



PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING : Tuesday, 1st December 2015

PRESENT : Cllrs. Taylor (Chair), Lewis (Vice-Chair), Hilton, McLellan, Hobbs, Hanman, Williams, Brown, Dee, Toleman, Chatterton and Etheridge

Officers in Attendance

Jon Sutcliffe, Development Control Manager

Michael Jones, Solicitor, One Legal

Adam Smith, Principal Planning Officer, Major Developments

Bob Ristic, Senior Planning Officer

Tony Wisdom, Democratic Services Officer

APOLOGIES : Cllr Smith

52. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Chatterton declared a prejudicial interest in agenda item 6, Victoria Basin by virtue of his position as Museum Director at the Soldiers of Gloucestershire Museum.

53. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2015 were confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

54. LATE MATERIAL

Members' attention was drawn to the late material in respect of agenda items 1 and 8 which had been published on the internet as a supplement to the agenda.

55. VICTORIA BASIN, GLOUCESTER DOCKS - 14/01377/FUL

Councillor Chatterton, having declared a prejudicial interest in this application, retired to the public gallery and took no part in the debate.

The Principal Planning Officer presented his report which detailed an application for the stationing of a replica pirate galleon with masts at the dockside and use as a

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.12.15

café, erection of a bin store, and ramp to pontoon, works to dock side barrier at Victoria Basin, The Docks.

He advised that the vessel comprised a steel hull with a steel skeleton superstructure clad in timber. It would also have pirate themed accessories added to it including replica cannon, treasure chests, beer barrels and pirate models.

It would be used as a café and for children's parties, and would seat a maximum of 80 adults and children. A number of staff would be required to run the business.

David Howard, the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Mr Howard hoped to address two controversial aspects. He advised that the location had been selected by former British Waterways managers and was bounded on three sides by commercial properties and by a public car park on the fourth. There were no legally permitted residential berths in the basin. Access was good with safety barriers on the dockside.

The vessel had a steel hull with modern fittings, disabled access and fire precautions. The colours were warm and not intimidating to children and would maintain the fantasy.

It was expected to attract thousands of visitors from outside Gloucester. Educational facilities would be provided for school visits including books and artefacts at no charge to schools or pupils.

Jobs would be created for local people with a living wage.

Mr Howard thanked the Principal Planning Officer who had suggested conditions and restrictions. He confirmed he was happy with any restrictions imposed by the Council and he confirmed that the vessel was not to be used as an adult events venue. He noted that the masts would be 8 metres above water level and flags would be 9 metres above water level.

Greg Moger addressed the Committee in opposition to the application.

Mr Moger advised that he was representing boat owners.

He had visited the boatyard and described the vessel as a shed on a dumb barge. It would dominate the preserved Victorian port in a cathedral city. He believed that it would open the doors to tack and he advised that boat owners already tolerated events of short duration. even a temporary permission would set a precedent.

He stated that the proposal would add to parking problems and anti-social behaviour in the area and would destroy the peaceful setting of the Docks.

He noted that the Gloucester Docks Estate Company objected to the proposal and believed that Victoria Basin should remain non-commercial. The Docks had won awards and all the boats using the basin, old or modern, were authentic. He asked Members to reflect before reaching their decision.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.12.15

Councillor Hilton stated that pirate galleons had never sailed from Gloucester which was a Victorian industrial port. He believed that the proposal would destroy the ambience of the Docks and if the application had been in the form of a building it would be rejected.

He believed that it was a 'carbuncle' and granting consent would make the Committee a laughing stock. The other boats using the basin, old and new, were authentic and the proposal represented a poor Disney-style theme park.

Councillor Lewis believed that the application had a place but not in Victoria Basin. He agreed that the wood gave the vessel a warm appearance and children would have a great time aboard but not in this location.

Councillor Dee agreed that the galleon should be located away from the historic Docks as it would ruin the authenticity of the site, possibly further south towards Sainsburys.

The Chair believed that the proposed location was acceptable and would help to link the quays to the City Centre. He had no concerns regarding amenity as the galleon would not be open at night.

Councillor Williams believed that more was needed in the City for young people and children. She noted that the Docks had been intended to provide a mix of entertainment, residential and business uses.

Councillor McLellan agreed with the Chair and Councillor Williams. He believed that the proposed location would be good for children but noted that the owners of the Docks would be able to prevent the development anyway if they did not want it. He noted that the Conservation Officer had not objected.

Councillor Hanman agreed with Councillor McLellan.

Councillor Toleman believed that the galleon was hideous and it would live or die on market forces.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions in the report.

56. LAND TO SOUTH OF WATERWELLS DRIVE - 15/00892/FUL

The Development Control Manager presented the report which detailed an application for the erection of a new manufacturing and distribution facility (Use Classes B2/B8) and ancillary office with associated car parking, landscaping and access arrangements on land to the south of Waterwells Drive.

He advised that the intended occupier was FLI who currently occupied other premises at Waterwells and Madleaze Road. These sites would be relocated with an anticipated increase of 30 jobs.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.12.15

He drew Members' attention to paragraph 6.7 of the report⁶ which detailed the applicant's proposal for quiet working between 23.00 and 07.00 hours.

He noted that the Environmental Protection team were satisfied with the proposed noise conditions. There was a policy requirement for 8 metre easements along the watercourse and there were pinch points where the building was closer to the watercourse for a limited area which was considered to be acceptable.

Bill Hayley, director of the Hayley Group addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Mr Hayley advised that FLI had been bought from receivership and opened the current factory in Waterwells in 1996. The workforce had grown from 54 to 77 and the main activity was the manufacture of telecommunications masts. The market for masts had disappeared and a new market developed with the manufacture of railway electrification equipment.

He thanked Officers for their assistance and confirmed his acceptance of all proposed conditions but requested that conditions 19, 20 and 21 have the words "for B2 use" added.

He explained that this was requested to provide an alternative if the business environment required a change to a B8 Class distribution use. He advised that a high quality building was specified and the anticipated cost was £3 million more than originally expected.

The Development Control Manager advised Members that the impact of a 24 hour B8 use had not been fully assessed and if that use was to become dominant the applicant could apply to vary the conditions. He emphasised that the Committee did not have the necessary information on the impact of a 24 hour storage/distribution use to make that decision.

Councillor Hobbs welcomed the application for a very attractive building for a local company that was doing well but he acknowledged that there was insufficient information to consider varying the conditions.

Councillor Hanman questioned the need for any restriction on the business.

Councillor Williams noted that there was a distribution business nearer to residential properties than the application site.

The Development Control Manager reiterated that the application before the Committee had been assessed and considered acceptable for 24 hour employment use. Whilst he could not say whether 24 hour operation for a solely B8 use would not be acceptable, there was no evidence available to prove that it would be.

The Chair suggested delegating authority to approve the change subject to a satisfactory noise impact assessment.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.12.15

Councillor Hilton believed that the application be approved in accordance with the recommendation as the local community had not been consulted on the change requested by Mr Hayley. The applicant could always apply to vary the conditions.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions in the report.

57. BRISTOL ROAD - 15/00286/REM AND 15/00287/REM

The Senior Planning Officer presented his report which detailed two applications for sites that were formerly in separate ownerships:-

Site A – 15/00286/REM - Reserved matters scheme for 172 residential dwellings with associated open space and landscaping at the former St Gobain & Wellman Graham factories, Bristol Road/Tuffley Crescent.

Site B – 15/00287/REM - Reserved matters scheme of 86 residential dwellings with associated open space and landscaping at the former Contract Chemicals site, Bristol Road.

He drew Members' attention to the late material which contained confirmation that Gloucestershire County Council Highways raised no objection and were drafting conditions; additional representations; a letter from PS Development Solutions Ltd and a revised Officer recommendation.

Councillor Dee was advised that there would be no vehicular through route between Bristol Road and Tuffley Crescent.

Councillor Hanman expressed concern that a previous occupier had produced soda and cyanide on the site. He was advised that considerable remediation had been undertaken pursuant to a remediation condition on the outline planning consent.

Councillor McLellan referred to the letter from PS Development Solutions Ltd and was advised that the current applications were for reserved matters only and noise had been addressed by condition at the outline application. He was advised that the new dwellings would need to meet the required noise standards as set out in the conditions on the outline planning consent and the applicant may have to amend the layout if the condition could not be discharged.

Councillor Lewis was reassured that it was the applicant's responsibility to achieve acceptable noise levels in accordance with this condition.

Councillor Hobbs welcomed the application and requested that officers write to the Highways section requesting that LED lighting was specified.

Councillor Hilton suggested that the parking spaces identified for visitors be restricted to such use by condition. He was advised that the application made generous provision for parking and such a condition would be difficult to enforce.

Councillor Lewis requested that the Committee be informed about who would maintain the visitor parking spaces.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.12.15

RESOLVED that the Development Control Manager be authorised to approve the reserved matters applications subject to the conditions in the report, any additional relevant conditions as recommended by the Highway Authority and any associated revisions to the approved drawings under Condition 2.

58. LAND NORTH OF INNSWORTH LANE (CONSULTATION BY TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL)

The Development Control Manager presented his report which detailed a consultation by Tewkesbury Borough Council in respect of an application being determined by that Council for a mixed use development on land north of Innsworth Lane comprising demolition of existing buildings up to 1300 dwellings and 8.31 hectares of land for employment generating uses comprising a neighbourhood centre of 4.23 ha (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1, D2, B1), office park of 1.31 ha (B1) and business park of 2.77ha (B1 and B8 uses), primary school, open space, landscaping, parking and supporting infrastructure and facilities, and the creation of new vehicular accesses from the A40 Gloucester Northern Bypass, Innsworth Lane and Frogfurlong Lane.

Councillor Porter, a ward Member for Longlevens, was invited to address the Committee.

Councillor Porter stated that Longlevens residents were concerned at the impact of this application which was in addition to 700 spaces at Twigworth proposed in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). There was provision for 800 primary school places but no provision for secondary education places. The area was served by two surgeries which were already operating at capacity.

He stated that the existing infrastructure was totally inadequate for this application. He believed that it should be mentioned that parts of the site were underwater in 2007 and the land was currently in the Green Belt and there was no submission to the secretary of State to remove that protection.

He noted the importance of ensuring that the proposed access to the A40 was completed before development commenced.

He stated that the area had the largest infants and junior schools in the City but these were already full as were the two surgeries. The Universities were expanding and he questioned where the student population would obtain health care.

In conclusion, he requested that the points which he had mentioned be raised with Tewkesbury Borough Council.

Councillor Williams believed that the land should not be in the Joint Core Strategy because of flooding concerns. She noted that Tewkesbury Road flooded regularly; the traffic situation would be made worse; there was no provision for medical care and Gloucester Royal Hospital was full; there was no medical practice proposed and no schools for senior pupils.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.12.15

Councillor Hilton believed that the application was premature. He stated that the JCS Inspector would want to consider the proposed allocations holistically. He noted that flooding issues could be addressed by linear parks but this could not be achieved through applications considered on a piecemeal basis. He believed that traffic would cause problems and he called for reassurance on drainage issues.

The Chair stated that the site was one which the Council had indicated that it would wish to see developed in the JCS.

Councillor Chatterton expressed concerns regarding medical issues and education provision. He noted that Hunts Grove was a development of similar size in total and had overwhelmed facilities in that locality.

He asked that the following issues be raised in addition to the recommendation:-

- medical provision
- primary school places
- proper secondary school provision

Councillor McLellan asked about the provision of affordable housing and the Development Control Manager advised that 35 per cent affordable housing was proposed and that Tewkesbury Borough Council would seek the views of Gloucestershire County Council on education provision.

Councillor Dee stated that no reliance could be placed on traditional views on what was protected land until the JCS Inspector's report was available.

Councillor Toleman expressed concern on how the application would address traveller and gypsy issues.

Councillor Lewis noted that Tewkesbury Borough Council would consult the education authority on schools provision.

The Chair proposed that the recommendation had a further point added to make reference to the issues of primary and secondary education; medical provision; highways and drainage.

RESOLVED that Tewkesbury Borough Council be advised that Gloucester City Council supports the principle of the development proposed in the outline planning application, but requests that careful consideration be given to the following issues either by requiring further information before a decision is reached, or securing the objectives by means of Planning Obligations and Planning Conditions (as appropriate)

1. That the A1 retail floorspace should be for the provision of local food/convenience expenditure, not for comparison spending, as this would impact unduly on other retail centres in Gloucester.

2. That the issue of gypsy and traveller provision should be properly addressed at this outline stage.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.12.15

3. That if possible the employment land provision should be increased to match the aspirations set out in the JCS.

4. That the opportunities to enhance ecological connectivity in the development site be explored and secured through management agreements.

5. That the issues of primary & secondary education, medical provision, highways and drainage be given careful consideration.

59. FORMER GLOSCAT SITE, BRUNSWICK ROAD (GREYFRIARS SITE) - 15/01408/CONDIT

The Principal Planning Officer presented his report which detailed an application for the discharge of Condition 29 (Public Art) of planning permission 15/00362/FUL at the former Gloscat site, Brunswick Road. He confirmed that it had been brought back to the Planning Committee because this had been requested when members considered the original planning application for the site.

Councillor Chatterton considered that the cloister remains were more important than proposals for planting trees in the square. In terms of the Roman wall proposal, he noted that the illustrated proposals included Roman military diplomas and he asked if something more specifically relevant to the history of the City could be used instead, either the history of Gloucester generally or preferably to Gloucester's Roman period.

The Principal Planning Officer undertook to convey that suggestion to the applicant and would advise Members of the outcome.

Councillor Toleman asked that the plaques be firmly fixed to prevent theft.

RESOLVED that the Development Control Manager be authorised to partially discharge Condition 29 subject to the applicant providing the items listed in the report and satisfactory outcome of discussions regarding the proposed plaques.

60. DELEGATED DECISIONS

Consideration was given to a schedule of applications determined under delegated powers in the month of October 2015.

RESOLVED that the schedule be noted.

61. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 15 December 2015 at 6.00pm

Tuesday, 12 January 2016 at 6.00pm

Time of commencement: 6.00 pm

Time of conclusion: 8.32 pm

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.12.15

Chair