

# Objection Letter

Relating to the updated Planning Application PT17/5810/RM, Erection of 763 dwellings, community building, nursery and retail units with parking, landscaping and associated works. (Approval of reserved matters to be read in conjunction with outline planni

Robert Forsey, The Willows, Harry Stoke Road  
11<sup>th</sup> April 2019

## Background

The proposed development at Harry Stoke was granted outline planning consent by the Secretary of State in 2006 with a large number of conditions attached to it. Condition 5 required a site wide Design Codes document to be produced prior to any reserved matter applications.

The planning application PT17/5810/RM has been submitted by Crest Nicholson in December 2018 and an updated plan in February 2019. Following objections from local residents and the Parish Council new plans have been submitted on the 15<sup>th</sup> March 2019

The plans submitted in December and February did not acknowledge that there was a Design Codes document and It is encouraging that the developers have now done this with the production of a Compliance Statement. However, it is disappointing that they are still not adhering to many of the codes and the justification provided is factually incorrect.

### Justification for not adhering to the outline plan and Design Codes

**Section 1.2.4** of the Compliance Statement proposes that the surrounding context of the site has;

“changed significantly since the outline consent and design code were approved over 11 years ago. The most significant change is the intensification of development to the south of the site on the UWE campus. Approval was granted in 2015 for 561 apartments on the UWE campus ref:PT15/33, which have been delivered in the form of a 6 storey apartment blocks and also a high rise sports hall”

The apartments mentioned are not adjacent to the site as they are on the other side of the UWE Campus and so not relevant to the site. The assumption is that the 8 storey flats on the UWE campus are being used as a justification, however the planning permission for that development was granted on the 14<sup>th</sup> October 2004 with completion around 2006. Therefore they pre-date the Design Codes document and even the outline planning consent.

**Either the developer is being unprofessional by not checking the relevance of the justification used or is deliberately trying to find any evidence that supports their assertion that the context of the site has changed, when it clearly has not.**

**Section 3.2.4** continues with the same justification;

“a recent context analysis, which identified a change in the built form and character of the surrounding area since 2012.”

**As stated above this is factually incorrect as there has been no development around the Southern end of the site since 2012.**

**Section 3.2.5** then states;

“Following this review the design team felt that this edge of the site could accommodate a higher density of development.”

This is the main problem with their plan as it takes the context from the apartments in UWE and not from the much closer dwellings on Harry Stoke Road. This is against the Design Codes and the guidelines and requirements in the South Gloucestershire local plan. **See my objection letter from the 4<sup>th</sup> March** for a detailed breakdown of where the plans do not follow the Design Codes and Local Plan.

The photograph on page 4 of their document clearly shows the proximity of Harry Stoke Road to the site, and the significant distance away the UWE apartments are. There is a hedge, bus lane, another hedge, dual carriageway and then a hockey pitch.



Photograph showing proximity of Harry Stoke Road and the UWE campus to the development site

**Section 3.2.6 shows the heights of the new plan**, which does now adhere to the rural edge definition along Harry Stoke Road, but does not adhere to the Urban Village definition for the rest of the highest part of the site with 4 storey blocks of apartments.

**Section 3.5** states that the new design complies with the Urban Village definition.

- Predominantly semi-detached and short terracing – There are very few semi detached dwellings and it is mainly terracing and 3 and 4 storey apartments. So it is **NOT COMPLIANT**
- A transitional architecture that responds to the cottage vernacular with minimal contemporary elements – The house design and materials are fairly traditional but certainly could not be described as “responding to the cottage vernacular”. The apartments are completely at odds with the traditional and rural setting of Harry Stoke Road. So it is **NOT COMPLIANT**
- Apartment blocks proposed to the Southern edge of the site creating a distinctive visual reference – The design code states that apartments and special houses would be on key corners, not a continuous block 4 storeys high. This is not a distinctive visual reference it is an over bearing presence that is not compliant with the Design Codes or the Local Plan. So it is **NOT COMPLIANT**
- Generally 2 storey development. 3 storey fronted units where levels require it – They forget to mention the 4 storey apartments. So it is **NOT COMPLIANT**

**Section 3.6** states that the new design complies with the Rural Edge definition.

- Predominantly detached and semi detached 2 storey dwellings – The rural edge along Harry Stoke Road has no detached houses, a few semi detached houses and is predominantly small terraces. So it is **NOT COMPLIANT**

**Section 4.1.3, 4.1.4 and 4.1.5** in the conclusion states that there are only minor instances where they deviate from the code and attributes this to the changes in local context since 2012. As explained earlier this is completely false as the context has not changed since 2006.

**Conclusion.**

**It is extremely disappointing that the developer has used factually incorrect information to justify their so called “minor” deviations from the Design Codes document. There has been no major developments to change the context of the area since the campus development in the UWE in**

**2005/6. Which pre-dates the outline planning approval given in October 2006 and the agreed Design Codes document in 2012.**

**They have also left out significant information when stating their compliance, particularly with regard to the 4 storey apartments that are against all the design codes and local plan requirements located in the urban village area opposite Harry Stoke Road. See my earlier objection letter of the 4<sup>th</sup> March for details.**

**The new plan is an improvement but it is still far short of providing the diversity and character of dwellings needed to meet the requirements of the Rural Edge and totally fails to meet the requirements of the Urban Village and therefore should be rejected.**