



PUCKLECHURCH PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 21ST JANUARY 2026 AT 19:30 AT THE BUNGALOW HMP ASHFIELD.

PRESENT.

Cllrs G Boyle, R Dunning, A Hemmings, T Symons, S Reid and D Freestone
In attendance: Clerk D Dunning, 1 member of public and Ward Councillor Palmer

Public Participation.

Shortwood resident raised concerns around the Rock House Farm planning application which is not seen as sympathetic and will overwhelm the existing small settlement and local infrastructure.

2026/01/21 No 1. To receive apologies for absence.

Cllrs Parker and Hawkins. Cllr Pibworth was absent. Ward Cllr Stokes did not attend.

2026/01/21 No 2. Declarations of interest (if any) and dispensations.

Non-pecuniary interests by Cllr Freestone in 5a as chair of Pucklechurch Cricket and Cllr Symons in 5a as PCA Trustee.

2026/01/21 No 3. To approve minutes and sign as correct records of the council meetings.

Resolved subject to amending the spelling of Cllr Symons name to approve the minutes of 10th December 2025 and 5th January 2026. Minutes were duly signed by the Chair of meeting.

2026/01/21 No 4. To receive report from ward councillor(s).

- White lines on Westerleigh Road by the M4 motorway bridge will be reinstated and cat's-eyes replaced later in the year.
- Appeal APP/P0119/W/25/3369680 heard for P24/02055/F Land Opposite Meadow View Shortwood Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire. Outcome awaited.

Standing Order 3m was suspended and it was agreed to consider item 7ai. P25/02966/O Land At Rock House Farm Shortwood Mangotsfield South Gloucestershire

2026/01/21 No 7ai. P25/02966/O Land At Rock House Farm Shortwood Mangotsfield South Gloucestershire

Having reviewed the proposed wording, **resolved** to object – see appendix 1.

Thanks were given for all the work in preparing the response. The council noted the growing time commitments required to respond to these planning applications and the importance of residents submitting their own views and comments.

2026/01/21 No 5. AGENDA ITEMS TO ACTION.

2026/01/21 No 5a. To receive any updates and agree any actions relating to the Community Centre and in addition consider:

- i. Review of condition survey.
- ii. Cost implications from condition survey.
- iii. Action planning and meeting with Pucklechurch Community Association.

Cllr Hemmings updated the meeting. A record of completed and outstanding works to date is required and an action plan needs to be developed for new and/or priority works.

Actions:

Cllr Symons to obtain a list of all works completed by Pucklechurch Community Association (PCA)

Cllr Hemmings to investigate recommended electrical requirements for the Scout hut

Cllrs Hemmings and Symons to provide draft action plan.

2026/01/21 No 5b. To receive any updates on the Scout hut and agree any actions and in addition consider:

i. Cost implications from condition survey.
As above.

ii. Consider request to use the Scout hut for a Youth Club and agree any actions.

Resolved more supporting information and safeguarding controls required before the request can be appropriately considered.

2026/01/21 No 5c. To receive any updates and agree any actions on other S106 projects including sport pitches and woodland

Recreation ground sports pitches – further work undertaken.

Pucklechurch woodland – area supported by the parish council is fully planted. More volunteers required. Agreed to promote on social media.

2026/01/21 No 5d. To note Q3 figures, review final drafts of the budget and approve the required budget and precept request for 2026/27.

Q3 reviewed and noted.

After a further review, **resolved** to approve budget and set precept at £175,000 which equates to a rise of 50p/week for a Band D property – Appendix 2.

2026/01/21 No 5e. To review applications and approve any grant allocations.

The council was disappointed at the number of applications received.

In line with new criteria and grant limits, **resolved** to approve grants as follows noting that in future direct costs such as insurance will not be covered by grants.

Group	Grant request	Amount requested	Amount awarded
Tower Playgroup	Annual insurance	£500.00	£500
South Glos CAB	Support fortnightly outreach sessions Cadbury Heath from 1 st April 2026 – 31 st March 2027.	£500.00	£500
PCASC	2 picnic table/bench seating	£900.00	£450
Pucklechurch Cricket	22 playing shirts	£528.00	£500
Revel	4 toilets £199.80 + disabled/baby change £126 including VAT + two lighting towers £459 Including VAT + Children's Entertainment £274.80 including VAT	£1,059.60	£500.

2026/01/21 No 5f. To consider and agree any additional street cleaning requests for the SGC Parish/Town maintenance team to undertake.

Agreed Councillor to provide ideas to the Clerk.

2026/01/21 No 5g. To approve the replacement of the Eagle Crescent defibrillator cabinet (installed 2015) which is allowing water to ingress at a cost of £750 plus VAT and carriage and fitting.

Resolved to approve replacement.

2026/01/21 No 6. AGENDA ITEMS TO NOTE

2026/01/21 No 6a. To note items of correspondence and agree if any actions required:

- i. To note email complimenting new cleaning contract at the Scout hut.
- ii. To note correspondence with Westerleigh Speedwatch
- iii. To note response from St Thomas a Becket Pucklechurch over concerns around car parking causing congestion.
- iv. To note email regarding clarification to questions raised at South Gloucestershire Council meeting on 17th December.
- v. To note concerns about holly bush in burial ground

All noted.

2026/01/21 No 6b. To note the commissioning of professional support for the Rock House Farm application.

Noted.

2026/01/21 No 6c. To note November 2025 crime statistics.

Noted.

2026/01/21 No 7. PLANNING.

2026/01/21 No 7a. Planning applications.

2026/01/21 No 7ai. P25/02966/O Land At Rock House Farm Shortwood Mangotsfield South Gloucestershire

See above

2026/01/21 No 7aii P25/02906/PIP Land Adjacent To Pennymead Cattybrook Road Mangotsfield South Gloucestershire BS16 9NJ

Permission in principle for the erection of up to 5no. dwellings.

Resolved to object

Access to the proposed dwellings is planned along a constrained private new access road for which inadequate visibility splay/swept path analysis information has been provided at its junction with Cattybrook Road. The proposed layout also results in a kink to the access road which may result in poor forward visibility and users would not have full vantage along its length. No pedestrian walkway appears to be proposed along the length of the access road and therefore all users would have to use the carriageway itself, which may lead to potential conflicts between drivers/pedestrians. Provision for refuse collection at this site is also unclear.

Adjacent parish

2026/01/21 No 7aiii. P25/02994/F Barn At Barley Close Barn Hinton Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9SJ

Conversion and extension of agricultural building to form 1no. self build residential dwelling with parking and associated works.

Noted.

To note objection comments submitted under delegated powers.

7aiv. P25/02877/HH The Cedars Castle Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9UF

Erection of 1.no rear dormer to facilitate loft conversion. Erection of lower ground floor garage. Creation of new vehicular access.

Noted. Appendix 3

2026/01/21 No 7b. Planning decisions. All noted

2026/01/21 No 7bi P25/02545/LB Moat House Kings Lane Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9PP

Internal and external works to repair and stabilise stonework on garage wall. Approved with conditions.

2026/01/21 No 7bii. P25/00374/F 114 Westerleigh Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9PX

Extension of existing vehicular access. Approved with conditions.

2026/01/21 No 7biii P25/02597/TCA Yew Tree House 12 Abson Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9RH

Works to 1no. Apple to all-round crown reduction up to 1 metre, Works to 1no. Cedar to reduce height by 2 metres and reduce lateral imposing branches to match and shape the crown up to 1.5 metres, Works to 1no. Cherry to crown lift up to 2 metres, Works to 1no. Sycamore to crown lift up to 3 metres, foot path and garden side, reduce height by 2 metres and reduce the rest of the crown up to 1.5 metres, Works to 1no. Cherry plum to reduce the height by 2 metres and crown lift up to 3 metres, foot path and garden side, and Works to 1no. Conifer to reduce the height by 3 metres and crown lift, foot path and garden side up to 2 metres all situated in the Pucklechurch Conservation Area. No objections

2026/01/21 No 7biv P25/02681/TCA Court Farm 49 Westerleigh Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9RD

Works to 1.no Ash Tree to remove overhanging limbs on rear neighbour side. No objections.

Decisions received after agenda issued

2026/01/21 No 7bv P25/02807/TCA St Thomas A Becketts Church Westerleigh Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9RB

Works to pollard 12.no Lime trees by 3-4m. All trees situated within Pucklechurch Conservation area. No objections.

2026/01/21 No 7bvi P25/02491/F Harwood Farm Castle Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9RF

Erection of oak-framed gazebo link extension between farmhouse and existing barn and installation of PV panels on south-west facing roof of the barn: Approved with Conditions.

2026/01/21 No 7bvii P25/02475/LB Harwood Farm Castle Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9RF

External works for the erection of oak-framed gazebo link extension between farmhouse and existing barn and installation of PV panels on south-west facing roof of the barn. Approved with Conditions.

2023/01/21 No 7viii P25/02566/HH Shortwood Lodge Shortwood Hill Mangotsfield South Gloucestershire BS16 9PF

Demolition of existing front entrance porch. Erection of single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation. Replacement of front canopy, Installation of rear access steps. Enlargement of windows and door to front elevation and raise roofline of existing boot room to match proposed rear extension. Approved with Conditions.

2026/01/21 No 7c. Planning enforcement and any other actions.

2026/01/21 No 7ci. COM/25/0673/ADV Pucklechurch convenience store

Noted that replacement signage is to be fitted with a compliance review scheduled for the new year.

2026/01/21 No 7cii. COM/25/0712/COU - 4 Fleur De Lys

Noted the potential breach of planning permission is under review.

2026/01/26 No 7ciii. COM/25/0868/UNT : Land At Redford Lane

Noted matter is being actioned and monitored by Enforcement.

2026/01/21 No 8. REPORTS.

2026/01/21 No 8a. To receive report from the Clerk.

- Responded to resident regarding Coxgrove Hill
- As requested, wrote to Bristol Energy Network to raise concerns over early press release.
- Circulated email to councillors from a concerned Shortwood resident and suggested ways to raise awareness and how residents could respond to a planning application.
- Provided clarification to a query on the maintenance contract.
- Reported offensive graffiti on Scout hut door (duly acknowledged by the Police) and arranged its removal.
- New village agent Sharon Wood who hopes to attend the February meeting.
- New PCSO Max Kingsland-Wain
- Process underway to appoint an examiner for the Pucklechurch Neighbourhood Plan. I have notified South Gloucestershire Council that there are no issues with either proposed examiner.
- Shared update from Westerleigh and Coalpit Health Parish Council following presentation on proposed turbine project.
- Noted feedback from community event for Leigh Farm wind turbine project continues to change.

2026/01/21 No 9 FINANCE.

2026/01/21 No 9a. To approve contractual and other obligations for January 2026

Payee	Description	Net	VAT	Total
D Dunning	salary	£2,026.73	£0.00	£2,026.73
D Dunning	Batteries for Scout hut smoke alarm	£8.50	£0.00	£8.50
HMRC	Tax and NI	£823.96	£0.00	£823.96
Primrose gardening	Maintenance contract 259	£1,585.00	£0.00	£1,585.00
Primrose gardening	litter 2602	£250.00	£0.00	£250.00

Primrose gardening	safer surfacing cleaner and fencing removal 261	£105.00	£0.00	£105.00
SERCO	Pucklechurch News Winter 92100860	£358.88	£71.78	£430.66
Microshade	Increased IT hosting charges	£62.59	£12.52	£75.11
Andrea Pelligram Ltd	Professional support Rock House Farm application SI-420	£1,200.00	£240.00	£1,440.00
		£6,420.66	£324.30	£6,744.96

All invoices checked and confirmed for accuracy against payment list - Cllr Symons
Resolved to approve payments. Cllrs Boyle and Hemmings to authorise.

To note invoice approved for payment in December but not yet received.

Payee	Description	Net	VAT	Total
Midland Forestry	Woodland tree works quote 4855	£2,100.00	£420.00	£2,520.00

Direct debits.

Supplier	Goods	Net	VAT	Total
o2	phone	£11.00	£2.20	£13.20
BT	broadband	£35.87	£7.17	£43.04
NEST	Pension Contribution	£144.37	£0.00	£144.37
EDF Energy	Electricity Eagle Crescent	£18.00	£0.00	£18.00
EDF Energy	Electricity Parkfield	£24.00	£0.00	£24.00
EDF Energy	Electricity Scout hut	£131.25	£6.56	£137.81
Reconomy	Monthly waste collection	£48.68	£9.74	£58.42
Unity Bank	charges	£8.55	£0.00	£8.55
Water2Business	Scout hut annual water and sewerage	£125.54	£10.04	£135.58

Noted. Invoices checked for accuracy against direct debit list – Cllr Symons

2026/01/21 No 9b. To receive and agree reconciliations for December 2025.

Balance per bank statements as at 01/12/25	£
Unity Bank current	£69,232.96
Unity Instant access savings	£90,706.32
Hinckley and Rugby BS	£75,000.00
Unity Bank current	
Less: payments for December 2025	£10,710.82
Plus: Unity income for December 2025	£175.00
Balance as at 31/12/25	£58,697.14
Unity Bank instant access savings	
Less: payments for December 2025	£0.00
Plus: Income for December	£499.88
Balance as at 31/12/25	£91,206.20
Hinckley and Rugby BS savings account	

Less: payments for December 2025	£0.00
Plus: income for December 2025	£1,206.99
Balance as at 31/12/25	£76,206.99
Balance as at 31/12/25	£226,110.33

Figure 1 Print screen of December 2025 accounts.

Less: payments in month	0.00	0.00	10,710.82		0.00	0.00	229,332.96
Balance c/fwd	76,206.99	91,206.20	58,697.14				
	A	B	C				
Combined balance	D	226,110.33		Bank rec at 31 12 25			
				Hinckley and Rugby 90 day	76,206.99		
				Unity instant access savings	91206.20		
				Unity	58,697.14		
Balance as at 1st April 2025		244,038.85					
Plus: receipts in year to date		211,404.44			226,110.33		
Less Payments in year to date		229,332.96		Less: uncleared chqs	0.00		
Balance as at 31st December 2025	E	226,110.33		F should equal D & E	226,110.33	Diff	0.00

Figure 2 Print screen Unity Bank current account statement December 2025.

15/12/2025	Faster Payment Debit	B/P to: Primrose Gardening	£200.00	£0.00	£60,454.32
15/12/2025	Faster Payment Debit	B/P to: Primrose Gardening	£1,585.00	£0.00	£58,869.32
15/12/2025	Credit	M Walkley	£0.00	£70.00	£58,939.32
19/12/2025	Direct Debit	Direct Debit (NEST)	£144.37	£0.00	£58,794.95
19/12/2025	Credit	L Dunwell	£0.00	£45.00	£58,839.95
23/12/2025	Direct Debit	Direct Debit (EDF ENERGY)	£133.66	£0.00	£58,706.29
31/12/2025	Fee	Manual Credit Handling Charge	£0.60	£0.00	£58,705.69
31/12/2025	Fee	Service Charge	£8.55	£0.00	£58,697.14

Figure 3 Print Screen Unity savings account December 2025.

Your Instant Access account transactions:					
Date	Type	Details	Payments Out	Payments In	Balance
30/11/2025		Balance brought forward	£0.00	£0.00	£90,706.32
31/12/2025	Credit Interest	Credit Interest	£0.00	£499.88	£91,206.20

Figure 4 Print Screen Hinkley and Rugby BS savings account as at 31st December 2025.

The screenshot displays the 'Savings Accounts Summary' page for H&R Building Society. At the top, the current balance is shown as £76,206.99. Below this are two buttons: 'PAYMENTS' and 'MANAGE ACCOUNT'. A 'Year' dropdown menu is set to 2025. The main section is a table with the following data:

Date	Description	Amount	Balance
29/11/2025	Interest	£1,206.99	£76,206.99
22/05/2025	Receipt	£74,000.00	£75,000.00
01/05/2025	Receipt	£1,000.00	£1,000.00

All approved. Reconciliation checked for accuracy against bank accounts – Cllr Symons

Date of next meeting 18th February 2026.

Meeting closed at 21:05

APPROVED MINUTES SIGNED VERSI

APPENDIX 1 P25/02966/O

Demolition of existing structures; erection of up to 280 no. dwellings and 1 no. building providing up to 350 sq m GIA of commercial space (Class E); vehicular access off Main Road / Shortwood Hill; emergency access off B4465; pedestrian and cycle routes; together with water management measures, green infrastructure and landscaping, and all associated infrastructure (Outline) with access to be determined, all other matters reserved.

Pucklechurch Parish Council (PPC) has reviewed the documentation associated with this application, commissioned professional planning advice from Lee Searles MRTPI at Andrea Pellegram Ltd, and considered the Draft Pucklechurch Neighbourhood Development Plan (now at Regulation 16) alongside its responses to the South Gloucestershire Draft Local Plan. Having examined the application in detail, Pucklechurch Parish Council concludes that the proposal is in material conflict with national and local planning policy and technically incomplete.

As a result, Pucklechurch Parish Council resolves to object to the application.

The Parish Council raises significant concerns about:

- Green Belt justification
- Access and traffic impacts
- Under-assessment of impacts on Shortwood and Pucklechurch as a whole
- Infrastructure shortfalls
- Active travel deficiencies

Missing Application Documents

The Planning Statement refers to an Air Quality Assessment and a Noise Assessment, but neither has been uploaded. Pucklechurch Parish Council requests these be made available immediately for consultation.

- **Air Quality Assessment** – At paragraph 8.65, the applicant's Planning Statement refers to the submission of an Air Quality Assessment as a supporting document. This has not been made available on the application portal, and it should be as soon as possible to allow consultees the opportunity to review it and comment.
- **Noise Assessment** – Similarly at paragraph 8.62, the applicant's Planning Statement refers to the submission of a Noise Assessment as a supporting document. This has not been made available on the application portal, and it should be as soon as possible to allow consultees the opportunity to review it and comment.

Green Belt Issues

The applicant's Planning Statement sets out arguments in favour of the site's status as Grey Belt. The contention is that the site does not make a strong contribution to Green Belt purpose (a) to prevent urban sprawl, primarily because it is located next to Shortwood Village. This is queried on the following basis:

- Shortwood is a long established small linear settlement (fewer than 90 dwellings in total) extending no more than around 300m along Main Road for its main part – outlying parts of the village further along are connected by Rock House Farm which is an agricultural development with adjacent cottages consistent with a countryside location. As such the Green Belt boundary is currently based on the strong boundary provided by the A4174 ring road and Shortwood remains in the Green Belt.
- The Local Plan (Draft policy LP7) proposes to remove the application site from the Green Belt to facilitate the future development of the site for up to 280 homes. The additional need for health, education and other community facilities this will create cannot be met on site. To an extent, the release of the application site from the Green Belt relies upon the release of other land parcels from the Green Belt and their development, in order to meet community infrastructure requirements. The release of

the application site is therefore proposed as part of a much larger release of land which has not yet been examined through the local plan examination process.

- The ARUP 2025 Sustainability Assessments contained changes to the West of England Combined Authority (2022) Strategic Green Belt Assessment for eastern fringe sites covered by policies LP6, 7 & 8 without supporting evidence to justify downgrades. This was raised by Pucklechurch Parish Council as an issue for Local Plan examination purposes since the Rock House Farm site was assessed by WECA as making significant contributions to purposes (a) & (c) but now appear to be downgraded to 'moderate' for (a), allowing a professional judgement to conveniently reduce green belt protection. There is a lack of robust justification for reducing the green belt protection across this site and in effect would only extend greater Bristol.
- If the site's contribution to Green Belt purpose (a) is considered on its own and in advance of the Local Plan examination findings, then it should be seen that there would be a strategic extension of urban settlement to the east of the ring road and so a significant incursion into the Green Belt beyond the clear/strong line provided by the ring road.
- In short, by seeking permission early, the applicant must justify the proposed development in isolation of wider local plan proposals which are not yet confirmed as sound. On this basis it is contended that the site does indeed make a strong contribution to purpose (a) because development would be a clear isolated breach of a strong line that prevents urban sprawl. In due course, the situation may change, but as of now this is the position. As such the site cannot be considered to be Grey Belt at this time.
- With regard to Green Belt purpose (c) to prevent encroachment of development into the countryside, the development of the application site would clearly encroach beyond the edge of the urban settlement of east Bristol, into the countryside. Local Plan proposals do not seek to remove Shortwood Village from the Green Belt which indicates that development of the land adjacent to it would not be appropriate development in the Green Belt. The context within which development can take place is one that requires the release of the site from the Green Belt along with other sites but only upon the conclusion of the Local Plan Examination which finds the proposals sound. This has not happened yet.
- Development in this eastern fringe green belt has always been considered unsuitable. The remaining green spaces, commons, woods and green corridors will be placed under immense pressure through increased footfall. Placemaking requires genuine community engagement. The local community does not support large-scale developments in the green belt at this site. Greenfield land contributes towards the mitigation of climate change and nature conservation if left undeveloped, as recognised by NPPF 125b, which says that planning policies and decisions "should recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production". It is Pucklechurch Parish Council's belief that this site should remain undeveloped Green Belt as it plays a vital role in addressing climate change by providing critical carbon storage, helping to alleviate urban heat island effects and with its ability to adsorb heavy rain, mitigate against flood risk.

Access and Traffic

Pucklechurch Parish Council has significant concerns regarding the proposal for the application site to have its main access off Main Road in the southern part of the site instead of providing a main access directly onto the B4465. According to the Transport Statement, traffic (52%) will utilise the A4174 via the Dram Way Roundabout off the B4465 or will go through Pucklechurch (27%). It makes little sense from a traffic perspective to route traffic to and from the proposed site via Main Road.

- The direct result of placing the main access on Main Road is that traffic associated with the proposed development will have a greater propensity to be routed through Shortwood itself, whether this be residents, visitors or deliveries. The Design and Access Statement and the Transport Statement simply do not consider the impacts of traffic associated with the development on the stretch of road immediately outside the site from the proposed site access, along Main Road to the bridge over the A4174.
- Pucklechurch Parish Council believes there are some specific matters to consider, including the narrow width of both Main Road and of the pavements, the obstacles created by parked cars on the road, the impact of the traffic calming buildouts on traffic flows, conflicts and queuing. The assessments are silent on these matters and in the view of the Parish Council they must be considered and responded to.
- The application documents make little mention of the relationship between Shortwood and Pucklechurch Village, apart from references in lists to the Three Shires Medical Practice and the Pucklechurch Primary School. The application presents the development as urban facing and heavily interacting with the Bristol conurbation. Whilst there may be significant interaction across the A4174, the Parish Council's view is that the potential for resident interaction with, and use of facilities in Pucklechurch (and utilisation of traffic routes through the village), is not recognised and significantly under-represented. As such, there should be more consideration of travel connections between the proposed development and Pucklechurch Village and a greater consideration of the demand created for a range of facilities in Pucklechurch.
- Pucklechurch Parish Council considers a single priority road junction serving the domestic traffic associated with 280 dwellings to be very poor design. Reliance on one junction means that:
 - all peak-hour movements converge at the same point
 - right-turn conflicts increase
 - queues form in both directions
 - minor incidents cause disproportionate disruption

This creates a fragile access point where even a small blockage could gridlock the entire development. Furthermore, PPC believes that the road access proposal conflicts with current national and local design expectations. A single-access estate is the exact opposite of permeability. It creates a cul-de-sac at the scale of an entire neighbourhood and is at odds with the National Model Design Code, which supports the NPPF requirement for well-designed places. The cycle and pedestrian links do not solve the resilience problem - cycle links may provide opportunities for active travel, but they do not change the traffic loading. The proposal for an emergency access route acknowledges the absolute safety requirement for a second point of traffic access but there appears to be no justification for not making this the main point of road access.

- Pucklechurch Parish Council believes the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of PSP11, CS8 and CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan. Public transport journey times from Shortwood—whether starting from the bus stop on Main Road or on foot from the Dramway Roundabout—are consistently long, multi-stage and unreliable, with door-to-door travel to key destinations such as Bristol Parkway, UWE and Bristol City Centre typically ranging from 35–60 minutes, compared with 10–20 minutes by car. This demonstrates that public transport is not a reasonable alternative to private car use, contrary to CS8. The need for interchange, low service frequencies and the absence of direct strategic routes mean that the site does not ensure “appropriate, safe, accessible, convenient, and attractive access is provided for all mode trips arising to and from the proposal” as required by PSP11. As a result, the scheme is unlikely to reduce car dependency, undermining the design expectations of CS1. Taken together, the evidence shows that the site would

be inherently car-dependent and therefore unsuitable for a major residential development of 280 dwellings.

The movement structure of the proposal compounds these shortcomings. Shortwood's Main Road is an unclassified road. It sits at the very bottom of the road hierarchy. This means:

- It is a local access road, not intended for strategic traffic.
- It is not appropriately designed to carry the full traffic load arising from a 280-dwelling development.

As with many other unclassified roads it has:

- a narrower carriageway
- tighter bends
- limited visibility
- no formal pedestrian or cycle infrastructure
-

This means even with light traffic:

- queues form more quickly
- turning movements block through-traffic
- collision risk increases
- the junction fails under peak demand

The B4465 might cope but an unclassified road cannot. A conservative estimate is that a 280-dwelling development of this nature could generate 1,800–2,200 two-way vehicle movements per day (with AM peak of 144 two-way trips and a PM peak of 132 two-way trips) or between 650,000 and 800,000 additional two-way vehicle movements per year that must pass through the single access on Main Road, an unclassified road with narrow pavements, traffic-calming buildouts, and constrained geometry. An emergency-only route provides for improved resilience for fire and ambulance services and compliance with minimum fire-service access expectations. This is valuable but it is not enough to make the layout acceptable for a development of this scale. PPC believes the design to be at odds with PSP11, as it would have the capacity to create or contribute to severe congestion and have an unacceptable effect on highway and road safety.

Public Transport and Active Travel

There is no evidence to support the claim that encouraging active travel and links to public transport reduces high reliance on cars. Indeed, the census 2021 confirmed residents predominately use cars to commute over public transport and active travel (3% use public transport, 2% cycle and 5.7% walk). In addition, the 2024 National Travel Survey, demonstrated that active travel (walking and cycling) rates were similar to the previous year, while people in England made an average of 357 car trips per person annually. Data and access profiles (DAPs) also show that low numbers of residents live and work in the same place even in areas with multiple employment options. Air pollution remains an ongoing problem across the authority and continues to pose a threat to health. Imagining that everyone will suddenly start to use public transport is fanciful and aspirational, indeed a recent presentation by SGC's Transport Engagement Team suggests that by 2042 car use will rise by 28%. As described above, public transport accessibility from the Shortwood area remains fundamentally weak, even when journeys begin from the most favourable location at Dramway Roundabout. Although this point would provide the shortest walking distance to the Emersons Green bus corridor, the resulting journey times to key destinations remain long, multi-stage, and uncompetitive with car travel. This demonstrates a high level of structural car-dependency that cannot be mitigated through minor service improvements.

Although active travel within the site and its connections with routes to Bristol and north-south via the Dramway are positively prepared, there are still routes outside the site that need some improvement.

- Policy PUCKLE 15 of the Draft Pucklechurch NDP identifies priorities for improvement to the existing network in Shortwood Village. The road and pavements are very narrow. Crossing places are not formal but are based on use of traffic calming build outs into the road. Parked cars in the village create visibility issues for pedestrians who need to cross the road. Nevertheless, the travel plan expects this substandard route to be used by people walking into Mangotsfield and to access bus services.
- PUCKLE15 also prioritises improvements to active travel routes from Shortwood to Pucklechurch village. There is a need to provide a pavement on Shortwood Hill to the junction with the B4465. At present there is no walking route from the village to Pucklechurch without walking on the road (a diversion via Cattybrook Lane and then up the B4465 is a big dog-leg and is not considered reasonable given its length).
- The Transport Statement shows predicted growth in traffic using the Shortwood Hill/B4465 junction over the next 15 years with development. The junction is wide with sweeping entrances which make it a difficult junction for pedestrians to cross even with the central refuge area. As stated, there is no pavement down Shortwood Hill from this junction. The applicant and South Gloucestershire Council are asked to consider what further can be done to ensure there are safe and convenient pedestrian routes from Main Road to connect to existing pavement infrastructure on the B4465.

Community facilities and Infrastructure

Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy sets out the Council's approach to securing infrastructure and developer contributions on new development in order to improve the sustainability of communities. The SGC Core Strategy says "Access to community facilities is fundamental to creating sustainable communities. Similarly, opportunities to participate in the cultural life of communities can contribute greatly to the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities as a whole. New development will clearly put additional pressure on existing facilities." Parish Council believes that the application fails to fully meet the requirements of policies CS6, CS23 or CS24 – Pucklechurch Parish Council would welcome an opportunity to discuss the issues it has identified further.

- Draft Pucklechurch NDP Policy PUCKLE2 also sets out requirements for specific community infrastructure that has the potential to be met through new development, either directly or through financial contributions. The submitted proposals contain some commitments to provide facilities identified in this policy. This includes the replacement of the play area in Shortwood which will be replaced by two separate play areas for smaller and older children. A clear understanding of arrangements for the maintenance/management of the play and other communal areas, in accordance with required standards is needed. However, what is described as a 'a new mixed use hub facility for the area, that may be utilised as employment space, community café, or retail, with a mobility hub' does not appear to be ring-fenced for a specific designated community use as permission is sought for flexible Use Class E. In addition, elsewhere in the Design and Access statement, the illustrative floor plans show a sales area, warehouse etc and describes it as having a commercial ground-floor function with residential accommodation above. Designating the proposed community space as Use Class E is unacceptable because it provides no long-term protection for community use and would allow the space to be converted to a wide range of commercial activities without planning permission. This directly undermines the purpose of securing community infrastructure as part of the development and fails to meet the expectations of the NPPF (Section 8, Para 98), SGC Local Plan policy and the Draft Pucklechurch NDP, all of which require community facilities to be safeguarded for genuine community benefit. Only Use Class F2 provides the

necessary planning control to prevent the future loss of the facility, ensure continued community access, and thereby secure the public benefit relied upon in the planning balance. For these reasons, the community space must be designated as Class F2.

- SGC's Local Plan identifies a need for outdoor sports pitches in the area, the proposed development application makes no mention at all of sporting facilities and does not appear to be making any contribution toward meeting this need. The need is partly pre-existing in Pucklechurch parish and partly arising from the new development. The proposed new development will not therefore secure the required infrastructure provision to meet the existing needs of Pucklechurch, the non-provision for the new development and increase the need to travel elsewhere will remain. Pucklechurch Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss how sports provision can be improved to meet local needs within a clear timetable.
- The written submission indicates that 0.2ha of allotments will be provided to meet demand arising from the development, though the masterplan draws an area which incorporates approximately 45 plots. The applicant is requested to confirm the number of allotment plots expressed in terms of full-size or half size plots (a full-size allotment plot is about 250 square metres (10m x 25m). The provision of allotment plots is welcomed. It should be noted that there is an outstanding identified need for 12 additional allotment plots to meet existing demand in the parish.
- Pucklechurch Parish has insufficient burial space capacity to accommodate the future need for burials from additional population. Draft NDP Policy PUCKLE2 seeks to ensure that additional capacity is provided as part of a planned approach should strategic development create additional burial space needs in the Parish. The indicated requirement is for provision of at least 180 burial spaces and 700 cremation ash spaces to meet the long-term requirements of the Parish.
- The Bristol, North Somerset, South Gloucestershire Integrated Care Board has responded to the planning application consultation and has identified a shortfall in primary care capacity in the area such that provision of additional facilities are required to meet needs for GP surgery floorspace arising from the demand created by the new development. The development will create other needs (such as primary school and secondary school places) which may or may not be able to be accommodated by existing provision. The Local Plan approach is intended to provide new community infrastructure across strategic development sites in this area. As a smaller development, the application site is unable to deliver this infrastructure by itself. Financial contributions have been requested by the Integrated Care Board towards the provision of refurbished and/or extended facilities (given that provision of new facilities is uncertain pending the outcome of the Local Plan and of further planning application processes. Pucklechurch Parish Council is concerned to ensure that they money collected through contributions can be spent on local facilities to make additional capacity. The Three Shires Practice in Pucklechurch has space to accommodate only a modest increase in demand.

Complementary Design

Pucklechurch Parish Council appreciates this an Outline application and that many details would be provided at a later stage under Reserved Matters should it be approved.

Nevertheless, there are several aspects it wishes to raise as points of concern. Built development in Pucklechurch Parish should help to conserve and enhance existing positive character features within Pucklechurch, Shortwood, other settlements and the countryside. Pucklechurch Parish Council believes the plan that has been brought forward has the capacity to overwhelm the existing Shortwood settlement. In addition, the Rock House farm site would be marooned between the A4174 and B4465 and as such the proposed design sits separately to Shortwood without integration. The proposal fails to bring any positive additions to the public realm of Shortwood itself. This is a rural community, yet the indicative layout and design references pay more attention to the urban modular designs of Emersons

Green. It should be noted here that the Draft Pucklechurch NDP Policy requires applicants to have regard to design codes set out in the NDP and their supporting report.

- Draft Pucklechurch NDP Policy PUCKLE6 requires applicants to consider proposals that would avoid the creation of overbearing new development in relation to existing development which is at significantly lower density. PPC believes the overall proposed density to be significantly higher than that exhibited in Shortwood, as described in the Draft NDP.
- The submitted Design and Access Statement commits to the provision of a minimum buffer of 25m between new built development and existing development on Main Road in Shortwood Village, including a 13m landscape buffer to provide planted screening. The Planning Statement refers to a 20m minimum buffer including a 15m planting buffer. This should be clarified and confirmed. The creation of a 25m buffer is required to ensure privacy can be maintained, and a wider planted buffer of at least 15m is requested as the minimum required to provide effective all-year round screening from new development which is likely to be lit and active throughout the day.
- Pucklechurch Parish Council understands the proposals to place taller development (maximum 3-storeys) to the centre/northern part of the proposed development are to provide a lower profile on the boundaries of the development adjacent to existing residents. However, Pucklechurch Parish Council would again refer SGC and the applicant to the Draft NDP Policy Design Codes.
- With regard to Housing Types, SGC and the applicant are referred to the Pucklechurch Housing Needs Assessment and Draft NDP Policies PUCKLE 3 and PUCKLE 4 which provides an assessment of the local housing needs and affordability constraints on different housing products and tenures. These should be considered in formulating proposals. In addition, Pucklechurch has a significant workforce based on self-employment and small businesses operating from home. Draft NDP Policies PUCKLE 9 and PUCKLE 10 encourage new developments to plan positively with sufficient space/accommodation to support local enterprises working from home. Pucklechurch Parish Council also seeks clarification that should this application be approved as a 'grey belt' development, that the provision of 40% of the dwellings as affordable housing would meet Golden Rules identified by the NPPF.
- Pucklechurch Parish Council does not agree with the suggestion that parking standards should be reduced at this site if approved. This would be contrary to the expressed design code in the Draft NDP, which supports the provision of visually attractive on-plot parking allocation in line with the SGC parking standards and that developments of multiple dwellings must include visitor parking spaces in line with SGC parking standards.
- Comments submitted by the Designing Out Crime Officer observe that the Design and Access Statement does not include enough information to demonstrate that the applicant has considered sufficiently the ASB, crime and safety implications of the design. This should clearly be rectified and in addition attention paid to comments regarding parking arrangements and lighting.

Drainage strategy

Comments submitted by the LLFA suggest this appears to be incomplete and cannot currently be supported because it fails to follow the SuDS hierarchy and lacks the essential evidence required by the LLFA. No infiltration testing has been carried out, despite this being a basic requirement, and the applicant has not demonstrated why higher-priority SuDS options—such as reuse, infiltration or discharge to a watercourse—are unfeasible. The proposal to discharge all surface water to a 300mm highway drain is therefore unjustified, and no evidence has been provided to show that the highway system has the capacity to accept these flows. Until infiltration testing, SuDS hierarchy assessments and full capacity

modelling are submitted, the LLFA cannot give in-principal approval. The application therefore appears contrary to drainage policy and should not be approved in its current form.

Land Contamination

The Environmental Protection Contaminated Land Officer's response suggests that there are still questions to be asked about the suitability of this land for development, and further reports are required to ascertain risk and remediation to ensure that it does not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Surely this should be ascertained before permission is granted. The Phase I assessment identifies the potential for contamination that requires intrusive investigation to be carried out. For a large residential scheme on land with potential risk factors, Pucklechurch Parish Council believes that without the results of these additional investigations this would leave too much uncertainty for SGC to determine that the site is suitable or can be made suitable, as required by the NPPF. Deferring essential investigation to conditions is inappropriate because the extent and nature of any contamination is still unknown. Permission would therefore be premature until intrusive testing and a full risk assessment are completed and reviewed before determination.

Conclusion

The Green Belt justification relies on Local Plan proposals that have not yet been examined or found sound, and the site continues to perform a strong Green Belt function when assessed in isolation, as required at this stage. The access strategy is fundamentally flawed, relying on a single junction onto an unclassified road, contrary to CS1, CS8 and PSP11, and the development would be inherently car-dependent with no realistic prospect of achieving sustainable travel behaviour. The proposal fails to secure or safeguard community infrastructure, including the inappropriate use of Class E for a space that should be protected under Class F2. The drainage strategy is incomplete and land contamination risks remain unassessed, making permission premature under the NPPF. Key supporting documents referenced in the Planning Statement (Air Quality and Noise Assessments) have not been provided.

Taken together, these issues demonstrate that the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy, the Policies, Sites and Places Plan, or the Draft Pucklechurch Neighbourhood Development Plan. The proposal would inevitably place unacceptable pressure on existing infrastructure.

APPENDIX 2 PUCKLECHURCH PARISH COUNCIL APPROVED THREE YEAR BUDGET 2026/27 - 2028/29

TAX BASE 965							
INCOME	2024/25		2025/26		2026/27	2027/28	2028/29
	Actual	Budget 2025/26	Actual as Q3 adjusted for I&E	Estimated year end 2025/26	Proposal For Precept	Proposal For Precept	Proposal For Precept
Burial ground	£2,150.00	£1,000.00	£750.00	£800.00	£800.00	£800.00	£800.00
Allotments £20.00 per site x 30	£600.00	£620.00	£580.00	£580.00	£600.00	£600.00	£600.00
Grants - Neighbourhood Plan	£7,566.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Football club	£470.00	£470.00	£470.00	£470.00	£470.00	£470.00	£470.00
Cricket club	£375.00	£375.00	£375.00	£375.00	£375.00	£375.00	£375.00
PCA ground rent	£5.00	£5.00	£5.00	£5.00	£5.00	£5.00	£5.00
Wayleave (Western power distribution)	£92.95	£92.95	£17.95	£92.95	£92.95	£92.95	£92.95
Bank Interest	£352.47	£50.00	£2,413.19	£2,500.00	£1,000.00	£450.00	£500.00
S106 draw down	£104,528.17	£60,619.95	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
CIL Payments	£1,337.65	£0.00	£1,856.61	£1,856.61	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Donation	£500.00	£0.00	£627.52	£627.52	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Suez grant			£40,000.00	£40,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Hire of Rec	£250.00	£200.00	£250.00	£250.00	£250.00	£250.00	£250.00
Hire of Scout hut			£790.00	£1,000.00	£600.00	£0.00	£0.00
Total other income	£118,227.24	£63,432.90	£48,135.27	£48,557.08	£4,192.95	£3,042.95	£3,092.95
Expenditure	Actual	Budget 2025/26	Actual as Q3 adjusted for I&E	Estimated year end 2025/26	Proposal For Precept	Proposal For Precept	Proposal For Precept
Salaries (net)	£23,559.50	£25,200.00	£18,411.59	£24,548.79	£26,750.00	£27,750.00	£28,900.00
Mileage & home office allowance	£401.78	£400.00	£278.11	£370.81	£420.00	£450.00	£450.00

NI & tax (employee and employer)	£8,436.01	£9,500.00	£7,670.32	£10,227.09	£9,300.00	£11,000.00	£11,250.00
Pension (employee and employer)	£1,667.08	£1,900.00	£1,340.91	£1,787.88	£0.00	£2,000.00	£2,000.00
Payroll PATA Costs	£195.81	£208.00	£157.38	£200.00	£220.00	£235.00	£250.00
Rent Shortwood	£360.00	£360.00	£180.00	£360.00	£360.00	£0.00	£0.00
Insurance	£784.59	£1,000.00	£1,539.24	£1,539.24	£2,000.00	£2,250.00	£2,500.00
Electricity Defib	£420.00	£520.00	£430.98	£574.64	£530.00	£550.00	£580.00
Room rental	£70.00	£100.00	£0.00	£0.00	£100.00	£100.00	£100.00
Pucklechurch news	£1,509.00	£4,000.00	£717.76	£1,435.52	£1,537.84	£1,650.00	£1,750.00
Internet	£397.32	£420.00	£287.26	£430.89	£480.00	£500.00	£520.00
Phone	£142.56	£165.00	£102.69	£136.92	£150.00	£170.00	£190.00
Audit	£920.00	£1,200.00	£1,140.00	£1,140.00	£1,250.00	£1,300.00	£1,400.00
professional fees consultancy	£8,555.31	£1,000.00	£1,080.00	£2,160.00	£5,000.00	£5,000.00	£5,000.00
Membership/subscriptions	£1,380.56	£1,400.00	£1,832.73	£1,832.73	£2,000.00	£2,100.00	£2,200.00
Litter picking/ Rec Village waste /dog bins	£10,077.84	£12,000.00	£7,282.36	£10,500.00	£8,000.00	£8,200.00	£8,400.00
Grass cutting/gardening	£7,469.33	£8,700.00	£5,617.43	£7,489.91	£8,700.00	£8,850.00	£9,000.00
New - hedging maintenance	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£3,000.00	£4,000.00	£4,000.00	£4,000.00
Tree survey	£850.00	£1,500.00	£850.00	£850.00	£900.00	£950.00	£950.00
Maintenance contract	£18,512.54	£21,000.00	£14,330.00	£19,106.67	£22,000.00	£22,500.00	£23,000.00
Bank charges	£109.85	£150.00	£89.95	£119.93	£150.00	£160.00	£170.00
Admin general stat post print	£403.35	£350.00	£172.44	£229.92	£350.00	£365.00	£380.00
Play area maintenance/ repairs & renewals	£7,367.13	£5,000.00	£1,018.00	£4,500.00	£5,000.00	£5,000.00	£5,000.00
Ground maintenance	£6,104.41	£4,200.00	£4,705.38	£6,273.84	£6,000.00	£6,150.00	£6,300.00
Training/conferences	£290.00	£700.00	£376.00	£501.33	£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£800.00

Heartstart Defib maintenance	£156.86	£1,300.00	£0.00	£0.00	£500.00	£500.00	£500.00
Office equipment & software included email hosting. .gov domain and website and remote hosting	£983.71	£2,000.00	£221.85	£1,000.00	£1,500.00	£1,600.00	£1,700.00
Grants	£4,207.21	£4,500.00	£0.00	£4,500.00	£4,500.00	£4,500.00	£4,500.00
Recruitment costs	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£1,000.00	£0.00	£0.00
Election costs		£1,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£500.00
Legal	£2,000.00	2000	£750.00	£1,750.00	£1,500.00	£1,500.00	£1,500.00
sub total	£107,331.75	£111,773.00	£70,582.38	£106,566.11	£116,197.84	£121,330.00	£123,790.00
Play area s106	£17,471.50	£0.00	£58,455.56	£58,455.56	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
CIL	£5,213.39	£0.00	£1,167.00	£1,167.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Open spaces s106	£0.00	£60,619.95	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Sports s106	£0.00	£0.00	£57,801.00	£72,801.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Woodland and tree work	£0.00	£2,000.00	£0.00	£4,000.00	£4,000.00	£4,000.00	£4,000.00
Parkfield turning space	£0.00	£1,000.00	£0.00	£500.00	£0.00	£1,500.00	£2,000.00
Reserves to refurbish play areas	£0.00	£15,000.00	£0.00	£5,000.00	£10,000.00	£10,000.00	£10,000.00
Grantscape donation for Active play project	£4,465.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Neighbourhood plan consultancy fees	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£3,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Local climate and nature action plan	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£500.00	£0.00	£500.00	£500.00
Scout hut	£0.00	£10,000.00	£722.92	£9,000.00	£15,000.00	£15,000.00	£15,000.00
Parkfield football	£0.00	£2,000.00	£2,260.21	£2,260.21	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Community centre	£0.00	£8,000.00	£3,500.00	£20,000.00	£22,495.00	£20,000.00	£20,000.00
Burial ground refund	£55.00		£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00

New defibs			£5,355.95	£5,355.95	£0.00	£0.00	£1,000.00
Metal fencing upkeep along Recreation ground					£5,000.00	£2,500.00	£2,500.00
Burial ground landscape improvements					£1,000.00	£1,000.00	£1,000.00
BT phone box adoption and use					£1,500.00	£0.00	£0.00
Revel 75					£1,000.00	£0.00	£0.00
Memorials for parish					£0.00	£0.00	£0.00
Accessing EGTC community bus					£3,000.00	£2,500.00	£2,500.00
Sub total	£27,204.89	£98,619.95	£129,262.64	£182,039.72	£62,995.00	£57,000.00	£58,500.00
Total	£134,536.64	£210,392.95	£199,845.02	£288,605.83	£179,192.84	£178,330.00	£182,290.00
PRECEPT REQUIREMENT	£121,896	£146,960	£146,960	£146,960	£175,000		
Income Precept	£121,896	£146,960	£146,960	£146,960			
Total other Income	£118,227	£63,433	£48,135	£48,557	£4,193	£3,042.95	£3,092.95
Total expenditure	£134,537	£210,393	£199,845	£288,606	£179,193	£178,330.00	£182,290.00
DIFF	£105,587	-£0	-£4,750	-£93,089	-£175,000	-£175,287.05	-£179,197.05
2026/27							
Precept agreed 25/26		£146,960.00					
Precept 2026/27		£175,000					
Increase for 2026/27		£28,040	19.08%				
Band D tax base 965	965	£181.35					
increase from previous year £		£26.17					
Increase per week		£0.50					

Anticipated reserves at year end:									
Anticipated									
CIL	£0.00								
Play equipment Reserve	£50,000.00								
Neighbourhood Plan	£0.00								
Village hall project reserve	£9,500.00								
Woodland/ tree/ash die back	£4,622.50								
Professional /legal fees	£4,000.00								
Financial contingency	£45,000.00								
Sports s106	£14,472.71								
environmental money	£500.00								
Scout hut	£10,000.00								
Parkfield turning circle	£11,000.00								
	£149,095.21								
General reserves	£0.00								
	£149,095.21								

APPROVED MINUTES SIGNED VERSION HELD BY THE CLERK

APPENDIX 3 P25/02877/HH

The Cedars Castle Road Pucklechurch South Gloucestershire BS16 9UF

Objection

This site is located on the edge of the built-up residential area of Pucklechurch and faces open countryside looking out towards the Cotswold Scarp. It must be tested against PSP38 with regard to visual amenity, residential amenity and highway safety. As with a previously refused application relative to 22 Hillview Road, SGC Officers noted that Feltham Road marks the edge between the settlement of Pucklechurch, adjacent to the adopted Green Belt boundary, and faces the open countryside. The development pattern along this road is one of transition with large gardens and loft landscape leading to an almost rural appearance. While the proposed garage is technically underground, from Feltham Road when read in conjunction with the addition of the proposed dormer, the dwelling would appear as a three-storey building. The immediate character is not one of built form facing directly on to or up to the property boundaries along this road and the proposed additions run contrary to the rural attributes of the area and therefore impacts visual amenity. The garage, and the associated retaining wall would become an incongruous feature and not respect the grain of the locality or the local street scene.

In addition, the provision of a garage at Feltham Road level would require significant earthworks to be undertaken and cuts across a steep embankment that sits adjacent to the road. No Design and Access statement has been provided, no specific information about the nature of the retaining walls has been provided, nor any diagrams showing visibility splays, which are a significant omission, especially given the proximity of the new proposed access to the junction with Castle Road. There are no pavements along this stretch of Feltham Road that would allow residents to safely access the garage on foot from the roadside. It is worth noting here that the property already benefits from a garage, driveway and parking provision yet the application form states 'no' in response to the question " Does the site have any existing vehicle/cycle parking spaces or will the proposed development add/remove any parking spaces?" Clearly the answer should have been 'yes'.