheme brought forward with the advice of others.
- Does not have any professional objectors, and
- Is a scheme which will not be detrimental to neighbours' enjoyment, particularly with the aid of the required Construction Management Plan at Condition 06.
- The proposal will be a modest extension to the village of Masterton but an addition to Dorset's much needed housing stock all the same.

Chairman Members, it is hoped that you can agree with your Officers advice at para 16.1 of your report that concludes *“the balance of consideration leans towards approval as the benefits outweigh any adverse impacts and there are insufficient material considerations which warrant a recommendation of refusal of this application”*.

Members we ask that you vote to approve this well-developed application today.

WP/19/00993/OUT - Land at Beverley Road, Weymouth

Steve Tapscott - Agent

My name is Steve Tapscott and I am representing the applicant. I am a chartered town planner with over 15 years' experience in local government and commercial roles. I commend the case officer's recommendation to approve this application.

Members will be aware of the pressure to build more homes and the risks of speculative applications to build outside built-up areas. Opportunities should therefore be seized for development within Weymouth, a highly sustainable town. Land at Beverley Road is one such site, whose development the town council supports.

The site has been deemed surplus to requirements by the Council's management committee and put on the market for the express purpose of developing it. It is not recognised in the local plan as safeguarded public open space and there are no officially recognised rights of way through it. That may explain why it has been neglected for so long, to the point where it is now somewhat of an overgrown eyesore.

The proposed development would therefore see the site cleared and improved significantly.

In devising the scheme before you, considerable technical work has gone into ensuring amenity would be safeguarded, as would highway safety. A full ecological survey has been undertaken and agreed by the Dorset NET; this includes the translocation of slow worms and the provision of onsite native planting and offsite management of Lorton Valley.

We have also worked hard to ensure that the development would not exacerbate surface water flooding and have demonstrated that, when cleared, the basin at the centre of the site would have sufficient capacity. The submitted health and safety report has been given the green light by officers, who are satisfied it strikes the right balance between retaining a sense of openness without compromising safety.

Members will see that the topography of the site is varied and this results in abnormal build costs requiring cut and fill and retaining structures. This, along with other costs such as mitigating ecology and surface water, affects the viability of the scheme. However, the independent DVS has confirmed that it would be viable to provide a commuted sum towards affordable housing, which both the applicant and the Council's housing enabling team agree to.

In addition, the development will contribute over £162,000 towards the Community Infrastructure Levy, ensuring that contributions will go towards multiple infrastructure types, including leisure, waste management, transport, education, healthcare, emergency services and utilities.

In summary, I hope members will agree with officers that this is a quality scheme and can approve the application today. This would enable the applicant to proceed quickly towards the reserved matters approval and start building these much-needed family homes as soon as possible. Thank you.

WP/20/00944/FUL - 35 Easton Road, Portland, DT5 1BS

1 Mr & Mrs P D Simpson

We object to this application on the grounds that, as with the last proposed plans, we consider it to be unsuitable intensification of land use, in an already highly developed area, compounded by inadequate access for the proposed number of dwellings and loss of amenity for existing dwellings nearby.

Back-land development, whilst existing nearby (but in some cases not recent), is not a good form of development in planning terms, Further there appears to be no provision for rear access to the proposed properties that would support this type of back-land development.

We are however pleased to see this proposed development has now been reduced to a three bed roomed bungalow, and feel this would, "if the planning application was successful", be a much more sympathetic addition than previously proposed, however we would like guaranties that if successful, this development could not be resubmitted for a larger upgrade in the future.

2 Kenneth Lynham

I have lived most of my 84 years opposite the property known as No.35 which is the subject of the above planning application (Conversion into 4 dwellings).

Throughout its life as a noisy Public House known as the 'New Inn' in War time, later with music licence, and latterly as a peaceful B & B. The property is well clear of the main shopping area and lends itself to conversion for much needed housing.

The access is no different to those already repeated further down the road, and in recent times a new bungalow/chalet has been built at the back of a narrow access which necessitates driving over a pavement in a much busier area adjacent to the shops and main bus stop, so feel a precedent has already been set. It will be good to have some residential permanence.

As there is provision for parking behind the old pub (No.35) it should not impact on an already busy street scene. I feel the sensitive conversion will enhance the look of the area.

3 Tim Clark

We are writing to express our support for the above application as residents of Portland. We know the building and garden from visiting when it was a public house. We prefer this scheme than the previously proposed, as it is much like other developments in the area which were already passed and have been built.

We feel the modest use of the rear garden space with just one plot is in keeping with the area.

The proposed chalet style bungalow in the rear will be much less imposing than previously proposed town houses.

We see no issues with access as this is an existing situation with access to other properties along the street, and much less disruption than when the pub had regular deliveries.

Access is also far away from shopping area of Easton Square. This application will bring new people to the area which will help support the local businesses and enhance the community of Easton.

Easton local businesses and local economy will benefit from new families being able to move to the area.

We support this change of use of building as it makes good use of an attractive building in the street scape. With the conversion to residential will result in far less disruption to neighbouring properties than any commercial use.

We fully support and welcome this application.

4 Wendy King

I am a resident in Easton Street, Portland, I have read the plans that have been submitted for 35 Easton Street, Portland. I would like it to be known that I fully support this application. I would consider it to be in keeping with the Community feel and that it is a well considered Architectural design, that will hopefully provide subtle, unobtrusive opportunity for new home seekers. It would seem odd not to give this plan permission, when this particular area of land seems large enough for a quality of life for all concerned, it has access that is already established and utilities that are easy to access without too much disruption. The design is not looking for areas that have to be squeezed into or boundary walls of neighbouring properties that are encroached. Therefore I would feel that the same consideration, would be given to this plan as the other plans that have been passed in this area of Easton, that it would appear in my opinion has not had the already established access or extent of land that this plan has. I am sure that the committee, in particular the members who know the locality, will be fair, and will, as the whole planning committee always are, professional in their decision. Thank you for the opportunity to give this opinion.

5 Ross Fisher – Agent

The first 3 points in the officers report relative to Housing supply do not need further justification, in terms of the following:

- The loss of business use is considered acceptable based on evidence submitted.

Additional evidence was requested; an agents letter explaining the timeframe in respect to the marketing the property since 2012- 2013 as a pub which led to the change to a B & B, as an attempt to make the property viable, this proved unsuccessful and since 2018 the property has been marketed as a going concern with no positive outcome.

- There is not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity or amenity of potential occupiers.

The previous application which was refused and in turn lost at appeal, these proposals for 3 No. 3 storey town houses located in the rear of the garden. The proposals here before you are for a modest chalet type bungalow which has minimal impact on adjoining neighbours.

- There is no harm presented to the Conservation Area or setting of other designated & non designated heritage assets in accordance with the NPPF (2021).

Minor amendments were requested by the Conservation Team, which were promptly responded to in a positive manor and drawings subsequently amended to suit.

- There are no highways safety issues.

The access is an existing access much like other access points along this side of Easton Street, which also serve similar forms of development to that proposed. Arguably the access was in use as a pub and as a Guesthouse. The proposed use as residential would create no additional danger to pedestrians to what has and still exists on the site.

- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

This application was submitted on the 11th December 2020 and given the validation date of the 16th December 2020, although this did not happen until the 1st February 2021. The application as per the Officers report has been concluded with no material considerations which would warrant a refusal of this application. Nearly 12 months from submission, 2 local company directors and employers with a property that clearly is not fit for purpose which they must endure the cost during the worst economic crisis this Country and the World has

ever seen and here we are now discussing this. Who benefits from this application being held during this committee today, if you are suggesting this site does not conform to policy and does not pass the test for residential development then please answer this one question, if not residential then what?