



Planning Policy Sub Committee

**Meeting: Thursday, 12th February 2015 at 6.00 pm in Committee Room 1,
North Warehouse, The Docks, Gloucester, GL1 2EP**

Membership:	Cllrs. Taylor (Chair), Lewis (Vice-Chair), McLellan, Smith and Dee
Contact:	Tony Wisdom Democratic Services Officer 01452 396158 anthony.wisdom@gloucester.gov.uk

AGENDA

1.	APOLOGIES To receive any apologies for absence.
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive from Members, declarations of the existence of any disclosable pecuniary, or non-pecuniary, interests and the nature of those interests in relation to any agenda item. Please see Agenda Notes.
3.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME To receive any questions from members of the public provided that a question does not relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters which are the subject of current or pending legal proceedings, or • Matters relating to employees or former employees of the Council or comments in respect of individual Council Officers
4.	PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS To receive any petitions and deputations provided that no petition or deputation is in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters relating to individual Council Officers, or • Matters relating to current or pending legal proceedings
5.	INTERIM POLICY STATEMENT - PUBLIC HOUSES (Pages 5 - 22) To consider the report of the Head of Planning.

6.	<p>EVIDENCE BASE UPDATE - SUMMARY REPORT (Pages 23 - 24)</p> <p>To consider the report of the Head of Planning.</p>
7.	<p>STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</p> <p>The Head of Planning to provide an oral update.</p>
8.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>Thursday 12 March 2015 at 6.00pm.</p> <p>Please note that informal Members' Briefings have been arranged as follows:</p> <p>Community Infrastructure Levy – Thursday 19 February at 6.00pm.</p> <p>JCS Transport Modelling – First week in March (Confirmation will be provided at this meeting).</p>

ms Shields

.....
Martin Shields
Corporate Director of Services and Neighbourhoods

Date of Publication: Wednesday, 4 February 2015

NOTES

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

The duties to register, disclose and not to participate in respect of any matter in which a member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest are set out in Chapter 7 of the Localism Act 2011.

Disclosable pecuniary interests are defined in the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012 as follows –

<u>Interest</u>	<u>Prescribed description</u>
Employment, office, trade, profession or vocation	Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.
Sponsorship	Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the Council) made or provided within the previous 12 months (up to and including the date of notification of the interest) in respect of any expenses incurred by you carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.
Contracts	Any contract which is made between you, your spouse or civil partner or person with whom you are living as a spouse or civil partner (or a body in which you or they have a beneficial interest) and the Council (a) under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and (b) which has not been fully discharged
Land	Any beneficial interest in land which is within the Council's area. For this purpose "land" includes an easement, servitude, interest or right in or over land which does not carry with it a right for you, your spouse, civil partner or person with whom you are living as a spouse or civil partner (alone or jointly with another) to occupy the land or to receive income.
Licences	Any licence (alone or jointly with others) to occupy land in the Council's area for a month or longer.
Corporate tenancies	Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) – (a) the landlord is the Council; and (b) the tenant is a body in which you, your spouse or civil partner or a person you are living with as a spouse or civil partner has a beneficial interest
Securities	Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where – (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the Council's area and (b) either – i. The total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or ii. If the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, your spouse or civil partner or person with

whom you are living as a spouse or civil partner has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

For this purpose, “securities” means shares, debentures, debenture stock, loan stock, bonds, units of a collective investment scheme within the meaning of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 and other securities of any description, other than money deposited with a building society.

NOTE: the requirements in respect of the registration and disclosure of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and withdrawing from participating in respect of any matter where you have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest apply to your interests and those of your spouse or civil partner or person with whom you are living as a spouse or civil partner where you are aware of their interest.

Access to Information

Agendas and reports can be viewed on the Gloucester City Council website: www.gloucester.gov.uk and are available to view five working days prior to the meeting date.

For further details and enquiries about this meeting please contact Anthony Wisdom, 01452 396158, anthony.wisdom@gloucester.gov.uk.

For general enquiries about Gloucester City Council’s meetings please contact Democratic Services, 01452 396126, democratic.services@gloucester.gov.uk.

If you, or someone you know cannot understand English and need help with this information, or if you would like a large print, Braille, or audio version of this information please call 01452 396396.

Recording of meetings

Please be aware that meetings may be recorded with the Mayor or Chair’s consent and this may include recording of persons seated in the Public Gallery or speaking at the meeting. Please notify a City Council Officer if you have any objections to this practice and the Mayor/Chair will take reasonable steps to ensure that any request not to be recorded is complied with.

Any recording must take place in such a way as to ensure that the view of Councillors, Officers, the Public and Press is not obstructed. The use of flash photography and/or additional lighting will not be allowed unless this has been discussed and agreed in advance of the meeting.

FIRE / EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest available exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by council staff. It is vital that you follow their instructions:

- You should proceed calmly; do not run and do not use the lifts;
- Do not stop to collect personal belongings;
- Once you are outside, please do not wait immediately next to the building; gather at the assembly point in the car park and await further instructions;
- Do not re-enter the building until told by a member of staff or the fire brigade that it is safe to do so.

Gloucester City Council

Meeting:	Planning Policy Sub-committee	Date:	12 February 2015
Subject:	Interim Policy Statement – Public Houses		
Report Of:			
Wards Affected:	All		
Key Decision:	No	Budget/Policy Framework:	No
Contact Officers:	Anthony Wilson, Head of Planning		
	Claire Haslam, Planning Officer		
	Email: anthony.wilson@gloucester.gov.uk		Tel: 396830
	claire.haslam@gloucester.gov.uk		396825
	APPENDIX 1 – Consultation Document		
	APPENDIX 2 – Consultation Responses		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To present an Interim Policy Statement for the protection of public houses and the findings of a recent public consultation on this matter. To seek the Committee's endorsement of the Interim Policy Statement and the future work required to progress the statement through the City Plan process.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 Planning Policy Sub-Committee is asked to **ENDORSE:**

- (i) The Interim Policy Statement for the protection of public houses (outlined in section 5 of this report); and
- (ii) To endorse the consultation response report; and
- (iii) The future work required to evidence a draft policy for the City Plan (outlined in section 6 of this report).

3.0 Background

- 3.1 The closure of public houses has been raised by Members as an issue that requires planning policy guidance in order to protect against the loss of these facilities.
- 3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework and the Submission Version of the Joint Core Strategy consider public houses to be community facilities. As such protection against their unnecessary loss is considered to be of importance in the creation of sustainable communities.
- 3.3 This issue will be dealt with fully as part of the ongoing City Plan process. A draft of the City Plan policies is due to undergo public consultation in the autumn of this year.
- 3.4 In the meantime an Interim Policy Statement has been produced in order to open up a conversation with regard to the direction and content of the policy, and to scope out the evidence base required to support any policy which will eventually form part of the City Plan.

4.0 Consultation Responses

- 4.1 The draft Interim Policy Statement was subject to a four week consultation period between 5th January and 3rd February 2015. A copy of this document can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.
- 4.2 A total of 13 responses were received (2 objections, 5 supports, 6 comments). These responses are attached in appendix 2 of this report.

5.0 Final Draft Interim Policy Statement

- 5.1 *Public houses are considered to be a valuable social and community facility. As such the Council will seek to protect against the loss of public houses. Planning permission for the redevelopment or change of use of a public house will be permitted only when the following can be clearly demonstrated:*
- i. It is no longer viable to run the property as a public house, and;*
 - ii. The public house has been appropriately and positively marketed for a reasonable period and no reasonable offers have been received, and;*
 - iii. Any proposed development would not have a detrimental effect on the design, character and heritage of the existing public house and/or the wider street scene, and;*
 - iv. There is an alternative public house within walking distance, or;*
 - v. A replacement community facility will be provided on part or all of the site, or within walking distance of the site. The size and nature of this facility will be determined through evidence of extensive engagement with the community and the Council's Partnership and Engagement team to ensure that the*

replacement facility meets the needs of the community that it will serve and is fit for purpose.

In the case of historic pubs, where permission is granted for redevelopment the applicant shall be required to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in accordance with the Council's emerging heritage policy and in line with best practice guidance published by English Heritage.

Supporting Text

Viability and Marketing

Where applications for a change of use or redevelopment of a public house are received, the Council will require evidence that:

- a. a comprehensive sustained marketing campaign (agreed in advance by the Council) has been undertaken, offering the public house for sale as a going concern and using an agreed realistic valuation of the premises;*
- b. the marketing campaign has run for a period of at least twelve months before the planning application is submitted;*
- c. if marketing has been based wholly or partly on an alternative community or employment use, there has been prior discussion with the Council on the principle of the proposal;*
- d. the public house has been offered for sale locally, and in the region, in appropriate publications and through specialised licensed trade agents;*
- e. it can be demonstrated that the public house is not financially viable; in order to determine if this is the case, the Council will require submission of trading accounts for the last three full years in which the pub was operating as a full-time business;*
- f. the CAMRA Public House Viability Test, or a similar objective evaluation method, has been employed to assess the viability of the business and the outcomes (to be shared with the Council) have demonstrated that the public house is no longer economically viable.*

6.0 Future work

- 6.1 In order to take this Interim Policy Statement forward as part of the City Plan the following work will need to be undertaken:
 - a. Survey work to establish the extent of the issues facing Gloucester's pubs. The number of pubs the City currently has along with the number of losses and gains over recent years will need to be examined.
 - b. Mapping work to visually map the existing and closed pubs to establish the spread and therefore any concentrations or gaps in the provision of facilities.

- c. Establish a suitable 'walking distance' as referred to in the policy in order that the policy may be used in the assessment of planning applications.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 The Planning Policy Sub Committee are asked to endorse this Interim Policy Statement, the Response Report, and the future work as outlined above, in order that this policy may be developed further and progressed to adoption through the City Plan process.

APPENDIX 1 – Consultation Document

DRAFT FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION INTERIM POLICY STATEMENT ON PUBLIC HOUSES - 5TH January 2015

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 This interim planning policy statement has been compiled to address issues and concerns raised by Members in relation to the potential loss of pubs in the City.
 - 1.2 In recent times there have been a number of planning applications for the conversion or demolition of pubs to provide mainly residential or retail schemes. Pubs of a certain size can also be converted to some other uses through Permitted Development Rights.
 - 1.3 Whilst the loss of public houses may appear to be concerning, many of our pubs have managed to stay in business despite testing economic times, proving that the right management and offer can be successful. Three of the City's historic pubs have been successfully refurbished in recent times (The Pelican, Robert Raikes and the Northend Vaults) and new opportunities have been created within the Gloucester Quays development.
 - 1.4 This policy statement also confirms the Council's view that pubs are more than just private businesses. Local pubs provide an opportunity to bring people together and support community function. As such the Council wishes to afford pubs greater protection to reflect this 'community role', bringing the status of pubs in the City in line with advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
 - 1.5 It is also acknowledged that many of the City's historic pubs also play an important role in the character and appearance of the City.
 - 1.6 This policy statement sets out the policy approach that will be taken forward in the development of the City Plan. The statement takes into account the following key principles:
 - a. The importance of pubs as community gathering spaces which reinforce the importance of community and social interaction.
 - b. A need to preserve the important economic functions of pubs which provide a substantial amount of local employment, providing job opportunities to local people.
 - c. The need to preserve pubs which have an important historical and architectural function, contributing to the local townscape.
 - d. A need to be flexible enough to respond to the changes and realities of the local economy and the wider economic environment.
 - 1.7 It should also be noted that the guidance is not proposing the use of an Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights for pubs to change to cafes and restaurants (A3), financial and professional services (A2) or shops (A1).
 - 1.8 However, the Council may use an immediate Article 4 Direction on a case by case basis should it be deemed by the Council to be appropriate. Immediate Article 4 Directions can be imposed on specific buildings or land when there is a justified and urgent requirement for the land or buildings protection. The Council as the planning authority would therefore have the right to stop permitted development changes relating to a pub if required.

1.9 Public houses - a definition

In planning terms a pub is designated as Use Class A4 Drinking Establishments under the Town & Country Planning Use Classes Order (1987) as amended. Pubs require a premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 which is administered by the Council. Under their licence terms, the definition of a 'public house' is framed so as to include all premises licensed for the supply of alcohol for consumption on the premises, including bars and restaurants. The licence is valid for an indefinite period once granted and can only be repealed if the proprietor breaks the terms and conditions of their licence, or fails to pay their annual fee.

2. Status

- 2.1 This interim policy statement has been compiled in accordance with the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF), the Joint Core Strategy Submission Version (2014) (JCS), and the Second Stage Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).
- 2.2 It is the Council's intention that this statement will be taken forward to be further developed as planning policy through the City Plan preparation process.
- 2.3 This interim policy statement will be subject to a public consultation that will run for 4 weeks from 5th January 2015. All comments must be received before 3rd February 2015. Comments can be submitted online at:
<http://consult.gloucester.gov.uk/consult.ti/InterimPubPolicyConsultation/consultationHome>
or in writing to Planning Policy Team, Gloucester City Council, Herbert Warehouse, The Docks, Gloucester, Gloucestershire, GL1 2EQ
- 2.4 Any representations made to the consultation will be reported to the Planning Policy Sub Committee on the 12th February 2015. The committee will then decide whether or not to approve the interim policy statement.
- 2.5 Should the statement be approved it will clearly highlight the Council's policy intention going forward which will subsequently be taken forward more formally through the City Plan process.
- 2.6 In order to develop this statement into an adoptable planning policy further work will need to be undertaken. This work is outlined in section 5 of this draft.

3. Policy framework

- 3.1 The NPPF provides a wealth of general support for those community facilities which can promote social inclusion whilst supporting the economy. In particular paragraph 70 defines pubs as community facilities. The Council's current local development plan does not definitively include pubs as a community facility.
- 3.2 In order to align the local plan with the NPPF this statement suggests that the Council uses the more recent definition of community facilities in the NPPF and JCS in implementing its Local Plan policies including policy CS.1 of the Second Stage Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

- 3.3 Paragraph 70 of the NPPF recommends that planning policies and decisions should:
- Plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;
 - Guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the communities ability to meet day to day needs;
 - Ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community; and
 - Ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing economic uses and community facilities and services.

3.4 The Joint Core Strategy Submission Version (2014) states the following with regard to community facilities:

Policy INF5: Social and Community Infrastructure

1. Proposals to develop land or buildings currently or previously in use as a community facility will demonstrate, including evidence of engagement with relevant local community groups and partner organisations, why the facility is no longer required and, as appropriate, how, when and where suitable local replacement facilities will be provided. Provision of replacement facilities will have regard to the locational and other relevant elements of this policy.
2. Where new residential development will create, or add to, a need for community facilities, it will be fully met as on-site provision and/or as a contribution to facilities or services off-site. New or refurbished provision will be of an appropriate type, standard and size. From an early stage, developers will be expected to engage with the relevant local authorities and infrastructure providers and, as appropriate, relevant local community groups where they exist, to ensure that new provision meets the needs of the community that it will serve and is fit for purpose.
3. Social and community infrastructure should be centrally located to the population it serves and be easily accessible on foot and by bicycle. It should be located so as to have the potential to be well-served by public transport. Developers should aim to provide flexible, multifunctional facilities within mixed-use developments, creating shared space which maximises benefits to the community and minimises land-take. In the case of open space, 'easily accessible' means it is located within reasonable walking distance of the development it serves. New facilities should be accessible to all members of the community, and be planned and phased in parallel with new development.

The supporting text clearly states that for the purposes of the policy community infrastructure is considered to include pubs.

3.5 The Second Stage Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002) has a policy adopted for development control purposes for the protection of community facilities. It states:

Policy CS.1 Protection of Community Facilities

Planning permission will be refused for a development proposal which leads to the loss of existing community facilities, unless:

1. the facility is replaced within the new development; or
2. alternative provision of equivalent community benefit is provided, wherever feasible, at a location in or adjacent to a designated centre, or otherwise at a location which is accessible by other means of transport than the private car; or
3. the facility is not in use and it can be established that there is a surplus of community facilities in the locality and no other organisation is willing to acquire the site and continue its use as a community facility.

4. Suggested Policy

Public houses are considered to be a valuable social and community facility. As such the council will seek to protect against the loss of public houses. Planning permission for the redevelopment or change of use of a public house will be permitted only when the following can be clearly demonstrated:

- i. It is no longer viable to run the property as a public house, and;
- ii. The public house has been appropriately and positively marketed for a reasonable period and no reasonable offers have been received, and;
- iii. Any proposed development would not have a detrimental effect on the design, character and heritage of the existing public house and/or the wider streetscene, and;
- iv. There is an alternative public house within walking distance, or;
- v. A replacement community facility will be provided on part or all of the site, or within walking distance of the site. The size and nature of this facility will be determined through evidence of extensive engagement with the community and other partner organisations to ensure that the replacement facility meets the needs of the community that it will serve and is fit for purpose.

In the case of historic pubs, where permission is granted for redevelopment the applicant shall be required to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in accordance with the council's emerging heritage policy and in line with best practice guidance published by English Heritage.

Supporting text

Viability and Marketing

Where applications for a change of use or redevelopment of a public house are received, the Council will require evidence that:

- a. a comprehensive sustained marketing campaign (agreed in advance by the Council) has been undertaken, offering the public house for sale as a going concern and using an agreed realistic valuation of the premises;
- b. the marketing campaign has run for a period of at least twelve months before the planning application is submitted;

- c. if marketing has been based wholly or partly on an alternative community or employment use, there has been prior discussion with the Council on the principle of the proposal;
- d. the public house has been offered for sale locally, and in the region, in appropriate publications and through specialised licensed trade agents;
- e. it can be demonstrated that the public house is not financially viable; in order to determine if this is the case, the Council will require submission of trading accounts for the last three full years in which the pub was operating as a full-time business;
- f. the CAMRA Public House Viability Test, or a similar objective evaluation method, has been employed to assess the viability of the business and the outcomes (to be shared with the Council) have demonstrated that the public house is no longer economically viable.

5. Future Work

- 5.1 This interim policy statement is an important step forward in protecting Gloucester's valued pubs in line with the NPPF and the resolutions of Full Council.
- 5.2 Further work and evidence gathering will need to be undertaken to support and develop this interim policy statement. This will include more detailed survey work of pub gains / losses and a comprehensive mapping of pubs.
- 5.3 Those pubs which are considered to be of significant historic value will be added to the council's emerging Local List of non-designated heritage assets.
- 5.3 Officers have sought the help of the local branch of CAMRA (Campaign for Real Ale) which is happy to assist in some of the collation of the data. All of this work and information gathering, along with any consultation responses, will help evidence and inform the interim policy statement as it goes forward as part of the City Plan process.

Name	Question: 1. What is the nature of your response?	Question: 2. Please set out your views below.	Officer Response
Gloucestershire County Council (Rob Niblett)	Comment	<p>The production of this Interim Policy Statement (IPS) is welcomed as a means of affording pubs greater protection from demolition and change of use.</p> <p>The IPS should refer to 'Assets of Community Value' (ACV) as introduced by Part 5, Chapter 3 of the Localism Act 2011. The following is taken from a Commons Standard Library Note authored by Mark Sandford:</p> <p>"Part of the Government's community empowerment agenda it requires a local council to maintain a list of 'community assets'. Nominations for community assets can be made by parish councils or by groups with a connection with the community. Individuals cannot nominate community assets. If the nomination is accepted, the group will be given time to come up with a bid for the asset when it is sold. The right to bid only applies when an asset's owner decides to dispose of it. There is no compulsion on the owner of that asset to sell it. The scheme does not give first refusal to the community group, unlike the equivalent scheme in Scotland; and it is not a community right to buy the asset, just to bid. This means that the local community bid may not be the successful one."</p> <p>Listing as an ACV is another means by which pubs can be retained for the local community by allowing groups the opportunity to bid for them as and when they come up for sale. Although there is no guarantee that a local group's bid will be successful or that the listing will in itself prevent the pub being converted for other uses within current permitted development legislation, it is relevant to this IPS and needs to be included. Also, as the City Council is responsible for determining applications for ACVs and maintaining a list of them, it needs to set out details of the process involved and the Council's role within it.</p> <p>Ideally, the potential for listing as an ACV should be referred to in the proposed policy and then expanded in the statement</p> <p>Further information on the ACV can be found at:</p> <p>http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/research/briefing-papers/SN06366/assets-of-community-value</p> <p>Paragraph 1.7 - There is an ongoing CAMRA campaign to change existing planning legislation and PD rights, to ensure that any change of use of a public house will require a planning application, thus giving members of the local community a chance to comment on the proposal and potentially object. The policy would need to be amended to take account of this change should it become law.</p> <p>Another issue that has arisen in relation to pub closures has been pub companies selling off pubs with restrictive covenants thereby preventing any chance of the purchaser reopening the building as a public house and therefore by default forcing a change of use even if the pubs was a viable business. I'm not sure what LAs can do to prevent such restrictions but it may be worth flagging the practice up as one which the City Council would wish to discourage.</p>	<p>Noted - The process for the listing of Assets of Community Value (ACV) can be found on the City council's website:</p> <p>http://www.gloucester.gov.uk/business/land-and-property/Pages/Community-Assets.aspx</p> <p>Reference to the ACV process will be made in the City Plan in the supporting text of the community facilities policy.</p>

English Heritage (Rohan Torkildsen)	Support	English Heritage wish to support the City Council's efforts to conserve its heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. Perhaps important, but non designated, pubs could be included in a 'local list' which can provide added protection in the planning system? Might it also be beneficial to map the city's historic pubs and also perhaps provide an opportunity for volunteers to survey/audit their internal and external historic features?	Noted – A local list is under development and will be continued through the City Plan process. Non-designated heritage assets, including those non-listed public houses of heritage value will be included.
One Eyed Jacks (Pat Hurley)	Object	Pubs that are viable do not close to profiteer from selling for retail or housing. Pubs close due to social and economic changes, supermarket pricing of alcohol, healthy lifestyle choices, increase in costs across the board for beer, electricity, etc. All local shops and amenities contribute to community facilities, all have social interaction and all are missed if closed. It is grossly unfair to apply restrictions on a pub freeholder who needs to sell, and is aware that, due to all the factors outside his/her control the buyer may not wish to continue as a pub. Most publicans would much prefer to sell to an operator who will continue as a pub, to build on years of blood sweat and tears they have put in to make a go of it - however this is not something that should be controlled by a local authority - these are freehold buildings and should have the same rights to sell, to the right bidder, as the seller may choose, as in any other freehold business. It is contrary to democracy and capitalism to impose restrictions on one sector of business simply because they do a good job. Private business is not a social enterprise, if pubs are to be deemed as such they should be supported with tax incentives and other perks that community organisations receive. I find it hard to believe these proposals are legal, to retrospectively change the conditions a business has been purchased with. The conditions you propose will devalue our premises, will deter buyers from paying the market price if they feel trapped into a system that will make it longer and harder for them to sell if necessary, and may cause banks to refuse mortgages to potential buyers for those very reasons. For all these reasons I strongly object to this proposal, many pubs have closed but many will survive with the support they deserve, given your own appraisal of the benefits we bring to communities, to our employees and to the tax man, surely it is only fair we be treated equally when we wish to sell.	Noted – While public houses are private businesses the government has acknowledged them as valuable community facilities through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The policy does not stop public houses being sold on to be maintained as public houses. Nor does the policy stop applications for change of use and redevelopment being submitted. Those applications that meet the criteria of the policy will normally be permitted. The council, through the NPPF, has a duty to provide for sustainable communities by protecting and providing suitable facilities that serve the needs of those communities.
Will Perrin	Comment	Pubs should be protected as institutions. They should not be able to be converted to retail just because the current owners have built up a debt, that doesn't in itself mean the pub is economically unviable.	Noted
Brian Stokes	Support	I support the current draft proposals. It is unfortunate that they were not in force earlier. During the since 1971, when I moved into my current house in Romney Close, the 2 nearest pubs, The Seymore in Seymore Road and The Northfield in Northfield (or maybe Southfield) Road have closed and been demolished or adapted for housing. There is now a large area in this locality without a local within safe walking distance.	Noted
Ricki Mac	Comment	You should not be encouraging drinking, Pubs such as the Ridge and Furrow closed because it was no used. because of this it was not maintained by the owners and needs to be demolished. Local authorities must not be involved in such issues leave it to the private sector.	Noted – Public houses have been acknowledge by the government as community facilities.
James Crawshaw	Comment	I would really like to see the redevelopment of the ridge and furrow pub. It was the heart of the local community and was missed more than ever over Christmas. There are no other local pubs in this area. The he area has lost its focal point, a place for friends and families to meet up and socialise. It's now an eyesore which appears to have no use whatsoever! Please see sense and bring back this brilliant local pub.	Noted – the future of the Ridge and Furrow pub is a matter of a separate planning application.

Darrel Kirby	Support	<p>I think this is a very welcome move - anything that we can do to preserve our pubs - both historic and those that form the centre of the community - is to be encouraged. The stipulation that any proposed development "would not have a detrimental effect on the design, character and heritage of the existing public house and/or the wider street scene" is interesting as I can't see how you could convert a pub to anything else whilst abiding by it. It is hard to preserve the character of a pub when you turn it into apartments or a soulless, garishly lit supermarket – the fate of the Welsh Harp and The India House, for example. However, if merely retaining the façade will meet the requirement then maybe that is less reassuring. Finally I am interested in the stipulation that there must be "an alternative public house within walking distance." This is an excellent stipulation to prevent communities being hollowed out through the loss of their pub. You only have to look at Barton Street, once thriving with pubs, to see what can happen. However, it depends how far you reasonably expect people to walk: it may be considered that the walk from the Great Western or the Plough to One Eyed Jacks, for example, is perfectly acceptable. So clearly the policy will need to be tested in reality to see how well it stands up, but the fact that the council are pushing for it is a great sign and something that anyone who cares about our pubs should welcome and support.</p>	Noted – In the further work required to evidence this policy a suitable 'walking distance' will be established.
Anita Faulkner	Support	<p>This is an excellent idea, and long overdue. You may wish to consider defining "walking distance", or putting a figure on it. Walking distance could be extremely subjective. I would particularly hate to see any historic pubs lost.</p>	<p>Noted – In the further work required to evidence this policy a suitable 'walking distance' will be established.</p> <p>Historic pubs may already benefit from the additional protection afforded to Listed Building. Those that are not designated, but do make a positive contribution to the heritage of the city will be included in the Local List as it continues to be developed.</p>
Mark Trotman	Comment	<p>I must heartily applaud Gloucester City Council on this forward thinking policy proposal. The public house is, and always has been, a community facility and I have, over the years, been much saddened by the demise of various public houses and consequent loss of community throughout various parts of the City and surrounding areas.</p> <p>I hope that for the future of Gloucester and the heritage of the affected public houses, this policy is adopted.</p>	Noted.

<p>DCLG (Kris Hopkins MP)</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter of 23 October to Brandon Lewis MP about your constituents' concerns about the loss of pubs. I have been asked to reply as the issues you raise fall within my area of Ministerial responsibility.</p> <p>I hope you will understand that because of the Secretary of State's role in the planning process. I am unable to comment on specific cases. However, I am able to offer the following general comments in response to the issues you raise.</p> <p>If there are concerns about viable public houses being lost the answer is for communities and local authorities to work together to develop a clear, proactive strategy to protect those pubs which provide the most community benefit.</p> <p>Through the Community Right to Bid we have given people the power to nominate local buildings, such as public houses, as Assets of Community Value. I am very pleased to see that this pub has already been listed as such. Where such Assets are listed the planning authority may take this into account as a material consideration when determining a planning application, so far over 500 pubs have been listed, and a number of those, where they have been put on the market, have been saved from closure.</p> <p>Local planning authorities have powers to remove national permitted development rights where it is felt that it is necessary to protect local amenity or the wellbeing of the area by making an Article 4 direction. This then requires that a planning application is submitted for the change of use, which the local planning authority can then determine in accordance with national policy and its local plan. This power can be strengthened when it is informed by strategic local plan policy which identifies and protects pubs that provide the most community benefit. We do not believe that Article 4 directions are overly restrictive and instead provide protection of specific facilities which are important to the local community.</p> <p>I hope this illustrates the Government's strong support for community pubs.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
-------------------------------	----------------	---	---------------

Save the Ridge and Furrow Campaign	Support	<p>I refer to the above planning policy consultation. I write to you on behalf of my client – the Save the Ridge and Furrow P.H. Community Campaign Group. The campaign group fully endorses and supports the Council's draft policy. It will fill a much needed local policy vacuum and provide a robust policy framework which accords with national planning policy (the NPPF) and with the principles of sustainable development. The protracted and sorry tale of the Ridge and Furrow PH provides the perfect case study and justification for adopting a policy that will protect pubs that fulfil a valuable role in local communities. The Ridge and Furrow PH was a purpose built pub, planned to be at the heart of the community. It served that community for decades and was a vibrant, viable and successful pub. It won national awards for its role as a community pub. It was a meeting place that was highly valued by all sections of the community, including the elderly and disabled. It has now been closed, boarded up and made to look an absolute eyesore for over a year. The reason is not because the pub has failed, or that it was not viable. The reason is because 'big business', in the form of a national supermarket chain, has decided it must be destroyed to make way for a petrol filling station. The MP's area wide survey in 2014 demonstrated convincingly that over two thirds of the community want to keep their pub. A community facility with massive local support and acknowledged value faces destruction to make way for something that the community does not want or need, and can access at multiple nearby locations (including Morrisons at the Railway Triangle). The planning application which proposes the permanent destruction of the Ridge and Furrow PH is yet to be determined by the City Council. However, as a proposal, it will fail to meet all of the relevant criteria set out in the draft policy. The application should be resoundingly refused. Given that council planning officers were instructed by Full Council to produce this policy 'urgently' in March 2014, the campaign group must formally request, in the interests of natural justice, that the application is not presented to the Planning Committee for a decision until the pubs protection policy consultation is concluded and the policy statement has been endorsed and adopted by elected members. Although the campaign group's prime focus is, understandably, about bringing the Ridge back into active public house use, we fully support a city wide policy. Other communities in the city should not have to endure what has happened to the community that was served by the Ridge. Our pubs are a vital part of our communities and they should be appropriately protected by planning policies.</p>	Noted – the future of the Ridge and Furrow pub is a matter of a separate planning application.
Wm Morison Supermarkets Plc	Object	<p>We are writing on behalf of our client, Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc, in response to the consultation currently being undertaken on the draft Interim Policy Statement “the IPS” on Public Houses which was published in January 2015. We have reviewed the document on behalf of our client, and have a number of concerns relative to it. These concerns are set out below:</p> <p>1. Presumption in favour of sustainable development</p> <p>The IPS suggests that it has been prepared in accordance with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF). However, both the NPPF and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) have a presumption in favour of sustainable development which is a principle at the heart of national policy.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how a policy which has every appearance of seeking to introduce a presumption against the granting of planning permission by placing a blanket protection on use classes, can be in accordance with this principle. In these terms, the IPS is against the presumption of sustainable development and therefore contrary to the NPPF and PPG.</p> <p>2. Principle of the IPS</p> <p>It is unclear what the IPS is seeking to include within its remit as the “suggested policy” refers to public houses, but the definition of public houses under paragraph 1.9 of the Council's note refers to Use Class A4 (Drinking Establishments), but suggests that bars and restaurants are also public houses in a non-planning context. The wording of the IPS is imprecise and not consistent with the definition, it therefore can not be</p>	<p>Noted. To address concerns in relation to the potential loss of pubs, the Council is seeking to protect pubs, where appropriate, as community assets. This accords with the NPPF and Submission Version of the Joint Core Strategy.</p> <p>This Interim Policy Statement has been produced in order to open up a conversation with regard to the direction and content of the policy, and to scope out the evidence base required to support any policy which will eventually form part of the City Plan.</p> <p>The ‘interim policy statement’ will be addressed fully as part of the City Plan process, a draft of which is due to undergo public consultation in autumn of this year.</p>

considered sound.

The NPPF and PPG do not make any recommendations to local planning authorities to draft or issue interim policy in advance of the Development Plan. On the contrary, the NPPF and PPG require local planning authorities to focus on the preparation and adoption of the Development Plan as a matter of priority. Other documentation, should only be prepared and adopted in the context of the development plan and therefore should be a secondary priority.

This is particularly relevant, given that the local authority has not had an up-to-date Development Plan for a number of years. It is noted that the local planning authority is progressing with the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury. The JCS was submitted for independent examination in November 2014.

The advancement of the IPS in this context is completely inappropriate, as it is not the role of the local planning authority to pre-empt the adoption of its development plan in the piecemeal manner sought.

In terms of procedure, the local authority appears to have no intention whatsoever of submitting the policy to the Inspectorate for their view. It is inappropriate for a local planning authority to seek to adopt “policies” that would have such blanket effect without them being properly discussed and independently examined.

Finally, the introduction of “the Policy” should not hold up the determination of current applications or even be adopted when it conflicts with existing national and development plan policies. In these terms the LPA should not be awarding this document any weight for decision making now or in the future.

3. Compliance with Chapter 8 of the NPPF

Chapter 8 of the NPPF, Promoting Healthy Communities, sets out within paragraph 70 that to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should (with our emphasis):

- Plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;
- Guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs;
- Ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community; and
- Ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.

We comment as follows:

- As previously noted, the IPS seeks to provide blanket protection over a single use class, regardless of individual circumstance, which is evidently not positive planning;
- The “Policy” goes well beyond guarding the loss of valued facilities, and comments relative to the onerous requirements of the policy are set out below;
- The “Policy” prevents community facilities being able to develop and modernise, and
- By focussing blanket protection on a single use class, any integrated approach to considering development is prevented.

For these reasons the IPS is in direct conflict with the NPPF and PPG.

4. Detailed commentary on “the Policy”

The requirements of “the suggested policy” are onerous, inappropriate and vague. Further, the requirements do not provide any certainty relative to how the test might be met. For example, no definition is provided relative to viability test (i.e. what is viable?).

In terms of viability (bullet point (i)), the supporting text refers to the CAMRA Public House Viability Test. CAMRA is an advocacy group who are conducting a widely publicised campaign to prevent the closure of public houses. It is therefore not appropriate to use their methodology to inform the local authority’s approach to planning decisions.

In terms of bullet point (ii), the marketing requirement is too prescriptive and does not allow for individual circumstances. Furthermore, a period of “at least 12 months” of marketing is inappropriate as it would either require a business to operate at a loss for 12 months or result in an empty public house over the same period. Either scenario is evidently unacceptable and unsustainable.

In terms of bullet point (iv), it is unclear, to say the least, as to why there should be alternative public house within “walking distance”. Further, the policy is unclear as to the starting point of the walking distance, or what that “walking distance” might be.

It is not suitable to require a replacement community facility as a public house in bullet point (v) if the current operation is not viable and there is no demand for it. The suggestion that there should be extensive engagement in these circumstances also suggests a lengthy process which is unlikely to come to a definitive outcome that is agreed by all parties or an outcome that can be properly defined, given the vagueness of the wording of the bullet point.

In terms of last section of “the Policy” it is difficult to see what this requirement would add to any discussions that would already need to be held with English Heritage in any event.

Summary

In summary, Wm Morrisons Supermarkets Plc object to the IPS in its totality for a number reasons, not least the following.

- The IPS is not clear what land uses will be affected by it;
- It is inappropriate for the local planning authority to bypass the development plan making process with a piecemeal document which will not be subject to independent examination;
- IPS is contrary to the principles and detailed commentary within the NPPF, and
- The detailed requirements of the “suggested policy” are onerous and unsound.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE

12 FEBRUARY 2015

Evidence Base Update – Summary Report

1 Gloucester Playing Pitch Strategy 2014/15 (ongoing)

- Commissioned consultants Knight Kavanagh and Page to undertake work and prepare strategy.
- Once complete, it will, amongst other things;
 - Inform emerging planning policy (for example policies for the provision of sports and leisure facilities through City Plan);
 - Provide guidance and evidence to inform decisions on development proposals Affecting existing sports and leisure facilities
 - Ensure the most efficient management and maintenance of sports facilities; and
 - Provide the basis for ongoing monitoring and review of the use, distribution, function, quality and accessibility of sports and leisure facilities.
- Strategy informed by consultation with all clubs in and around the city. As of the start of February, questionnaires have been sent to all winter sports clubs (football, rugby union, rugby league, hockey, bowls, American football and tennis) and around a third have responded. Reminders recently sent. All on-site pitch assessments for winter sports completed. Interviews with key stakeholders (Aspire, Gloucestershire University, key clubs etc) are underway.
- Submission of final strategy to Council – July / August 2015.

2 Strategic Assessment of Land Availability (SALA) 2014 (ongoing)

- Undertaken in-house by officers - provides an annual update of potential development sites.
- Assesses the availability of land in the city that could potentially accommodate housing and/or employment development.
- Liaison with site promoters to understand capacity and potential start date / build-out.
- Outputs inform an understanding of housing and employment land supply and in identifying sites for potential allocation in the City Plan.
- The Site Assessment Panel, held concurrently with Tewkesbury and Cheltenham took place on Monday 19th January 2015
- Pertinent site updates were presented to a panel of local land & planning agents and other specific consultees
- Little feedback was received from the panel on the Gloucester work - reflecting panel's acceptance of the work that had been undertaken on site capacities
- The study is now in the process of being written up and will shortly be available on the City Council website – it will help provide evidence on land supply in the City to inform site selection for the City Plan

3. Potential 'Out-of-Centre' Retail Sites – Sequential Testing 2015 (ongoing)

- Undertaken in-house by officers, this piece of work will assess the accessibility of potential 'out-of-centre' sites to accommodate some of the authority's future retail floorspace requirements.
- Once complete, the evidence will satisfy the Council's requirement, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), to identify sites to provide for their full assessed retail floorspace requirements, in the most accessible locations to the City Centre or other appropriate town centres.
- It is anticipated this will be published summer / autumn 2015.

4. Input into Major Planning Applications

- Officers have been working with DC colleagues on the two planning applications submitted for Winneycroft Farm. It has been necessary to bring both parties together to ensure good planning outcomes for the area – this has been a resource intensive task.
- Officers continue to consider both applications as they evolve as well as considering contributions requested from infrastructure providers who do not normally benefit from S.106 contributions in the City.
- Officers continue to provide policy input on all major planning applications to DM colleagues – seeking to ensure that the City has a 5 yr plus 5% housing land supply in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF as well as ensuring that retail applications are subject to relevant sequential tests.

AW/150203