#### HALL AND WOODHOUSE

ALTERATIONS TO THE EXTERNAL LANDSCAPING TO INCLUDE A TIMBER DECKING AREA, PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE AND THE RELOCATION OF DISABLED PARKING BAYS AT THE WORLDS END PUBLIC HOUSE, HEATHERTON PARK, BRADFORD ON TONE (RETENTION OF WORKS ALREADY UNDERTAKEN) (RESUBMISSION OF 07/11/0019)

Grid Reference: 317354.121939 Retention of Building/Works etc.

## **RECOMMENDATION AND REASON(S)**

Recommended Decision: Conditional Approval

The proposal is considered not to have a detrimental impact upon visual or residential amenity and is therefore considered acceptable and, accordingly, does not conflict with Taunton Deane Core Strategy Policy DM1.

# **RECOMMENDED CONDITION(S) (if applicable)**

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
  - (A2) DrNo 04 Existing and Proposed Sectional Elevations A-A, B-B
  - (A2) DrNo 03 Proposed Landscape Plan
  - (A4) Block Plan
  - (A4) Location Plan

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Notes for compliance

#### **PROPOSAL**

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of decking, bridge and child's play area at the Worlds End Public House. The proposals constitute an amended scheme, with the material change being the increase in height above ground of the raised decking. The decking has been constructed and the works completed at the site; the decking varies in height due to changes in the ground level, but generally varies between 300mm and 600mm above ground; the original application previously permitted a height of 150mm.

The application is made retrospectively with works having been competed on 29

## SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

The Worlds End is a large public house come restaurant located south of the A38 at Bradford on Tone. The property has a large car park and external seating/dining area to the rear (south); the latter is enclosed by a combination of stone and brick walls together with small areas of planting. The rear of the site is enclosed by timber fencing, stone walls and hedgerow planting that have a maximum height of 2.5 metres; the stone wall to the northern boundary of the car park has an approximate height of 2.5 metres and has recently had a small section adjacent to two existing disabled parking bays rebuilt. There are residential properties to the north and south of the car park.

Planning permission was originally granted for the proposals under LPA reference 07/11/0019; the works to the decking were not completed in accordance with the approved plans, with the decking being laid higher than permitted.

## **CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION RESPONSES**

#### Consultees

SCC - TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT GROUP - No objection.

BRADFORD ON TONE PARISH COUNCIL - No comments.

# Representations

1 letter of objection received raising the following planning related matters:

- The decking is raised to 600mm high, turning my 8 ft wall into a 6 ft wall and inviting possible burglary;
- It is beyond me how a construction that so little resembles the plans can be allowed;
- The height of the decking has compromised the privacy, security and tranquility of my property. I often have people peering over the wall into my garden;
- The maintenance of the wall is now difficult because a large area at the base is now inaccessible; the corridor left by buildings is too tight to be of use;
- The is a void under the decking which is a fire hazard with smoking customers dropping cigarettes onto stray bark chipping's;its also a health hazard as dropped floor will encourage rodents;
- They were made aware in advance that the decking height did not confirm to planning but continued regardless.

#### **PLANNING POLICIES**

DM1 - TD CORE STRATEGY - GENERAL REQUIREMENTS,

#### **DETERMINING ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS**

The principle of the development was considered to be acceptable previously and the majority of the issues raised by the objector have not changed since this original decision. The pertinent issue to consider is the impact of the additional height to the decking upon residential amenity.

The neighbouring resident has objected, claiming that the additional height to the decking is allowing customers of the public house to look over the stone wall that separates the two sites; burglary is also a concern as the wall is now lower for scaling than previously.

When stood on the decking within the site, the stone wall is approximately 1.9 metres in height above the decking. Having re-visited the site it is clear that views into the neighbouring property are largely restricted. A customer would only be able to see clearly into the neighbouring garden if they were in the region of 6ft 4 inches tall; such is well above the average height of the population, otherwise it would be necessary for people to deliberately scale the wall to look over and into the neighbouring garden. Such is not likely to be a regular occurrence and can be prevented with good management of the public house.

The impact of the additional height to the raised decking is not considered to significantly harm residential amenity of the adjoining property; nor is it considered likely to increase the risk of burglary as the 'reduced' height of the wall is not considered to aid any potential offender greatly.

Having regard to the above matters it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

In preparing this report the Planning Officer has considered fully the implications and requirements of the Human Rights Act 1998.

CONTACT OFFICER: Mr R Williams Tel: 01823 356469