## GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL



## UPDATE REPORT

1.0 This application was due to be considered by Planning Committee in May, however the application was taken off the agenda to allow for further discussions as the concerns previously raised had not been fully addressed.
1.1 Since that time we have now held a very constructive meeting with the applicant and agent to discuss the issues of concern. Primarily these related to the road layout, provision of parking, the mix and siting of the affordable housing and some relationships between dwellings as detailed within section 6 of the attached committee report from May. The overriding concern was the principle of using shared road surfaces throughout the whole development and the implications for pedestrian safety, vehicle speeds and car parking.
1.2 Amended plans have now been submitted and the agent has provided details of the changes within the attached letter. The main revisions are as detailed below.
1.3 The plans propose a reduction in the area of shared surface along the main access road into the estate with the introduction of a footpath on its eastern side. I consider that this is a definite improvement but that with further minor changes, the footpath could extend along the full length of the road. This road will serve a large number of properties and will also provide a direct link with the footpath network within the open space to the north.
1.4 The plans also propose to reduce the overall length of the road to the eastern boundary by designing it as two cul de sacs with a pedestrian link between the two, rather than the long continuous road as previously proposed. I consider that this has a number of positive effects including helping to reduce speeds and providing a more attractive environment to the new residents in that area, whilst still providing convenient pedestrian routes through the development.
1.5 The introduction of a new pedestrian link is also welcomed and will provide easier and more direct access from the development to Faulds Drive.
1.6 On the whole properties are provided with parking/garaging within or next to the plot however there are few examples where this has not been possible. Generally I am satisfied that the agent has explored all opportunities for providing convenient parking for residents within the layout and parking provision varies between one and three spaces per dwelling. There are also a number of areas allocated for visitor parking located throughout the development and also adjacent to the open space to the north.
1.7 Our concerns with the affordable housing previously related to the size of the clusters and the concentration of the lager properties together resulting in particularly high child densities within the rented units within these areas. Changes are proposed under the amended plans to provide better integration of the tenures of the affordable housing however further clarification and suggestions have been put to the agent. A bungalow has not been promoted within this scheme however a large four bedroom eight person property is proposed and this is welcomed and will meet the housing need of a larger family.
1.8 Given the timing of the receipt of the amended plans and the requirement to finalise the committee report I have not yet received consultation responses and can not form a recommendation until these have been received and the applicant has considered the other suggestions and improvements that could be made to the scheme. Copies of the current and proposed layout are attached to the report and all details associated with this application can be viewed in detail at

[^0]1.9 Members will be provided with further details within the late material update report.

### 2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER

2.1 No formal recommendation can be made at this stage.

Decision:
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## 14/01477/REM

## Land To East West Of A38 And <br> Naas Lane <br> Quedgeley <br> Gloucester

## Planning Committee 09.06.2015


© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 10019169
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

$\qquad$ m


CCO/JCO/BRS. 5693
19 May 2015
Joann Meneaud
Development Control
Gloucester City Council
Herbert Warehouse
The Docks
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BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Joann

## Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) Land at Parcel 4B1 Kingsway, Quedgeley, Gloucester <br> Reserved Matter Approval Application Ref: 14/01477/REM

I write following our meeting on $15^{\text {th }}$ May and am pleased to enclose an amended layout (Rev U) that addresses your concerns. I set out below a description of the amendments made.

## Parking

As discussed at the meeting, County Highway officers have no objection to the amount of car parking proposed (subject to a TRO) but we are conscious that the experience of earlier phases of the wider development is that parking provision has been insufficient and has led to overspill parking. We have therefore increased the total amount of parking to 300 spaces.

I have also compared the amount of parking proposed to that of earlier phases nearby. The table below demonstrates that the schemes reviewed have a similar dwelling mix, but the current planning application has significantly more parking per dwelling. Phase 4B2 directly adjoins the application site and has only 11 fewer dwellings but 94 fewer parking spaces for example.

It is also very significant that the current application achieves an average parking ratio of over 2 spaces per dwelling, whereas nearby phases did not average 2 spaces per dwelling.

| Scheme | No. of <br> dwellings | Mix | Total no. <br> of parking <br> spaces | Parking ratio <br> per dwelling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Current planning <br> application | 131 | $6 \times 1$ bed, 27x2 bed, <br> $77 \times 3$ bed, $21 \times 4$ bed | 200 | 2.29 |
| Phase 4B2 <br> $(10 / 00468 / R E M)$ | 120 | $3 \times 1$ bed, 25x2 bed, <br> $60 \times 3$ bed, 16x4 bed | 206 | 1.7 |
| Phase 4a4 <br> $(13 / 00362 / R E M)$ | 99 | $19 \times 2$ bed, 67x3 <br> bed, $13 \times 4$ bed. | 167 | 1.68 |

The amount of parking provision is clearly very preferable compared to previous schemes and I would be grateful if you could inform Members of that fact via your committee report.

Nearly all parking is on-plot and where the existing road layout has not enabled this, off-street parking has been provided as close to the associated dwelling as is practicably possible. Most spaces 'touch' the plot of the dwelling they serve and all are an acceptable distance away from plots, so no parking spaces are at a distance from homes such that their use would be discouraged. Other nearby developments have offplot parking too.

## Shared Surface

The shared surface proposed is informed by the hierarchy of streets and Framework Plan approved at Outline planning stage and you have agreed that the principle of using shared surface is acceptable.

In terms of pedestrian safety, the shared surface has been designed to provide an acceptable balance between allowing suitably wide shared surfaces to accommodate vehicles and pedestrians and preventing vehicle speeds in excess of 15 mph . A stage 1 road safety audit for the scheme has been undertaken and County Highway officers agree with the finding that the proposals are safe for pedestrians and vehicles alike.

The amended layout proposes a reduction in the length of shared surface (adjacent to plots 30-33) and a new pedestrian link through the scheme. This pedestrian link means that the total distance that pedestrians walking to plots 69-79 in particular will have to walk on shared surface in order to access the wider area is greatly reduced. Overall legibility and permeability is enhanced too. The shared surface along the eastern site boundary has also been split into 2 separate lengths although a pedestrian/cycle link has been retained.

## Relationship Between Plots

I understand that your sole remaining concern is in relation to the courtyard area in the north west corner of the site and plots 103 and 107 in particular. This area is constrained by the existing road to the west which prevents parking directly off this road and the sewer easement to the east. Together with the need to provide acceptable window to window distances and the necessary space for a turning head, there is almost no scope to change this relationship. We have tested alternatives since our meeting but can find no alternative solution.

We consider that it is right to avoid a dead space of parking and the proposed dwellings set around the courtyard provide natural surveillance of the courtyard and frame this space.

We have moved plot 103 as far south as physically possible whilst still maintaining acceptable turning dimensions within the courtyard, creating better separation between plots 103 and 107 . Plot 107 is a wide frontage property with windows overlooking the courtyard and it should also be noted that plot 107 benefits from roof lights that will provide significant daylight to rooms.

## Affordable Housing

The amended layout proposes 2 bedroom units close to the public open space in place of 4 bedroom units to mix up the size of units as requested by your housing officer.

I would be grateful for your confirmation that all comments regarding affordable housing are addressed. We have worked hard to provide the precise mix sought and this includes providing an oversized disability compliant accommodation and bespoke 4 bed 8 person unit.

## Pedestrian Refuge Areas and Junction Adjacent to Plot 98

The amended layout shows dedicated pedestrian refuge hardstanding areas on the 2 corners closest to the public open space.

We have investigated the opportunity to reduce the radius of the proposed junction. However, the radius is already the minimum required in order to achieve the refuse vehicle tracking sweep.

## Garage Doors

High quality garage doors will be utilised and these will be shown in the house pack that is being updated now. The FOG units will have glazed panels to doors. I can also confirm that a mix of colours will be used to match front doors, and the garage door colours will be referenced in the house pack.

You will appreciate that we tested numerous options and alternatives and worked positively to address all concerns and comments that have been raised wherever possible.

I trust that you will now find the proposed design to be acceptable and that the application will be reported to the June planning committee with a positive recommendation for approval. I look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully


## Chris Cox <br> Principal Planner

e-mail:
enc


[^0]:    http://glcstrplnng12.co.uk/online-
    applications/simpleSearchResults.do;jsessionid=A4418CC8C4243C83AAC5E 791ADB89D1A?action=firstPage

