OCTOBER 2023 PLANNING STATEMENT

1 ROCKSIDE GARDENS, FRAMPTON COTTERELL, BS36 2HL

ON BEHALF OF: GLD LTD

stokesmorgan

Stokes Morgan Planning Ltd 41a High Street Nailsea BS48 1AS

www.stokesmorgan.co.uk 01275 858256

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Application site and surroundings	4
3.	Authorised use & planning history	6
4.	Proposed development	6
5.	Planning analysis/balance	8
6.	Conclusions	16

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared by Stokes Morgan Planning Ltd on behalf of GLD Ltd.
- 1.2 It accompanies a full planning application for the demolition of the existing bungalow, and the erection of 3no. detached dwellinghouses, with associated soft and hard landscaping.
- 1.3 The purpose of this statement is to explain the background to the scheme and provide an assessment of the key planning issues set against the context of national and local planning policy and guidance, and any relevant material considerations.
- 1.4 This statement should be read in conjunction with the following supporting information:
 - Completed Application Form;
 - CIL Question Form;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/LP site location plan;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/1100 site plan existing;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/1200 front and rear elevations existing;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/1201 -side elevations existing;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/3000A site plan proposed;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/3001A block plan proposed;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/3100A –ground floor plan, proposed;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/3101A first floor plan, proposed;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/3102A roof plan, proposed;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/3200A streetscenes, proposed;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/3201A front elevations, proposed;
 - Drawing no. 1543-23/3202A rear elevations, proposed;

- Drawing no. 1543-23/3203A west elevations, proposed;
- Drawing no. 1543-23/3204A east elevations, proposed;
- 3D visual from Rockside Gardens;
- 3D visual from Ryecroft Road; and,
- Sun Study, dated October 2023
- 1.5 This document is structured as follows:
 - Application Site and Surroundings;
 - Authorised Use and Planning History;
 - Proposed Development;
 - Planning Policy Analysis/Balance; and
 - Conclusions.

2. APPLICATION SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The site lies within the Frampton Cotterell ward and parish, under the jurisdiction of South Gloucestershire Council. It falls within the Frampton Cotterell defined settlement boundary.
- 2.2 The site falls within Flood Zone 1 and is not subject to any policy designations. It is not within a Conservation Area, and there are no Listed Buildings or TPOs on site or within the vicinity.
- 2.3 The 0.1 ha application site comprises a detached bungalow within a large, elevated corner plot at the junction of Rockside Gardens with Ryecroft Road. There is a dwarf blue lias stone wall to the roadside boundary, and existing vehicular access from Rockside Gardens, serving an existing double garage. There is a large front and side garden, with a mature rockery garden rising up from road level to the ground level of the dwelling. A hedgerow (L-shaped) divides the front and part of the side garden from the rear and side garden.



Application site viewed from Ryecroft Road

- 2.4 Rockside Gardens in the main comprises semi-detached pairs of post-war dwellinghouses, including no. 5, which adjoins the site to the east. The application site is the only bungalow in the road, though 74 Ryecroft Road, which occupies the opposite corner to the site, was originally a bungalow, subsequently demolished and replaced with a substantial (7-bedroom, 422sqm GIA, with a 253sqm footprint and measuring 8.8m to the ridge) dwellinghouse, under planning permission PT14/1021/F.
- 2.5 96 Ryecroft Road adjoins the site to the north, a similarly-designed post-war bungalow, set back some 14 metres from the highway, with a front elevation level with the side elevation of the application site. Beyond this lie 98-100 Ryecroft Road, a pair of late-Victorian dwellings, set back circa 5 metres from the pavement. Opposite the site to the west lie 63-65 Ryecroft Road, a semi-detached pair of mid-20th century dwellings, and the side garden to no. 55 Ryecroft Road, which has previously been granted planning permission for a dwellinghouse, though this expired in 2012. Generally, the pattern of local development is of early-Victorian dwellings to the north, and post-war infill and new development to the east and west, reflecting the growth of the village over that period.

- 2.6 Ryecroft Road is a designated Active Travel Route, and there is a bus stop outside the site (on Ryecroft Road) with the 460 providing twice-daily service towards Winterbourne and Coalpit Heath. More frequent services are available from Church Road (120 metres to the north), with the Y6 operating hourly between Bristol and Chipping Sodbury.
- 2.7 The site is well-placed for local services and facilities, including The Rising Sun Public House (65 metres), Watermore Primary School (270 metres), and the local centre at Lower Stone Close (350 metres), which includes a convenience store, pharmacy and food outlets.

3. AUTHORISED USE & PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 There is no planning history for the site. The lawful use is as a C3 residential dwelling.
- 3.2 A pre-application enquiry was submitted to the Council in April 2023 (ref: PRE23/0261). The pertinent comments received will be addressed in the relevant section of the planning analysis below.

4. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

4.1 The proposed description of development is as follows:

"Erection of 3no. detached dwellinghouses, with associated soft and hard landscaping, following demolition of existing bungalow."

- 4.2 It is proposed to demolish the existing dwelling, and to erect 3no. detached dwelling houses, following the curve of the road, and each accessed from Rockside Garden, (requiring the creation of two new accesses).
- 4.3 All three dwellings would have four bedrooms and seven bedspaces, with 135sqm of internal floorspace (excluding attached garages) to plots 2 and 3, and 152sqm to plot 1. Each is to be arranged internally as ground floor integral single garages with utility rooms to the rear, kitchen/diners across spanning the rear and living

rooms and studies/home offices to the front of the dwellings. At first floor level, 3no. double-bedrooms and 1no. single bedrooms are proposed, with family bathrooms, and en-suite bathrooms for the largest bedroom.

- 4.4 A traditional design and palette is proposed, with single-storey bays to the front, flush with the garages (other than on plot 1, where the garage steps forward) side-gabled roofs. Dual-pitched roofs are proposed to the front of the garages, matching the pitches of the dwellings, with flat roof sections to the rear. The garage roofs will be continued across the bay windows, and to form entrance canopies above the front doors. A two-storey, gabled bay is proposed to the side elevation of plot 1, facing Ryecroft Road (which accounts for the additional floorspace to this dwelling).
- 4.5 The proposed palette is pennant stone to the front and side elevations, cream render to the rear, with brick quoins and window surrounds, and Bath stone cills. Sash composite windows are proposed, with composite bi-folds to the kitchen/diners, and composite patio doors to the side elevation bay of Plot 1, composite front doors, and white upvc fascias and soffits.
- 4.6 Externally, Plot 3 would have a 140sqm rear garden, Plot 2 a 106sqm rear garden , and Plot 1 a 70sqm rear garden and a 52sqm side garden (enclosed).
- 4.7 9no. parking spaces are proposed, with 3no. integral garages (including space for cycle parking) and 6no. off-street parking spaces. Refuse and recycling storage areas are proposed within the rear gardens to each property, with side gated access to allow receptacles to be taken on to the highway on collection day.
- 4.8 The existing access will be retained for plot 3, and two new accesses created for plots 1 and 2. The existing boundary wall is to be replaced with a pennant stone boundary wall of a similar height (600mm). Stone boundary walls are proposed between rear gardens, and existing rear boundary walls will be retained.

5. PLANNING ANALYSIS/BALANCE

- 5.1 The key policy tests and material considerations to be assessed in the determination of this proposal, are:
 - Is the principle of development acceptable?
 - Would the scheme make an efficient use of the land and provide a suitable housing mix?
 - Would the proposed design be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area?
 - Would the development ensure the residential amenity of neighbours and future occupants?
 - Is the proposed development acceptable in highway safety and parking terms?
 - Are there any other considerations that would warrant refusal?
- 5.2 These considerations are addressed separately below.

Is the principle of development acceptable?

- 5.3 The site falls within the Frampton Cotterell settlement boundary, and the preapplication response confirms that the principle of the erection of new dwellings on the site is acceptable.
- 5.4 Further to this, Policy PSP38 supports new dwellings within existing residential curtilages, subject to appropriate design, preserving the amenity of existing neighbours and future occupants, and highways considerations, all of which are addressed below.
- 5.5 For these reasons, it is considered that the principle of development would be acceptable.

Would the scheme make an efficient use of the land and provide a suitable housing mix?

- 5.6 Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy requires housing development to make efficient use of land and to maximise the amount of housing supplied, particularly where there are good transport links. The policy goes on to state that the development should be informed by the character of the surrounding area and contribute to high quality design and provide adequate levels of open space.
- 5.7 Paragraph 119 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should promote the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes, whilst paragraph 120 states that substantial weight should be given to the re-use of brownfield land, and promotes the development of under-utilised land.
- 5.8 The Council does not have a minimum density for housing. The 0.1ha site currently provides a single dwelling in a relatively sustainable location, which does not represent an efficient use of land. The three dwellings proposed would amount to 30dph, which is considered appropriate for a village location within a small-scale development, given the constraints of the site.
- 5.9 Policy CS17 requires proposals to contribute towards providing a choice of tenure and type, having regard to the existing local mix and the character and accessibility of the location.
- 5.10 The 2021 Census shows that two-bedroom dwellings account for 15.5% of dwellings in Frampton Cotterell, three-bedroom dwellings 40.8%, and four-or-more-bedroom houses 39.8%. For the district, the figures are 21.4%, 44.2% and 26.5% respectively. Whilst the figures for four-or-more bedroom dwellings are higher than the average across the district, and for two-bedroom dwellings, lower, this is indicative of the more rural nature of the area.
- 5.11 Given the small-scale nature of the site, it is not considered that the provision of 3no. four-bedroom dwellings would adversely affect the existing local mix, and would potentially free up smaller houses in the local area for downsizer and first-time buyers.

Would the proposed design be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area?

- 5.12 Central government is committed to high-quality design, which is integral to sustainable development. The government, through the NPPF, recognises the need for proposals to reinforce local distinctiveness but advise that this does not necessitate conformance to certain development forms or styles. The NPPF encourages innovative designs, originality, and initiative, and recognises that high quality and inclusive design should address the connections between people and places, and the integration with the natural, built and historic environment.
- 5.13 Core Strategy policy CS1 states that development will only be permitted where the highest possible standards of design and site planning are achieved.
- 5.14 The pre-application proposal sought views on a contemporary design approach, reflecting the development opposite at 74 Ryecroft Road. The feedback received was that Frampton Cotterell does not have a distinct housing style, and noted that in terms of materials the area consists of a mixture of render, brickwork and pennant stone, with the stone finishes being of a particularly high-quality, locally distinctive building material. It was hoped that this could be incorporated into the proposed dwellings. It was accepted that the illustrative elevations showed well-proportioned houses with a contemporary appearance which broadly reflect the scale of the adjacent semi-detached dwellings on Rockside Gardens, and consequently would not result in harm with regard to design and visual amenity.
- 5.15 The comments on pennant stone have been noted, and the application proposal retains the same general proportions, but now introduces pennant stone to the front and side elevations, and a more traditional appearance, reflecting the properties on Ryecroft Road. It is also proposed to replace the blue lias stone to the roadside boundary wall with a random pennant stone wall. The intention is to source this stone locally, and sample panels can be secured by way of condition.
- 5.16 In terms of scale and layout, the Council raised concerns with regards to plot 1, and the step back proposed, which was considered to break the building line of

Rockside Gardens to both the front and rear. Given the elevated position of the site, it was also suggested that bungalows would be more suited.

5.17 The application proposal addresses the concerns with regards to scale by reducing the ridge height from 9.7 metres to 6.4 metres, and the eaves height from 5.22 metres to 3.89 metres. The accommodation above the garages has also been removed from the current scheme, and their ridge heights dropped from 6.2 metres to 3.6 metres.



3D visual view from Ryecroft Road

5.18 It is considered that the reduction in scale also goes a long way to addressing the concerns with regards to the building line, as the proposal would now read as a link between properties on Ryecroft Road and Rockside Gardens, following the curve of the road, and the building line of Ryecroft Road (96 excepted). The use of more traditional materials, to match the pennant stone-faced properties to the north, creates a visual link between the site and the existing dwellings, transitioning through to the post-war properties which commence at the brow of the hill as the road climbs towards the existing Rockside Gardens properties. Working back in the opposite direction, the proposed dwellings would be of a similar scale and layout to the Rockside Gardens properties, further linking the site to existing development, as the above 3d visual demonstrates.

- 5.19 With regards to landscaping, pre-application feedback was that the front boundary stone wall was a noteworthy feature on the prominent corner plot and should be retained, and that there was an opportunity to provide additional planting behind the front wall and also tree planting in the rear gardens. Concerns were raised that the main patio area for plot 1 appears to be at the side of the dwelling, and therefore it was requested that the boundary treatment at the easterly corner of the site be carefully considered to ensure it is a sufficiently private and useable outdoor space for future occupiers. It was suggested that this could be achieved through planting behind the existing wall; it was confirmed that a fence in this location would not be supported.
- 5.20 As has been covered earlier in this statement, the existing wall will be replaced with a pennant stone wall, which is considered to be of a higher quality than the existing blue lias stone, and more in keeping with the character of this part of the village. The 3d visual above shows that the side garden to plot 1 will be enclosed with soft landscaping either side of the existing walls, and the rockeries will be retained to the front of each property. Additional tree planting is also proposed to the rear gardens, and a detailed landscaping scheme can be secured by way of condition. Block paving is proposed for all driveways.
- 5.21 Overall, the proposal is considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area, and would provide well-designed three dwellings.

Would the development ensure the residential amenity of neighbours and future occupants?

5.22 Policy CS1 requires (inter alia) proposals to respect and enhance the amenity of the site and its context. Policies PSP8 and PSP38 states that development should not create unacceptable living standards for occupiers or nearby properties, through (but not limited to) loss of privacy, overbearing or loss of light. PSP37 requires development to comply with National Space Standards, whilst policy PSP43 sets minimum external amenity space standards, as a guide, which equate to 70sqm for a four-or-more-bedroom house, Paragraph 8.67 of the supporting text states that, "The space standards are a guide and include the totality of balconies, front and

back gardens and communal spaces etc., but not access paths" and that they should also be applied as an average across the site. At paragraph 8.69 the Council recognises that higher densities may be appropriate in certain locations, and in such circumstances, standards can be relaxed if developers can demonstrate access to fresh air and daylight.

- 5.23 The three dwellings would each provide four bedrooms and seven bedspaces over two storeys with 135sqm of internal floorspace (excluding attached garages) to plots 2 and 3, and 152sqm of internal floor space (excluding garage) to Plot 1, in excess of the 115sqm requirement of the National Space Standards.
- 5.24 All properties would be provided with a minimum of 106qm of private amenity space (excluding front gardens but including the enclosed side garden to Plot 1), in compliance with policy PSP43.
- 5.25 The dwellings would be aligned north-to-south, with north-facing gardens, and both north and south-facing rooms. The ground floors are proposed with full-width kitchen/dining rooms to the rear, with bi-fold doors opening out on to the rear gardens, and south-facing living rooms. There are two south-facing and two-north facing bedrooms, giving flexibility of accommodation in relation to individual needs. As such, all dwellings would have good outlooks, natural lighting and appropriate internal layouts to provide appropriate levels of residential amenity.
- 5.26 In terms of overlooking and loss of privacy, the pre-application response stated that any future application would be required to address any harmful sense of enclosure and overbearing on the occupiers of no.96, including loss of light to the neighbour given the path of the sun and the fact the proposed dwellings sit to the south of no.96.
- 5.27 As noted within the design section of the earlier, the dwellings have been significantly reduced in height for the submission proposal, and whilst still two-storey, at 6.4 metres ridge height, they would stand only a metre higher than the existing bungalow. The garage ridge heights have also been reduced, to allow more sunlight to pass between the buildings towards the garden of no.96.

- 5.28 The accompanying sun study supports this approach, with additional shadowing falling within the gardens of the new dwellings, rather than the rear garden of no.96. The biggest change is shown only on the 5pm Winter Solstice, and in that instance, the additional shadowing is to the side elevation and front garden of no.96 only.
- 5.29 To address the potential for overlooking of the garden of no.96, additional tree planting is proposed between plot 3 and the rear garden, and it should be noted that the upper floor rear windows of plot 3 would be a similar distance from the garden of no. 96 (6 metres), as the existing upper floor windows to no. 5 Rockside Gardens (6.5 metres).
- 5.30 In conclusion, the proposal would raise no concerns with regards to existing or future residential amenity.

Is the proposed development acceptable in highway safety and parking terms?

- 5.31 NPPF paragraph 110 requires proposals to provide appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable travel, provide safe and appropriate access, whilst paragraph 111 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
- 5.32 Policy CS8 seeks to reduce reliance on the private motor vehicle, and supports development located near existing and proposed transport infrastructure, and existing facilities and services.
- 5.33 Policy PSP11 supports proposals which would generate a greater demand for travel where safe access be provided, it is located on safe walking and/or cycling routes and would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Policy PSP16 requires a minimum of three parking spaces for a four-bedroom dwelling, 1 cycle parking space per dwelling, and a minimum garage size of 6m x 3m.
- 5.34 As detailed at paragraphs 2.6-2.7, the application site is located in a sustainable location, on an Active Travel Route, and with a bus stop outside the site and

additional services within easy walking distance. The proposal would comply with all of the acceptable maximum walking distances are to services and facilities.

- 5.35 9n.o parking spaces are proposed, in the form of 3no. integral garages (6.25m x 3m) and 6no. off-street parking spaces, equating to 3 per dwelling.
- 5.36 Each dwelling will be provided with a Sheffield Stand within the garage, and refuse and recycling storage areas are proposed within the rear gardens of each.
- 5.37 The site has an existing vehicular access on to Rockside Gardens, and two further access are proposed, with the centre-point of the access to plot 1 (the closest access to the junction) sited 22 metres from the junction with Ryecroft Road, in excess of the recommended 10 metres.
- 5.38 Given that Rockside Gardens is a residential cul-de-sac, and each dwelling can be expected to generate 4-6 trips per day, it is not considered that there would be any significant impact on the local highway network.
- 5.39 In summary, there would be no adverse impact on the local highway network as a result of the proposed development. Consequently, the proposal is acceptable in transport/accessibility/safety terms.

Are there any other considerations that would warrant refusal?

BNG

5.40 The Council's Biodiversity and Planning SPD remains in draft form currently, and does not detail the process for Small Sites. BNG for small sites is expected to be applicable from April 2024. The existing site largely comprises the vegetation type, "Urban – unvegetated garden", which falls within the "very low" distinctiveness category, though it does fall within 500 metres of a priority habitat (the River Frome SNCI, 400metres to the northwest). There is clear scope within the site to be able to provide additional habitat units in the form of hedgerows and tree planting, and these can be secured as part of any condition, along with the Small Sites Matrix, should the requirement be adopted by the time of the decision.

Sustainable energy

5.41 The south-facing front roofslopes would accommodate solar panels to provide electricity and hot water for users of the building. Final details of carbon emission reduction could be secured by condition as part of the Council's response to the climate emergency.

Drainage

5.42 The Environment Agency maps show that the site is at very low risk of surface water flooding, and that the highway is at low-to-medium risk from surface water flooding. Permeable block paving with soakaways are proposed to reduce surface water run-off on to the road, and SUDS could be secured by condition if required.

6. CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The current single dwelling on a 1000sqm plot represents an inefficient use of land in a sustainable location within the settlement boundary of Frampton Cotterell.
- 6.2 The pre-application response was generally supportive of the redevelopment of the site, though was apprehensive about the scale and quantum of the proposed scheme.
- 6.3 The submission proposal has addressed these concerns by significantly reducing the ridge heights of the three dwellings from the pre-application stage, and the scheme would link existing development on Ryecroft Road with that on Rockside Gardens, and therefore fit in well with the existing character and appearance of the area.
- 6.4 Each dwelling would have suitable access, a good standard of residential amenity, and would not impact on neighbouring dwellings.
- 6.5 For these reasons, it is hoped that the Council can support this proposal.