

Public Document Pack



DORSET COUNCIL - WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 11 JUNE 2020

A recording of the meeting can be found on the committee page by using the following link:- [Link to committee page](#)

Present: Cllrs Simon Christopher (Chairman), David Gray (Vice-Chairman), Pete Barrow, Kelvin Clayton, Susan Cocking, Jean Dunseith, Nick Ireland, Louie O'Leary, David Shortell, Sarah Williams and Kate Wheller

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Ann Collins (Area Manager – Western and Southern Team), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Chelsey Golledge (Technical Support Officer), Colin Graham (Engineer (Development Liaison) Highways), Carol McKay (Senior Definitive Map Technical Officer), Vanessa Penny (Definitive Map Team Manager), Darren Rogers (Enforcement Manager) and Denise Hunt (Democratic Services Officer)

119. Apologies

No apologies for absence were received at the meeting.

120. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made at the meeting.

121. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 May 2020 were confirmed.

122. Public Participation

Representations by the public to the Committee on individual planning applications are detailed below. There were no questions, petitions or deputations received on other items on this occasion.

123. Planning Applications

Members considered written reports submitted on planning applications as set out below.

124. WP/20/00027/FUL - 56 Preston Road, Weymouth, DT3 6QA

The Committee considered an application to demolish an existing dwelling and erect 7 flats with associated access and parking.

An update sheet was circulated to members before the meeting which corrected an error in the report that referred to an incorrect number of flats, details of 2 further representations and a change to Condition 7.

Members were shown a site location plan which included the outline of a previous scheme in 2008 to redevelop No 58 Preston Road into 6 flats approved by the former Weymouth & Portland Borough Council that had now lapsed. The site of the application under consideration was to the south of that site.

Aerial photos were shown of previously approved flats at 12, 18, 42, 44, 46, 70 and 72 Preston Road on land formerly with detached properties within spacious grounds. No 66 remained a vacant plot with permission for 7 flats.

Another aerial photo showed Furzy Close wrapping around the site and the sloping nature of the application site.

A number of photos were shown of the existing access and dilapidated bungalow and its relationship with the neighbouring properties, including 4 Furzy Close.

The proposed site layout plan included a hardstanding for 10 parking spaces including 3 car port structures, bike spaces and bin storage.

There were a number of significant trees on the site protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) that had been subject to an arboricultural report. A material commensurate with root protection of the TPO trees would be used in place of tarmac for the hardstanding. It was confirmed that the Tree Officer was content with the protection measures subject to conditions.

Members were shown the proposed elevations which drew comparisons with a previous withdrawn scheme for 8 units which was unduly dominant due to its mass, scale and bulk. The proposed rear (east) and side (north) elevations were set into the slope of the site.

Floor plans, a roof plan, cross sections, landscaping plan and materials slide were also shown.

The key planning points were highlighted including:-

- principle of development - presumption in favour of sustainable development
- design and scale considered appropriate for the site
- no significant impact on amenity
- local urban character - previously developed land and viewed in relation to the neighbouring built form
- highway safety - highways authority raise no objection
- Nature conservation - Biodiversity Mitigation Plan considered acceptable subject to conditions
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable.

A number of written representations were received that were read out by the Technical Support Officer and are attached to these minutes.

Responding to comments in the representations concerning road safety, the Engineer (Development Liaison) advised that widening of the carriageway along Preston Road took place in 1995 and the road had also been downgraded to a B road, with traffic signposted towards Littlemoor Road and the Weymouth relief road. The verge and footway along Preston Road were just under 4 metres wide. The tree near the access to the site was part of a wide footway with the ability to see behind the tree.

The proximity of the access to the bus stop was acceptable with the presence of buses considered to be a temporary feature. The presence of a bus route made the location more sustainable.

Cllr Shortell questioned obstruction of views by the large tree at the access to the site and from buses waiting at the bus stop as well as the provision of on-site parking for contractors. He noted that the new development would be closer to the rear bungalow and that permissions granted for similar developments in Preston Road had not yet been built. He considered the scheme to be cramped and overbearing and noted that the extant permission at No 58 Preston Road was for 6 units on a larger footprint when this application proposed 7 flats on a smaller footprint.

The Enforcement Manager stated that the permission for 6 flats at No 58 approved in 2008 had lapsed and should be disregarded. Parking would be covered under the Construction Environmental Management Plan and accommodated within the application site.

The Engineer (Development Liaison) noted that the highways tree outside of the application site had been retained as a result of the Preston Road widening scheme. Although it had some light growth around the trunk that could be improved, the application could not be refused on this basis as there was sufficient visibility behind the tree. Although a bus parked at the bus stop limited visibility temporarily in the other direction, there was sufficient clearance around the bus and for other road users to be able to react accordingly.

Members considered that, although part of Preston Road towards Overcombe had altered over time due to developments of flats, this was not the case in the area of this application which remained predominantly larger family homes with no flats. It was considered that the application would therefore change the character of this part of Preston Road. Members also questioned the demand for flatted developments in the area given that there were flats that had recently been built that remained for sale.

The Enforcement Manager suggested that the previous approval for 6 flats at No 58 Preston Road would have been the first of this type of development had the permission not lapsed. The NPPF referred to making best and efficient use of land and this application sat in the context of Preston Road as a whole, rather than individual parts of the road.

Members also raised concerns regarding the size of the development in relation to the plot as being too small to accommodate 7 flats; that the scheme was overbearing for the space available; the impact on neighbours in Nos 54 and 58 Preston Road and 4 Furzy Close including loss of light; the proximity of the proposed development to No 58 Preston Road and the need to reuse existing buildings supported in the NPPF.

The Enforcement Manager stated that the report detailed the impact on No 58, in particular, the side amenity garden that was not the sole area for amenity for No 58.

Some members felt that that a scheme of 5 flats over 2 storeys would reduce the impact of the development and lead to benefits without the negative aspects.

Members also asked about speed of traffic along Preston Road which was a police enforcement matter; the removal of largely ornamental trees that were not subject to a TPO and sewerage capacity, which was a utilities matter separate to this application. A request was made for the Construction Management Plan to forbid use of the bus stop by construction traffic.

Cllr David Shortell proposed that the application be refused for reasons of layout and density; loss of light and overshadowing and highway safety. This was seconded by Cllr Louie O'Leary.

The Solicitor advised that the committee was entitled to form its own judgement in relation to matters of layout, density and loss of light. However, refusal on the basis of highways safety could not be defended given that there was no objection by the Highways Authority.

The Committee adjourned between 15:30 - 15:40 in order that officers could formulate the wording of the reason for refusal based on the comments made by members of the committee.

Proposed by Cllr David Shortell, seconded by Cllr Louie O'Leary.

Decision:

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

1) The proposed development by reason of its layout, mass, scale and bulk would have an unduly dominating and overbearing impact on each of the side neighbouring properties at nos 54, & 58 Preston Road and 4 Furzy Close at the rear, that as a result would sit uncomfortably in relation to those neighbouring occupiers and would be detrimental to their amenity in respect of overshadowing and loss of light. Its mass, scale and bulk would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policies ENV10; ENV12 & ENV16 of the adopted Weymouth & Portland and West Dorset Local Plan (2015); and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and in particular paragraph 127 which states amongst other things that decisions

should ensure that developments provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

125. **Application to divert part of bridleway - 39 Symondsburry at Lower Eype Farm**

The Committee considered an application to divert part of Bridleway 39, Symondsburry at Lower Eype Farm which was being made in the interest of the landowner. Planning permission had been granted for a new single storey dwelling to be occupied by the applicant and the diversion sought to improve privacy and security of the new property.

The application was presented by the Senior Definitive Map Technical Officer who showed a location plan and photographs of the existing and diverted routes as well as a computer-generated image of the new dwelling.

Members were informed that Symondsburry Parish Council had objected to the planning application for the new dwelling on the grounds that the bridleway would be affected.

An objection to this application had also been received from Symondsburry Parish Council which was outlined in the report.

Cllr Nick Ireland sought clarification on whether diversion of the route from a right of way onto a permissive path would result in a higher risk that it could be closed.

Members were informed that the diversion of the bridleway would mean that the whole route would become a definitive rather than a permissive route.

Proposed by Cllr Louie O'Leary, seconded by Cllr Peter Barrow.

Decision

That:

- a) The application to divert part of Bridleway 39, Symondsburry be accepted and an order made;
- b) The Order include provisions to modify the definitive map and statement to record the changes made as a consequence of the diversion; and
- c) If the Order is unopposed, it be confirmed by the Council without further reference to the Committee.
- d) If objections are received to the Order which are of a similar nature to those already considered by the Committee, the Order should be submitted to the Secretary of State without further reference to the Committee.

Reasons for Decisions

- a) The proposed diversion meets the legal criteria set out in the Highways Act 1980.

- b) The inclusion of these provisions in a public path order means that there is no need for a separate legal event order to modify the definitive map and statement as a result of the diversion.
- c) This report considers the objection to the pre-order consultation and also the order confirmation tests. If the committee resolves to make an order and no objections are received there would be no further material for the committee to consider.
- d) In the event that objections of a similar nature to those already considered are received to the order, the committee will have already considered the objections in the light of the legal criteria and therefore Dorset Council can submit the Order to the Secretary of State for consideration without further reference to the Committee.

126. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items

127. **Update Sheet**

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
WP/20/00027/FUL	56 Preston Road, Weymouth, DT3 6QA	5a	7-32
<p>Officers report Update</p> <p>A - Para 5.1 of the officers report makes reference to 8x2 bed flats.</p> <p>Para 5.4 refers to 8 units in total (2 on the ground floor with a further 3 flats on the respective 1st and 2nd floors).</p> <p>The revised 7unit scheme has 2 units on the ground floor, 3 on 1st floor and 2 on 2nd floor.</p> <p>B - 2 further representations - one in support stating</p> <p><i>“It has been broken into and is overgrown, it has the potential to be so much more and if nothing is done soon, I believe squatters are going to appear soon as well.”</i></p> <p>One objecting stating:</p> <p><i>To the planning committee,</i></p> <p><i>Destroying perfectly good desirable family homes is destroying what was once a beautiful tree lined entry into Weymouth.</i></p> <p><i>The committee is obviously aware that there are two current sites on Preston Road have gone back to the market due to the lack of interest in flats, although they previously had planning permission granted.</i></p> <p><i>One of the houses has been demolished and remains undeveloped for at least 5</i></p>			

years, surely that must tell you there is not a need for more flats (Holiday Homes) in the area.

The proposal is grossly over development of a site which will impinge on close neighbours. Not only that, the road was reclassified as a 'B' road but the majority of drivers drive well in excess of the "30"mph limit.

The local services such as the Doctors and sewage system is grossly overloaded as stated by Wessex Water

The other main problem is that cyclist young and old use the pavement as a cycleway which it is not, as the cycle path officially detours into Wyke Oliver Road but the signage is not adequate.

I live on Preston Road, and because of the long drives and walls to the pavement I am unable to see cyclists come past, I have in the past narrowly missed a number of cyclist as they speed along the pavement no matter that I am creeping out. This applies to all the other properties along the road.

To sum it all up, we do not need an extra 7+ cars coming onto an already dangerous road.

C - Recommended Condition 7 to read as follows:

Condition 7 Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised provision must be made to ensure that no surface water drains directly from the site onto the adjacent public highway in accordance with details which shall have, prior to development above damp proof course level, been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the approved drainage works shall be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the site is properly drained and that surface water does not flow onto the highway.

Duration of meeting: 2.00 - 4.00 pm

Chairman

.....

This page is intentionally left blank

WP/20/00027/FUL - 56 Preston Road, Weymouth

Written Submissions

Roger Dilley

I believe the statement that the renewed application has addressed all of the previous objections is far from true. I believe the applicants intention was to initially submit an application that would be rejected and then to submit a second slightly reduced application in a cynical attempt to obtain approval for a still unsuitable application.

The application repeatedly refers back to the neighbouring planning application as a justification to approve this application. There are a number of points to make about that now lapsed application.

58's plot size is larger than plot 56 and that was for only 6 flats not 7

The number of parking slots and hence metaled surface was also significantly less in direct contravention of **ENV12**.

The new application doesn't mention excessive free water runoff caused by heavy down pours which has caused major flooding issues along Preston Road and has been assessed by the Highways Manager as saturated and unable to support additional loading.

There is no reference to the collection of recycled waste.

The whole development is still very close to the rear of the plot with at least 6 higher floor bedroom windows looking directly over the bungalow at the rear.

Preston Road is saturated with new flats remaining unsold for over a year. **EVN10** calls for new developments to contribute to maintaining and enhancing local identity. We don't need more flats. **HOUS3** calls for recognition of the mix of the current range of house types. **HOUS4** calls for new developments to be compatible with the existing character of the surrounding area. Preston Road has a reputation for large family housing and more flats will negatively impact that character.

COM7 concerns road safety, this application makes absolutely no redress for the serious increase of traffic joining Preston Road close to a busy junction. It negatively impacts the existing hazardous line of sight from the mature Poplar tree and the high road verge at the entrance to the plot. Construction vehicles have historically parked on nearby verges, blocking traffic and causing hazards to road and pedestrian traffic alike.

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment appears to hide the fact that 5 of the 6 trees currently on the plot will be removed. It is worrying there are no details given as to the location or size of the replacement trees. The application makes no mention of TPOs which I would be surprised if none existed for the current plot.

John Liles

It's hard to believe developers feel profit can still be made from flats along the Preston Road. The once beautiful tree-lined approach to Weymouth is looking more like entering an industrial estate. Developers are keen to use previous developments as a precedence for their own, this was denied by Weymouth & Portland planning authority at a previous case. They clearly stated, no such precedence exists

Flats are fine in the right place but to destroy perfectly good properties in the process makes no sense, other than for money.

There are currently two other sites along Preston Road back on the market, instead of being developed, one where the house was demolished and left as a building site. If, as I believe, the market is saturated with flats we could end up with another empty plot.

Apart from my objections on moral and grounds of aesthetics, there are planning matters on which I feel this fails.

This proposal is a gross over-development of the site which will impinge on properties either side and especially to the rear. The now "patio doors" (assume Juliette Balconies) are still large windows looking into the bedroom of the rear property. It will clearly block light from No 58.

There is the loss of some trees and potential risk to others on the site, once diggers start maneuvering.

Although Preston Road is now a "B" road, the traffic volume is no less, I live there, any additional vehicles would not be welcome, certainly by cyclists and pedestrians.

Wessex Water are on record as stating that the old sewage pipes are already at full capacity.

Same applies to the Doctors surgery, already pretty stretched.

Please think very hard about what legacy such development leaves behind. Rather than pander to a developers greed, think for a moment about what this wanton destruction does to the lives of the people who live here.

Christine McManus

I object to the above planning application because I disagree with many of the developer's claims, some of which are definitely inaccurate.

* The developers claim a precedent has been established by repeatedly likening their proposals to other flatted developments along the road. However, their accompanying diagrams show that nowhere along Preston Road has such a large building been crammed into such a relatively small plot. Therefore, due to its close proximity, it compromises the light and privacy of existing residents. This contravenes NPPF guidelines.

* The ecological report the developers submitted was very inconclusive and inaccurate. It claims an Ariel Survey showed no ponds within 250 metres of the proposed site and therefore no amphibians likely to be foraging. Our pond, less than 10 metres away, is full of amphibians. (proof was supplied at Initial meeting). This is yet another possibility of guidelines being ignored re nature conservation.

* The developers include a daylight survey. How can a building, much larger and only 8metres away from the South facing windows of the house next door, not adversely affect the light entering the house?

Are these surveys merely paying lip service to requirements? Does anyone with relevant knowledge actually check their validity?

* The developer's misleading diagrams claim the rear bungalow will only see the ridge of the new roof. This is also untrue. The large back windows of the top flats will overlook the garden and bedrooms of the bungalow. (proof at previous meeting)

* The developers claim to be making the best use of available land, but this is a gross overdevelopment of the site. There would be little outdoor space for potential residents. The excessively large car park would add to road flooding. The extra cars crossing the footpath would increase the likelihood of a serious accident.

* The NPPF promote maintaining an area's prevailing character, enhancing local identity. The developers claim their building fulfils these obligations.

However, the latest block of flats hasn't sold after more than a year. Obviously not the best use of land! Definitely not enhancing the local

area with a huge tarmac car park at the front and permanent sale boards.

Previously, blocks have been attractive, have had sufficient inside and outside space to meet the needs of the elderly residents and ensure their wellbeing. They supported requirement for strong, healthy communities.

Preston Road doesn't need more flats that are not fit for purpose just because developers want to cram in as many as possible regardless of suitability.

The developers should 'properly' decrease the number of flats and building size in order to comply with NPPF guidelines to make best use of land and protect neighbouring amenities.

Linda Brown

My objections are twofold :-

A. The height of the proposed block of apartments; I would like a further reduction in height

B. The number of apartments; I would like five apartments in the block.

Character of Area and the Future

The above development should be a positive addition to the attractive tree lined Preston Road, with its varied styled houses and bungalows inter dispersed with several infill apartment blocks that are an appropriate scale to the size of their plots, except one 38 Preston Road which like the proposed is a cramped development supporting a large tarmac car park. Not surprisingly, completed Summer 2019- only one sold Nov 2019. It is worrying that should the Council's future planning be to demolish every detached house that comes up for sale with ever more dominating blocks of apartments Preston Road will no longer be that "attractive tree lined road". Is that the Council's Future Policy Plan? The reduction in scale and number of flats to the proposed block was welcomed but still when looking out of the back windows of 4 Furzy Close, the roof of the existing bungalow can be clearly seen despite the rising land to the rear, which means the windows of the first and second floors of the proposed block will have an uninterrupted view into their home. This doesn't happen quite so overbearingly on the other developments along Preston Road as they have substantially longer rear gardens. Reducing the number of apartments to five would take away a floor, the block would then be an appropriate scale to the plot size, the roof line in keeping with the neighbouring houses and so have a minimum impact on existing residents.

Highway Safety Issues

Preston Road is:-

A. An all year round busy approach road to Weymouth

B. A bus route for No 4, 4a, 5, 201, X54.

C. Used by cyclists and pedestrians, locals and visitors.

By reducing the number of flats to five the impact on an already busy approach road would be minimized, pedestrians, often families, and cyclists who Dorset Council are encouraging to "walk and cycle" down to the beach would stay as it is, a free flowing safe approach road into Weymouth for everybody

Adam Keene

The proposals are contrary to Policies SUS2, ENV16, COM7, HOUS 3 and HOUS4 of the Adopted Plan 2015, detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and harmful to the residential amenities of its neighbours. The Biodiversity report submitted is inaccurate, there is a pond within 250m of the development site and so the proposals could affect nature conservation.

The LPA rely on the lack of a 5 year land supply to recommend approval, this is the wrong approach to take in justifying the proposals and does not outweigh the material harm caused to character and amenity. It is inconceivable that the LPA found the previous proposals for 8 x 2 bedroom flats unacceptable and yet the insignificant reduction to the size of the building and parking area in the current proposals now acceptable? The LPA's objections in relation to the previous scheme still stand.

The proposals are harmful for the following reasons-

Overlooking (privacy)- The 'Juliet' balconies and windows result in harmful views of 4 Furzy Close. The minimum accepted distance between the 2 properties at 2 or 3 storey height is 21m, the proposed is 20m.

Loss of light- The light survey shows that the levels of light received only just meet the BRE guidelines for what is considered acceptable. The accuracy of this survey is contested and if time allowed 58 would have submitted their own evidence to show the contrary. A decision should be deferred for this additional evidence to be commissioned and considered. The photos attached to this statement clearly show the garden area of 58 and how the proposed flats will desecrate the amount of light and sunlight received to what is currently a well-used and pleasant area.

Outlook- The photographs show the south facing aspect of the garden and 56; demonstrating how replacing this subservient bungalow with a large 3 storey block of flats will be seen from 58. The increase in scale and volume of building in this position will severely affect the outlook of 58.

Traffic- Six additional households will result in increased traffic which would compromise the safety of pedestrians and other road users. The proximity to 2 bus stops is dangerous.

Scale and character- The replacement of a bungalow with a 3 storey development adjacent to a single domestic scale, two storey house is harmful and out of character. The loss of trees and shrubs is substantial and will permanently change the verdant setting of the site and how it is seen in the streetscene.

Residential intensity- Preston Road cannot absorb any more multiple occupancy buildings and the site cannot accommodate for the needs associated with 6 additional dwellings and the increase from 137m² to 782m² (+571%).

Stuart McHardy

I am writing to confirm that I am fully in favour of the planning application to redevelop 56, Preston Road, Weymouth into 7 apartments.

Firstly there are already several similar properties of this type of design which have received planning approval and having been built do not in any way detract from the other properties in this road.

Secondly the development will bring a much needed financial impact on the local area. It is likely to employ local Weymouth people, as well as the income to local shops from the new residents.

Lastly having reviewed the concerns expressed, I believe that the various reports from the appropriate bodies has adequately answered them.

Jonathan Pickard

I am writing to whoever is concerned regarding the proposed development of the above address.

I fail to understand how planning can be refused due to the already completed developments from single dwellings to flats that have been permitted along that road ,and that the above mentioned site also has had highways approval already agreed, and the number of units has already been reduced.

I feel that I had to express my thoughts as I see no reason why they should not grant planning permission.

Claire Woodcock

I am writing to express my strong support and agreement with the proposed development of seven, much needed, dwellings on the abovementioned site.

This is a sustainable location in an area that would hugely benefit from such a regeneration and would encourage others to upgrade in a similar way, bringing economic growth and improvement to the whole area. I look forward to hearing a positive outcome in relation to this site.

Cllr Tony Ferrari (Dorset Council - Littlemoor and Preston)

I am the ward Councillor for this location on both the Town Council and Dorset Council. I object to the application.

The principle of conversion of single family homes into multiple dwellings is well established on Preston Road. The concern with this application is not the principle but the scale of development.

There are issues that exist with the current dwelling but these are enormously magnified because of the size of the development, replacing one dwelling with 7. As I am limited to 450 words I will address some of them.

Vehicles exiting this site onto Preston Road represent a traffic hazard. The view from the drive up the hill is limited. High speed traffic could reach an exiting vehicle before it could clear the near carriageway when turning right. A vehicle exiting turning left will be a slow moving obstacle to a fast descending vehicle. This problem exists with the current house occupants. It is likely to be 7 times worse with this number of dwellings. The fewer dwellings, the lower the risk.

The building is built right up to the boundaries to the north and south and extends further back on the plot towards the houses behind compared to the house it replaces. It is a storey higher than the building that precedes it and the adjacent neighbours. The application makes note of earlier permission to develop a block of flats at number 58. That permission was never built but it was in substance the same height as the existing house so this block is a storey taller.

The bulk and height of this new proposal would be extremely intrusive looking down, or perhaps it should be described as looming over, the adjacent properties on all sides. There is a huge issue of intrusion and loss of privacy. These flats will look down into the windows and gardens of the houses that surround it.

I believe the key problems with this proposal are simply the result of the scale. A building which matched the height of surrounding homes and had fewer flats would be less intrusive and safer and would be worthy of support. This one is too large.

I recommend that the committee reject the application.

Gary House - Director of Nylo Homes Ltd (Applicant)

Hello, my name is Gary House and I am the director of Nylo Homes Ltd, the applicant for this application. Nylo homes are well established property developers based in Dorset and currently building at various sites within the county including a 23 units scheme at 66 Dorchester Rd, Weymouth.

We acquired 56 Preston Rd last year and appointed award winning David James architects to design an attractive scheme which we believe would be a positive contribution to the community and a betterment to the street scene if approved.

We, along with our consultants have worked very hard with the planning officers and his consultees over the last 9 months, we have listened, respected and overcome any potential harm to vehicular and pedestrian movements, Trees and ecology on site and amenity to our neighbours.

Members, you will hear a number of negative comments from objectors today- covering almost every negative claim that can be said against a proposed development. You may hear that we have mislead, lied or abused the planning system. This is simply untrue and very disappointing to hear.

You may today hear or have previous read neighbouring objections stating that the development has windows which directly overlook elderly residents and children's bedrooms or a swimming pool Again, this is untrue. Your officer has confirmed that there would be no significant adverse impact on any of the neighbouring properties sufficient to warrant refusal of permission.

There may be concern over other flats already for sale in the road or other sites already approved and yet to be developed but that is quite normal and gives those seeking new homes a wider choice.

We sympathise that change can be difficult to accept but every flat, bungalow or house we live in was once a previous planning application and construction site.

We build desirable high-quality homes and if approved today, this scheme will commence later this year creating economic benefits to the area in this uncertain time. I thank you for your time and hope you support your officer's recommendation to approve this application.

Neil McKeon - Agent

My name is Neil McKeon and I am a Senior Planning Consultant at Pure Town Planning, speaking on behalf of the applicant.

The proposal for a reduced 7unit scheme follows a withdrawn application for 8 units in 2019. Having met the Officer on site, concerns were raised in respect of the scale of the building and the potential impact on amenity of 58 Preston Road and 4 Furzy Close. It was agreed the best approach would be a revised application which addressed these specific objections, working in collaboration with Officers.

The height and massing of the 2nd floor rear projection has been considerably reduced. This fundamental change has two impacts. Firstly, the front elevation ridge line and gables have been lowered, which are more reflective of their neighbouring properties in the Preston Road streetscene. Secondly, the reduced massing to the rear safeguards against any harmful impact upon the privacy and amenity of 58 Preston Road or 4 Furzy Close. The application is supported by a Daylight Impact Report, demonstrating that the reduced height, reduced front and rear projections and absence of windows to this northern elevation prevents the building appearing overbearing to No. 58. The existing 8m gap between side elevations is retained. A similar arrangement is seen to No. 54, which the Officer's Report confirms will not impact their privacy or amenity.

The amended rear elevation removes the previously proposed rear gable and upper floor balcony, whilst also setting the building further away from the shared boundary to 4 Furzy Close. There is no outdoor space which can overlook the eastern neighbour. The plans create a 20-22m separation to 4 Furzy Close, which not only prevents the building from being overtly visible, but also safeguards the privacy and amenity of both properties.

Despite objections from properties on the western side of Preston Road in regard to potential overlooking, it is noted that said properties are positioned between 55m and 74m from the proposal, set behind an established tree-lined boundary, providing only glimpsed views of the building.

The revised application has the support of the Highway Authority. Following extensive consultation in respect of landscaping and trees, the Tree Officer fully supports the revised proposal, establishing that the neighbouring and protected trees on site will be unaffected by the proposal.

This high quality development is a product of extensive collaboration with Officers. All aspects of the withdrawn application have been addressed. The proposal is respectful of the Preston Road streetscene, the character of the area and neighbouring amenity – resulting in the full support of respective Planning, Highways, Trees and Biodiversity Officers.

With this recommendation in mind, I ask that you please take this into consideration and offer your support today.

This page is intentionally left blank