

## **Planning Application s**

### **Land North of Brinsham Park, Yate, BS27 7JT**

We object to Applications PK17/5388/RM and PK17/5389/RM

Yate Town Council has consistently objected to the plan to build these thousands of houses, but now turn to dealing with the detail.

This set of objections cover the details of both sites, as whilst there are some areas in which the sites are very different, most of our objections relate to the design of both application sites, and their interface.

Our first concern is not a planning one – that the developers are calling this Ladden Garden Village. This will confuse people as it sounds as though it is not part of Yate and is miles north on the Ladden Brook. The stream that runs through this area is the Brimsham Brook, the Ladden Brook starts miles to the north and does not run through this site. So this is completely misleading. There will be no vehicular access out of the site to the north, access will be solely through Yate so this marketing label is confusing at best.

We have met the developers and put some of our initial concerns to them. They agreed with us about some eg render, and the question of the location of play areas and the idea of keeping those as informal spaces, and putting the equipment in the existing area in the park to make it into a super play area like Kingsgate Park. But they say they are tied by the s.106 agreement to provide the equipment on site, and tied into render by the s.106. We really oppose this, and want to work to get the best solution for the residents of the existing and new houses. The larger take play areas for example are much preferred and would mean the new equipment being a matter of yards from where the s.106 says.....

#### **1. Construction Traffic**

- a. We note the proposal for wheelwashing facilities adjoining the compound. However, we want a condition making it mandatory for construction related traffic to go through wheelwashing whichever route they take away from the site, as the clay is particularly claggy.
- b. Vehicle routing for compound and construction traffic must come in from the Goose Green Way Roundabout up Randolph Ave and must not come in along Eastfield Drive
- c. Traffic calming is needed on Eastfield Drive to stop rat running of traffic
- d. Compound needs to be moved further from housing - currently too close to Pear Tree Hey in particular, it should be further into the new development, and not on the allotment site adjoining existing dwellings. This will be the main compound for all 2000+ dwellings and industrial estate and this is far too big and long term to be located that close to existing dwellings
- e. The site for the compound will have a long term adverse effect on the ability to deliver the allotments at the north of Randolph Avenue because of compound materials and use compacting the ground. A condition for restoration of the compound ready for organic allotment use is required.

- f. We object to the plan to bring all construction traffic for the whole site in via Randolph Avenue and not to complete the third access road at the start of the development – this will put unacceptable pressure on the existing two roads throughout the construction.
- g. We are deeply concerned about the impact of site traffic on access to Brimsham Green School for pupils crossing Randolph Avenue and require that pedestrian controlled lights are put in now, as traffic increases rather than coming later, and that construction traffic movements be banned during school entry and exit times. We note currently they are planning to have site traffic from 8am to 6pm for six days a week, which would include heavy lorries during school access times, and Randolph Ave has a huge number of unaccompanied children crossing it to school each day from Brimsham Park and from the Counties area. The developer needs to fund a solution from day 1.

## 2. Design in relation to existing dwellings

- a. Housing on 5389 which adjoins existing dwellings is poorly laid out and in particular has no regard to the amenity of existing residents. Many will have terraces of houses way too close to their garden, and we object unless the housing is set much further back so there is an equal distance either side of the fence, And Plot 71 beside 30 Dryleaze is very poorly located. It will block all light to the north for the garden and result in a 2 story gable end within 3 feet of the garden, with overlooking and a dominating effect. The housing should be set back far more from existing dwellings - that small cul de sac of plots 68 – 71 needs rethinking.
- b. But across the whole of 5389, which is the most sensitive site as it backs onto established existing housing we consider there should be a thick hedge row/ landscaping bund, so that the existing houses have some screening from the new ones, at least until the householders can develop additional planting in their gardens to screen themselves. We note the new housing on both applications is being well screened from the new roads, and we consider it essential that the same courtesy is extended to existing residents to give them screening

## 3. Pedestrian access

- a. Need to retain footpath walk from end of Randolph across to end of Leechpol and along to park so redesign cul de sac behind Pear Tree Hey
- b. We are extremely concerned about the complete lack of pavements except on the two main roads. All adoptable roads need a pavement, so people walking through them can walk safely. Otherwise they have to walk in the road in conflict with cars. This is not safe for children walking through to get to school or for older residents. So we need pavements along the edge between gardens and the roadway.
- c. We are unable to see any pedestrian crossings on the main roads. We need these planned in, with provision for adjusting their location should desire lines turn out to be different from expected. Where green corridors cross main roads we need barriers and in the case of spine roads then we need pedestrian controlled traffic lights; we need a safe routes to school plan, with safe pedestrian crossing points ie lights of zebras where children will need to cross the main roads shown on the current plan to

get to school – both primary schools and Brimsham Green as the secondary school. These need to be planned and shown from the very start.

- d. We are very concerned about the lack of pedestrian crossing facilities. There are dropped kerbs along the roads, where they cross side roads. But there is only ONE junction that has dropped kerbs to enable people to cross Leechpool or the road to the District Centre. We must have dropped kerbs at every junction and at desire lines along the road, so that people can CROSS Leechpool and cross to the District Centre when built.
- e. We are deeply concerned at the lack of any facilities for the public to cross Leechpool or to the District Centre. These will be very busy roads, being one of the main spine entrances to the entire estate. Yet we cannot even see a traffic island - and we consider these roads need a safe pedestrian crossing point. Leechpool will be busy, one of three entrances to the entire development yet children will need to cross it every day to get to Brimsham Green school in one direction and the Park in the other. So it desperately needs traffic light pedestrian controlled and / or a zebra crossing – and these need to be installed by the developer. Yet they are not shown on the plans.

#### 4. Main roads

- a. Crossing points
- b. Drives exiting onto main road - We are extremely concerned at the drive ways that exit onto what will be main roads through the estate. If we compare the existing Brimsham Park estate where drives do not exit onto the main roads, we are very surprised to see drives exiting onto main roads, particularly where they are narrow and done the side of houses with no room to turn, so vehicles will have to manoeuvre on the main road to reverse in or out. This is fine in the roads within a small street but not on the main roads. We are particularly concerned at....
- c. Lighting – we can see there is lighting on side roads and on the main road, with the exception of the eastern side of Leechpool – this is a crucial main spine adjoining the district centre. It is likely to be extremely well used, on both sides of the road, so needs lighting on both sides, following the footpath along the eastern side. A good example of this is along Greenways Road.
- d. Footpath along the eastern side of Leechpool. We are opposed the footpath on the eastern side running along the kerb. It needs to be set back into the deep area of open space, so as to form a pleasant green walkway, with the lighting alongside it. Greenways Road, a similar sort of deep green space along the road shows how this can be planted so as to feel like an off road walking route, which is extremely well used by the public (whereas nobody walks on the other side in front of the houses)
- e. Cycling – we can see no provision for cycling routes along the main roads or off road. This is essential to ensure Yate continues to be a cycling friendly town.
- f. Path through the open space area along the east of Leechpool Road
- g. We are unable to see any pedestrian crossings on the main roads. We need these planned in, with provision for adjusting their location should desire lines turn out to be different from expected. Where green corridors cross main roads we need barriers and in the case of spine roads then we need pedestrian controlled traffic lights; we need a safe routes to school plan, with safe pedestrian crossing points ie lights of zebras where children will need to cross the main roads shown on the current plan to get to school – both primary schools and Brimsham Green as the secondary school. These need to be planned and shown from the very start, and to ensure children

walking along the existing routes through Brimsham Park will be able to cross the current Leechpool. It is currently a quiet road and safe to cross, but this will cease to be the case once the development is under way and new houses come down it, so it needs a safe crossing now, not after the traffic is there.

- h. We are opposed to the thin areas of grass verge on the main roads between pavement and road. These serve no amenity purpose but are a considerable maintenance cost to tax payers. We welcome the trees, but consider the pavement should extend to the kerb without these little grass bits which are tiny and will not enhance amenity (they will get wheels on them from cars and become a mess).

#### 5. Parking/ estate roads

- a. Reversing – we are strongly opposed to the provision of narrow drives on main road frontages with no off road turning spaces which will result in reversing onto or off of the main road. This is particularly acute on the corners, and worst of all where the housing fronts directly onto the pavement with no front gardens which will result in shocking sightlines (see plots 60/61 in 5389). The cases where there coincide with corners on 5389 are particularly awful.
- b. Badly located parking spaces We are deeply concerned at the arrangements for parking for the corner houses on the main road frontage of 5389. In each case, these are large four bed houses, but the single garage and single off street parking space is located at the rear, accessed not from the front of the house but from the back. We know from experience that in such situations people park directly outside their doors (particularly given they will only have one off street parking space!) These need to be redesigned to locate the parking spaces closer to the door and to ensure they have the correct number of parking spaces for a four bedroom house. This mess applies to all the corner plots on 5389 eg plots 1, 56, 76, 6, 16, 36. We are particularly concerned about turning on 5388 in relation to pots 20/21 and 6-15 where there is no room, even as shown on their plan. Where will visitors pto 20, 23, 22 park?
- c. Number of spaces Some of the properties have the correct number of off street parking spaces, but overall we consider 10 visitor spaces on 5389 way too low. 16 on 5388 is slightly better but still not enough. This is particularly the case as there are many properties in 5389 which do not have the correct number of parking spaces for the number of bedrooms, which will result in vehicles parking on street routinely. Some eg plot 11 on 5389 have only 1 off street parking space and one single garage for a detached house. We must at the very least have all dwellings meeting the council's parking standards. At present we have a number of four bed houses with only a single garage and one off street parking space on 5389. This is completely unacceptable. We assume the Council will check the parking spaces and garages meet the Council's minimum dimensions. The properties have the correct number of parking space for the dwellings, excluding the visitor allowance, if the garages are big enough and count, although we have grave reservations about garages being included as so very few people park in garages, making on street parking crucial – feeding into our concerns about ensuring the roads are wide enough for on street parking. Otherwise the council is creating the sort of parking chaos we have in Normandy Drive.
- d. Visitor parking. Whilst the properties do deliver the Table A parking spaces, they do not then provide the additional 0.2 spaces per dwelling for use by visitors, so for example on 5389, with 80 dwellings there is only provision for 10 visitor spaces,

rather than the 16 the SPD requires. Additionally some of these are located in places that will cause congestion – and some houses are so far from ANY visitor parking that they are not realistically of any use. We are particularly concerned that the houses fronting the main road have no visitor parking easily accessible, and have four bed houses with only one off street parking space and one garage, so they are going to inevitably find visitors park on the main roads, which are already too narrow for that purpose.

- e. Parking for the flats. PLOTS 41 – 48 are flats, mainly one bed. There is only one visitor space for all 8 flats, and only 1 parking space per flat. This is inadequate, and there is no room for eg work vehicles. The Council's parking standards in their 2013 (SPD) would require 1.6 visitor spaces and as this is a corner frontage on a main road there is no scope for on street parking so an additional bay needs to be provided.
- f. Plots 85/86 on 5389. We realise these are the show homes, but the garages should be normal size, as these excessively long garages unduly impact upon existing dwellings which adjoin the plots.
- g. Road widths turning and parking. We are extremely troubled by the layouts within each development in terms of turning, refuse and fire brigade access. We are aware of the disaster in Normandy Drive, which is too narrow for vehicles to get through when anyone parks along the roads. We note the turning area plans attached to both applications show how a car can get in and turn, but this is a car, not a larger vehicle, and they only show vehicles parked on side of the road. Given the lack of off street and visitor parking it is very likely there will be a lot of on street parking and vehicles will not be able to get through. It is essential the roads are all wide enough for a car each side and the refuse cart to get through or they will be building another Normandy Drive. On 5389 the vehicle track plots show that cars could not get in if there is parking eg at 28/49/50/51 let alone a refuse vehicle if people park on both sides. And the entry road between 16 and 31 will be a problem if there is on street parking. Roads must be wide enough, and double yellow lines must be put in on tight corners from the start, not retrofitted years later at public expense as with Normandy Drive.
- h. We are concerned at the inconsistency of what is adoptable and what is not. The bottom spur of plots 22 – 26 is a small area on 5839 and should not be adoptable, on the other hand, plots 69 – 74 on 5388 should not be adoptable. We need consistency on whether private spurs are to be publicly maintainable.

## 6. Play areas

- a. These two phases show no play space. The only green spaces are along road margins, which are not play space. Accordingly, for children to run around or kick a ball around they will need access to Brimsham Fields the park to the south east of the application sites. This means there must be safe access across the roads, and, crucially the entrance to the park needs to be formed right at the start (and in the right place) The eastern play areas are in the wrong place, these should be informal open space and the equipped area should be merged into the one in the park, less than 100 yards away to form a bigger integrated all age facility which is what residents want, and we as occupiers of the park want. These small equipped areas opposite houses always end in problems and get removed. Not a single one like this has survived in yate. We are fundamentally opposed to the Leap / Neap concept, and to the particular locations chosen. Overall, we have found the leaps and neaps do not work. Parents no longer

let their children go and play unsupervised, and both parents and children have told us they much prefer to have a smaller number of larger play areas, where there is a bigger variety of equipment, which can meet the needs of all ages (and therefore families whose children are of diverse ages) and which are a destination. Our parks in Kingsgate, Witches Hat etc are hugely successful examples of this. We have found Leaps and Neaps, which do not offer this variety are little used, neglected, and face opposition from residents. They are eventually removed. We would therefore much prefer to do what was done on the original Brimsham Park, where the sites which would have been leaps and neaps were left as informal open space, and the money that would have purchased the equipment was pooled to provide the big play area at Millside, within the development.

- b. We are particularly concerned about the location of the LEAPS and NEAPS. Two are located at entrances to Brimsham Fields, (Neap 3 and NEAP 5) the local park, yet there is a large area in that park set aside for play, and the friends of the park want to improve that by adding more equipment. It would be better to have one big play area, rather than three within yards of each other. And this would be better located in relation to distance from dwellings. – need one large play area as evidence says parent take children to play and prefer larger play areas. Our proposal would keep the locations as informal play spaces, but put the equipment into the Park, into an area already fenced for play. This area is WITHIN SIGHT of the proposed equipped play area, and we can think of nowhere that such small pockets within sight of an established bigger area have worked. Far better to merge into one super area. This is preferable to parents, children and the town council who would then take maintenance and replacement responsibility.
- c. We are keen to take responsibility for the play area provision, subject to it being suitably located in a good cluster

#### 7. Relationship to the Park

- a. The Northern main entrance to the Park needs to be further to the east, as at present it comes in onto the narrowest part of the park where there will be only a footpath between the entrance and the lake, creating a dangerous pinch point, particularly for children running into the park. We have pointed this out at every stage and as the authority that runs the park we are keen to stress again that the access cannot be made at this point because of the dangers of doing so and needs to be further east.

#### 8. Design of new buildings

- a. We strongly oppose the use of weatherboarding or render in construction. Neither play any part in the local vernacular (which is stone and brick) and from experience where they have been used elsewhere locally they deteriorate very quickly, and are difficult to maintain. Particularly on road frontages this very quickly has a serious adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood. Brick and stone do not deteriorate in this way. We have spoken with the developer and we know they do not like render either, but the design brief forces it upon them. We strongly urge this be varied to delete weatherboarding and render.
- b. All boundary partitions that form a frontage to a public area whether main road or side road must be brick with pillars, not single skin runs (which fall over) or wood (which deteriorates). Again, we say this from experience of what deteriorates and undermines the character of an area.

- c. We are concerned that only one social housing unit on 5389 and none on 5388 are shown as designed for life, ie wheelchair friendly. All of the properties should be designed for life and therefore suitable for people with wheelchairs. And the parking spaces for the unit designated as wheelchair friendly only has a normal parking space outside, whereas of course it needs a disabled width parking bay to make it wheelchair friendly, otherwise wheelchair users will not be able to access their vehicles.

## 9. Trees and hedges

- a. The whole development needs at TPO so nothing is removed without consent. Also need hedgerow protection orders as all main hedgerows are over 400 years old dating from an earlier enclosure and are examples of Midland Fields system. Hedgerows to be in public ownership (YTC) and not in gardens to be consistent;
- b. Verges - the narrow bits of grass between pavement and roadway on the main roads will become muddy messes, cost money to maintain and will not add to the street scene. We welcome the idea of trees, but not of the verges and suggest the pavement extends to kerb, with trees set in.
- c. We have considered the tree method statement and worry that for many of the trees the fencing matches the canopy. The tree and hedge protection barriers must extend for the full root width as well as canopy width in line with the best professional standards to avoid the problems we encountered at Barnwood Road, and the tree barriers must be retained in place at all times.
- d. We object to the notion of water basins being treated as public open space. We have experience of this happening on the corner of Greenways Rd and Goose Green Way and the land is utterly unusable as public open space because it is waterlogged for so much of the year. So whilst we welcome water features these must be as well as not instead of public open space.
- e. We are very concerned about the treatment of the area along the retained hedge on 5389. Firstly, the ends of the ditches, where they are going to be steep ends to the ditch must have fences / barriers to protect from small children falling down the sheer slope (we have had an experience of this at Rectory Close and had to get the council to put in a proper barrier to stop accidents). These should be developer funded (the sides of course are different as these are less steep and therefore okay. Secondly, the footpath from between Dryleaze and Pear Tree Hey comes into 5389 opposite the open space / hedge. There is a pedestrian crossing point shown as a raised area, but then the public footpath completely stops. There are no pavements, and there is no footpath through the land to the north. Currently the footpath runs along the hedge line northwards. This must be retained, and the hedge and adjoining houses laid out to ensure this happens ie with a surfaced path through the gap alongside the hedge area, and with some of the houses located so that the hedge does not just become a neglected area behind back fences on both sides, which will become a dumping ground. We want the hedge and land around it to continue to be a feature with the footpath alongside it. Otherwise we have a very major north south footpath coming to a dead end, which is crazy. This path must be laid out in the planning consent along the line of the current public footpath – and explicitly so as a surfaced path particularly given the hedge is to be maintained by a private management company who may seek to exclude the public if this is not explicit.

