

GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE : **PLANNING**

DATE : **12TH JANUARY 2016**

ADDRESS/LOCATION : **LAND AT THE PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT AREA ON FRAMEWORK PLAN 5, KINGSWAY, FORMER RAF QUEDGELEY SITE.**

APPLICATION NO. & WARD : **15/0112/REM
QUEDGELEY FIELD COURT**

EXPIRY DATE : **31ST DECEMBER 2015**

APPLICANT : **ROBERT HITCHINS LTD**

PROPOSAL : **ERECTION OF 2 INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS**

REPORT BY : **JOANN MENEAUD**

**NO. OF APPENDICES/
OBJECTIONS** : **1. SITE LOCATION PLAN**

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The former RAF Quedgeley site comprises two areas of land located on the west and east side of the A38 to the south of the main urban centre of Gloucester. The larger part of the site on the east side of the A38 comprises approximately 133.5 hectares of land with a much smaller area of 3.25 hectares of land set between the A38 and the B4008. The larger part of the site is bounded by the railway line and Daniel's Brook to the east, the A38 to the west, Naas Lane to the south and the development known as Copeland Park to the north.
- 1.2 Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the site was granted by the Secretary of State on the 26th June 2003 following a public inquiry in September and October 2001. The permission was for a mixed use development including residential (2650 dwellings), employment uses (B1 and B8) on 20 hectares of land, two primary schools, a local centre, roads, footpaths, cycleways and public open space.
- 1.3 A further outline planning permission was granted by the Secretary of State for additional residential development including a primary school, roads, footpaths and cycleways, and public open space (providing an additional 650 dwellings to the total approved under the earlier outline planning permission to make an overall total of 3,300 dwellings) in 2007.

- 1.4 A further permission was the granted under reference 13/00585/OUT to renew the outline permission in relation to the employment land.
- 1.5 The land allocated for employment uses is located to the south western end of the development site adjacent to the A38 and to the rear of existing residential properties in Naas Lane. The land runs south from the main entrance road from the A38, behind Asda and down to Naas Lane and includes the land to the north of Rudloe Drive up to the boundary with the Manor Farm sports area.
- 1.6 The land is generally flat but slopes gradually from North to South. The area is bounded by the new linear balancing pond to the east with the Manor Farm sports and open space area to the north. A number of the former RAF buildings on the site have now been demolished but some still remain and are in active use. The area also includes Avionics House, the former officer's mess, and now in office use and the cricket square open space.
- 1.7 The site to which this application relates is located to the southern side of Rudloe Drive and the rear boundary is adjacent to residential properties in Naas Lane. The eastern boundary of the site runs along the linear balancing pond adjacent to land parcel 4A2
- 1.8 The application proposes one large building (referred to as unit1) to accommodate a B8 use and a further building (referred to as unit 2) to provide 6 small units for B1 purposes. Access to the site is from Rudloe Drive via the existing spur. The parking and service areas will be set centrally between the two units. A three metre high grassed and landscaped bund will be constructed to the rear of the buildings

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

2.1 00/00749/OUT

Outline permission for the redevelopment of the site was granted by the Secretary of State on 26th June 2003 following a public inquiry in September and October 2001. The permission was subject to 63 conditions.

06/01242/OUT

Proposed Residential development including a Primary School. roads, footpaths and cycleways, public open space, (Framework Plan 4 Kingsway) To provide an additional 650 dwellings to the total approved under outline planning permission 00/00749/OUT (Overall Total 3,300 dwellings). (Outline Application - All matters reserved) Granted on appeal September 2007

07/01081/REM

Provision of the link road between Naas Lane roundabout to the local centre, landscape buffer and drainage. Granted April 2008.

07/00505/OUT

Proposed Residential development including a Primary School, roads, footpaths and cycleways, public open space, (Framework Plan 4 Kingsway) To provide an additional 650 dwellings to the total approved under outline planning permission 00/00749/OUT (Overall Total 3,300 dwellings). (Outline Application - All matters reserved) (Amended Scheme). Withdrawn

08/00584/FUL

Variation to condition 54 of planning permission APP/U1620/A/01/1062329 to amend the permitted hours for deliveries and construction work from 8 am to 7.30pm Monday to Saturday to 7.30 am to 7pm Monday to Saturday. Refused 25th June 2008.

08/01198/REM

Infrastructure to serve the local centre, school and manor farm area (extension to areas of roads and drainage already approved). Awaiting decision

08/00708/REM

Reserved matters application for infrastructure (roads and drainage) to serve residential development on FP4 and primary school on FP2/3. Approved 10th August 2009.

09/00114/REM

Construction of balancing pond (Pond 5) on employment area (retrospective application). Granted 9th December 2010.

10/00842/REM

Erection of five buildings for B1 office use (including access roads, parking, landscaping and associated works. Granted 16th September 2011.

12/00423/FUL

Erection of a food store (Class A1) (3,713 sqm) with new vehicular and pedestrian accesses, layout of parking and servicing area and associated works. Permitted January 2013

13/00493/FUL

Variation of conditions 2, 9, 10 and 13 of planning permission reference 12/00423/FUL for the erection of a food store (Class A1) (3,713sqm) with new vehicular and pedestrian accesses, layout of parking and servicing area and associated works. (Amended scheme). Permitted August 2013.

13/00767/ADV

Display of signage to building and car park including internally illuminated fascia signs, non illuminated fascia signs, free standing totem sign, ATM signs, banner signs, poster frames, entrance signs and general information signs. Granted September 2013.

13/00585/OUT

Renewal of outline planning permission for the re-development of the former Raf Quedgeley site (00/00749/out) granted 26th June 2003 in relation to the employment area (20 hectares) on framework plan 5. Granted November 2014

3.0 PLANNING POLICIES

3.1 The statutory development plan for Gloucester remains the 1983 City of Gloucester Local Plan. Regard is also had to the policies contained within the 2002 Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan which was subject to two comprehensive periods of public consultation and adopted by the Council for development control purposes. The National Planning Policy Framework has been published and is also a material consideration.

3.2 For the purposes of making decisions, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that policies in a Local Plan should not be considered out of date where they were adopted prior to the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework. In these circumstances due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework.

3.3 The policies within the 2002 Local Plan remain therefore a material consideration where they are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

3.4 From the Second Stage Deposit Plan the following policies are relevant:

Policy BE1 – Scale, Massing and Height

Policy BE4 – Criteria for the layout, circulation and landscape of new development

Policy BE5 – Community safety

Policy BE6 – Access for all

Policy BE7 – Architectural design

Policy BE9 – Design Criteria for Large Scale Development

Policy BE21 – Safeguarding of amenity

Policy FRP6 – Surface water run-off

Policy FRP.10 (Noise)

Policy FRP.15 (Contaminated Land)

Policy TR8 links the development of the site with the completion of the South West bypass

Policy TR31 – Road safety

Policy TR32 – Protection of cycle/pedestrian routes

Policy TR33 – Provision for cyclists/pedestrians

Policy E1 – Mixed use allocations

Policy MU5 – Mixed use allocation for former RAF Quedgeley

Policy E4 – Protecting employment land

Policy ST12 – Identifies the RAF Quedgeley site as a key priority.

- 3.5 In terms of the emerging local plan, the Council has prepared a Joint Core Strategy with Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Councils which was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 20th November 2014. Policies in the Submission Joint Core Strategy have been prepared in the context of the NPPF and NPPG and are a material consideration. The weight to be attached to them is limited, the Plan has not yet been the subject of independent scrutiny and does not have development plan status. The Examination in Public has been ongoing since May 2015. In addition to the Joint Core Strategy, the Council is preparing its local City Plan which is taking forward the policy framework contained within the City Council's Local Development Framework Documents which reached Preferred Options stage in 2006.
- 3.6 On adoption, the Joint Core Strategy, City Plan and any Neighbourhood Plans will provide a revised planning policy framework for the Council. In the interim period, weight can be attached to relevant policies in the emerging plans according to
- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan
 - The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies; and
 - The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3.7 The NPPF advises that authorities should approve development proposals that accord with statutory plans without delay, and also grant permission where the plan is absent, silent, indeterminate or out of date. This should be the case unless the adverse impacts of allowing development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the framework as a whole, or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted. It also states that Authorities should seek to approve applications where possible, looking for solutions rather than problems.
- The NPPF sets out 12 core planning principles that may be summarised as follows – planning should;
- Be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people and should be kept up to date;
 - Not be just about scrutiny but a creative exercise to enhance and improve places;
 - Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development;
 - Always seek high quality design and good standards of amenity;
 - Take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting green belts;
 - Support the transition to a low carbon future, taking account of flood risk and coastal change, and encourage the re-use of existing resources;
 - Contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution;
 - Encourage the effective use of land by reusing brownfield land;
 - Promote mixed use developments;
 - Conserve heritage assets;

- Actively manage patterns of growth to make fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable;
- Take account of and support local strategies for health, social and cultural wellbeing and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services.

3.7 All policies can be viewed at the relevant website address:- Gloucester Local Plan policies – www.gloucester.gov.uk/planning; and Department of Community and Local Government planning policies - www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planning/.

4.0 CONSULTATIONS

4.1 Urban Design Officer – Comment Upon Amended Proposals

Since my previous comments dated 19th June, the most significant change to the proposals is the introduction of a new landscaped 3m bund. This will have a positive impact on the properties to the South. The largest unit has been reduced in height, which will result in reduced impacts on future residents. However, the close proximity of this industrial use to the existing residents along Naas Lane, and the recently built properties to the east, is awkward. There will be a number of impacts from the proposed development on the local residents. There are ways, in design terms, to partially mitigate the impacts through design, but fundamentally, this will not remove all of the impacts.

I raised in my previous comments the issues of the elevations and their impact on existing residents. This is connected to the issue of trying to develop this type of use in a residential area. The eastern elevation of units 2-7 in particular, facing the properties to the East, does need some further work. The proposal is for a completely blank elevation running the whole length, articulated simply with alternating vertical and horizontal metal cladding, in a lighter and darker grey finish.

Some tree planting is proposed along the eastern boundary. For what is a very prominent boundary to the site, which can be viewed from numerous residential vantage points, it lacks interest and presents a very dull and functional appearance. The use of the two grey colours is particularly dull.

I would suggest that increased tree planting along the eastern boundary would be a good way to mitigate some of the visual impact of the development, but that the materials used in this elevation should also be reconsidered. An approach where a multi-orange/red brick is used, in combination with vertically aligned metal cladding, could add interest and help to break up the elevation. One approach could be to treat each half of each unit as an individual façade and apply a random arrangement of brick and metal cladding along the facades. For example, Unit 7 could have half brick and half vertical metal cladding, while Unit 6 could be all metal cladding. This would add interest, while still being a simple approach.

Pre-built brick panels (using brick slips) can be used which give that appearance of solid brick, but which are actually non-structural. This would be

a way of reducing costs and saving time. The other elevations, particularly within what is characterised as a residential area, would need some refinement.

4.2 City Landscape Architect

The proposed mound/bund is intended to reduce noise levels. Do we have any details of the levels of reduction anticipated?

The bund also offers an opportunity to further screen views of the large buildings from the properties on Naas Lane by fully planting it, with both a 1m matrix planting native understorey and specimen trees, to provide more immediate impact.

A revised planting plan does not seem to have been provided at this stage, but the bund is very steep-sided and we have had issues on other developments where it has proven very difficult to establish vegetation on the bund. If at all possible, the slope gradient should be made shallower. We will need to see planting details for the bund (and methods for ensuring planting establishes on the steep sides) as well as the other planting areas to each side. On the eastern boundary, additional specimen tree planting should be incorporated into the proposals, to further soften views of the large new units from the existing residential properties. The tree officer's ongoing concerns will also need to be addressed

4.3 Environmental Protection Manager - No objection subject to conditions

4.4 Severn Trent Water – No objection subject to a condition requiring details of surface water and foul drainage.

4.5 Gloucestershire County Council Highway Authority – Comments awaited

4.6 Quedgeley Parish Council – Object to the provision of light industrial units, the site should be reserved for offices, storage and distribution only.

The tracking should be redone using fixed axle vehicle

No increase in run-off from the site from green field state up to and including 1:100 yrs rainfall event +20% by volume for climate change

A natural noise barrier to be provided to protect existing residential properties in Naas Lane

Restrict the house of operation to 6.00am – 10.00pm Monday – Saturday and from 8.00am – 9.00pm on Sundays and public holidays.

Support the comments of the Tree Officer and would oppose removal of any trees.

Ensure a noise protection barrier including the provision of established trees and shrubs be provide to offer a suitable amenity to the existing properties.

The results of the unattended noise survey gives too great increase and will offer an unacceptable standard of living.

All windows to be removed from the residential side of the proposals.

Restrict the hours of operation to 7am – 7pm Monday to Friday, no vehicle movements in or out before 8am or after 6pm on Saturday and no vehicle movements on Sunday or Public Holidays.

Disabled parking should be provided

The buildings should be re positioned to ensure the parking is provided furthest away from the residential properties.

Height of units to be sympathetic in scale and form to the existing properties in Naas Lane. The current proposals appear to provide an over intrusive form of development which will provide detrimental to the amenities to the local residents.

The numerous comments received by the local residents appear to give similar concerns and Quedgeley Parish Council support those concerns.

- 4.7 City Tree Officer - From a tree perspective the amended plans are an improvement but I still do not think this new scheme mitigates for the loss of the oak trees. Mature oak trees are currently a key landscape characteristic across the Kingsway estate. To maintain this it is important that young semi mature oak trees such as these are retained.

On a positive note the walnut tree is to be retained but I am concerned the footprint of unit 1 will be within the root protection area (rpa) of this tree as I can not see any plans submitted to confirm or otherwise. I would also have concerns about the impact of a 3 m soil bund within the rpa of this tree. If you are minded to grant consent these issues will need addressing.

5.0 **PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS**

- 5.1 The application has been advertised with a site notice, press notice and individual letters of notification to occupied properties in the immediate vicinity. Letters advising residents have also been sent following the submission of amended plans. At the time of writing the report over 40 letters of objection have been received.

I have reproduced in full below, those comments received in relation to the most recent amendments (including the change from 24 hour operation of the units). However all comments on the application can be viewed at the following link.

<http://glcstrplnng12.co.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=externalDocuments&keyVal=NIKUJKHMC0000>

I was surprised when a neighbour informed me that another amendment had been made to this proposed development and I had not been notified despite my previous objections. Now I have seen these I can see they have made no significant changes and my objections have not changed and they are as follows; The enormous height of the buildings will be overbearing this close to

residential properties. I am very concerned at how close these proposed units will be to our house. I understand there will be a 3m high bund, which I do not think will reduce the pollution from vehicles and the noise by much, especially with reversing lorries and fork lift trucks, car doors opening and shutting all and every day. This will be unbearable and be unacceptable to our neighbours and ourselves. Presumably there will be regular grass cutting and ground maintenance on the bund, overlooking neighbouring properties, which will invade our privacy and cause even further noise at that height. The working hours on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays is totally unacceptable in a residential area. We will never be able to sit in our gardens, because of the noise and pollution. Surely we have Right to use our houses and gardens without putting up with this level of activity every day of our lives. There is bound to be security lighting around the building perimeter, which will again impose on our property and our lives. Naas Lane is a residential area and with the existing units on one side of the lane and the proposed new units to the other side, the lane will be in narrow corridor between very high industrial units. Gloucester City Council have recently granted planning permission for houses and bungalows to be built along the boundary of this proposal, knowing that there are plans to build commercial units near the border. Surely Gloucester City Council now has a responsibility of care to the residents of these new homes and indeed to the rest of those residents nearby. Now they are contemplating allowing larger units than those agreed in the Master Plan of 2003, and again proposed in November 2014. We, and residents along Naas Lane bought our homes in good faith, understanding that smaller units and offices would be built on this land, and further back from the boundary. When we purchased this house we knew there probably would be light industrial units on the adjacent site, but we hardly thought there could be such enormous buildings this close to a residential area. I have no objections to commercial buildings being built on this land, but a distribution centre is certainly not appropriate so close to a residential area. As far as I am concerned, the only acceptable buildings would be low level offices with the parking facing towards Rudloe Drive. I consider this development would be detrimental to the amenities ourselves and of neighbouring residents. I trust that you will consider my objections when you are deciding this application.

Once again I write to object to this development its totally inappropriate to block in Naas Lane with Industrial type units both from the South (Waterwells) and the North with this development. I understand the need that R Hitchings requires to develop this land but surely not an industrial unit but the office type buildings which were agreed in the original proposal

I would like to strongly object for the exact same reasons given previously. Too close, overbearing, light pollution, noise pollution, probable air pollution and loss of privacy.....AND their proposed working hours. Again, commercial greed and no thoughts or consideration towards the people, who are expected to put up with their fallout. The questions I have raised about drainage/site run off, omitted details from plans (dimensions and heights, and totally out of scale), removal of oak trees still haven't been answered. What I fail to understand is the ignorance of this company in its quest to line it's pockets? It

had hundreds of acres of land on this site, and it chooses to try and dump this monstrosity several metres from our boundaries? We are the only residents that can be affected by the redevelopment of this site and they try to burden us with the largest unit with 24/7 working?? I suggest someone pours Mr Hitchins a coffee and asks him to smell it!! They still have the rest of the site available and my suggestion is you MOVE IT, because it isn't going to be a detrimental part of our household, or my neighbour's. I would also like to point out that our house was purchased back in 2004, when all that Hitchins proposed was offices?? If we ever thought this was going to be proposed, we certainly would never have moved here. A good proposal which was raised by one of my neighbour's was for you all to come and look at the area, then perhaps you may have a greater understanding of our concerns?

As I have said previously nothing has changed, I understand that they have made the one building smaller, it's still not small enough it intrudes on our privacy, most of all it's the noise that will be continuing to make on erecting of the buildings, and the continuation of the awful noise that will happen 7 days a week, our outlook will be spoilt, our totally privacy in our gardens will have gone, as most of us are pensioners now this is incroaching on our personal liberties.

We bought our house in Naas Lane in good faith in May 2015 understanding that permissions had been granted for low-rise buildings to be erected on the land directly behind our property. Since then it transpires that permission is being sought to erect much higher units. This is totally unacceptable for a variety of reasons.

- Noise - commercial vehicles with reversing sirens will substantially increase the current noise levels. The proposed hours of activity from 7am to 7pm including Sundays and Bank Holidays will impact hugely on our lives, preventing us quiet both inside and outside our homes.*
- View - currently from the back of our house we look out toward Robinswood Hill, the height of the proposed buildings so close to our property will be overbearing and will obscure our view.*
- Privacy - We are not at present overlooked from the back of our property - potentially we could lose our privacy. In the original plans I understood the development would have been 90 metres from the property borders in Naas Lane, what has changed so that could be decreased by about 2/3rds to 32 metres? I believe that as permissions for new properties have recently been granted the Council has a duty of care to the residents. The residential area of Naas Lane will become a corridor between two industrial sites.*
- Pollution - with large units comes large vehicles which will cause, with the units being so close to our houses, an increase of pollution to the residential area and potentially could impact on our health. We will also be subjected to night time security lights causing increased light pollution.*
- Bund - Should a bund be built to supposedly alleviate some of the raised concerns it will come with it's own problems. Maintenance of the bund will presumably be the responsibility of the landowner but cutting the grass and pruning the trees will increase the privacy and noise issues. What consideration has been made as to where the water will drain from the mound*

*especially during heavy rainfalls? Will this excess water cause flooding to our properties the impact of which will be to increase our house insurances?
We implore you to deal sympathetically with our concerns. I believe that taking the above points into consideration our properties will be less desirable and become devalued. Who is going to compensate us for this? Perhaps a site visit to include the residents of Naas Lane would be helpful to illustrate our concerns. I will be grateful if you keep me informed of future correspondence and developments with the owner of the land.*

*Naas Lane is a long established residential road with some large gated properties and several bungalows. At present the warehouses on Waterwells ie to the south side of Naas Lane, tower above all the houses at the west end of this lane. Now these proposed warehouse units would do the same on the north side of Naas Lane. Is it really good to have a residential area sandwiched between large warehouse units.? I assume that someone has walked down Naas Lane and seen the affect of the Waterwells warehouses. If not then I invite you to come down and see for yourself what is in store for us if this development goes ahead. It is difficult to understand why, that in this lovely residential lane, such a plan is being considered.
If everybody in the Council is adamant that this development goes ahead, then I am astonished and saddened that the voice of the local residents, who pay council tax, is being over ruled by big business.*

From my point of view the distance from the back of my house to the south side of unit 7 is still too small. As you will recall from my previous letter you will understand that in planning application 13/00585/OUT which was based on application 00/00749/OUT, and modified by the Dyer document Design statement dated 10th December 2008, the distance from the back of the house known as The Shieling on Naas Lane to the south side of unit 7 was set at 90 metres.

Because new houses have been built behind the older houses on Naas Lane, mine being one of them, the distance from the back of these new houses to the south side of unit 7 is now set at 32 metres, I enclose a sketch below showing the relative positions of The Shieling the new houses and unit 7. What makes a building look overbearing is the angle at eye level subtended from the horizontal to the top of the building. As you can see the original angle was 5 degrees and it is now 14 degrees which is a large increase. Consequently I still maintain that the proposed units will be overbearing and I request that single storey offices are built instead, A quick survey of the Waterwells industrial estate to the south side of Naas Lane, indicates that there are several large warehouses that are still empty. However the small offices/units in this area are all occupied. It seems that there is a market for small offices/units and no market for large units. So economically it seems sensible that to go for small offices/units. Single storey units would benefit the area by providing more employment than seven larger units and be more appropriate in scale to the new bungalows on Naas Lane.

Too much noise and heavy traffic , too big and unsightly and the wrong type of business net to a residential areas. Buildings of this calibre should be on a proper industrial site, not sandwiched next to homes and houses.

I feel Robert Hitchins could be a lot more imaginative with what they build here - as we've all side beofre, we have to live with what goes here.

As regards the working hours, I feel they are far too long and unacceptable on Sundays and Bank Holidays, We will never have any peace. We have a basic right to be able to live in our homes and gardens without having to put up with this level of activity every day of our lives.

Although this is something neither planners nor Robert Hitchins care about, this is diminishing the value of our homes and making them unsellable.

THE SITUATION It's noted that Hitchin's Architects have indicated changes to the proposal, in order to obtain planning, but once again, for the 4th time, we have to point out the changes are just minimal and insignificant, and yet again, they do not address our 1 major concern, THE NOISE ISSUE, and until this aspect is considered seriously, and dealt with, this proposal can never be acceptable, to those that live here.

THE PROBLEM Since The Master Plan of June 2003, Gloucester City Council have granted planning permission for houses and bungalows to be built along the boundary of this proposal, well knowing, that R Hitchins had plans to build an environment for employment near this border. Gloucester City Council now bears a responsibility of care, for allowing these homes to be built, as they are now contemplating allowing R Hitchins to build larger units, than those agreed in the Master Plan of 2003, and again proposed in November 2014. We, the residents along Naas Lane bought our homes in good faith, understanding that smaller units and Offices would be built further back from the boundary. The units now proposed in 2015, bear no resemblance in size, layout or usage to the original outline planning. If R Hitchins had proceeded with their build in 2003 as per the original plans, no doubt, our homes would never have been built, nor purchased, so R Hitchins also bears a responsibility now, to reduce (NOT ENLARGE) the size and shaping of these units. Its noted that the Environmental Health had agreed restricted hours of 7am – 7pm every day of the week, and to include working during Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holiday. (Effectively 365 days of the year) How can an organisation with the word HEALTH in its title, expect those living by these proposed buildings, to put up with with Noise and Pollution every day of their lives. Such permission demonstrates a real lack of empathy, towards the residents in Naas Lane. These working limits need serious admendments.

THE SOLUTION • Gloucester City Council and R Hitchins need to discuss how noise and inconvenience to Naas Lane, can be substantially reduced, which this proposal has failed to apply at this stage. • The layout of buildings is totally WRONG, Noise is funnelled through to Naas Lane, making the proposal unacceptable. The layout needs changing to offset Noise, with parking and vehicles close to Rudloe Drive. • This Parcel of land is just far too small for the 2 steel structures, proposed at this time, which comes complete with far too many complications, being too large for the plot, damaging the backdrop to Robinswood Hill and the entrance to Kingsway, and far to near to housing. The sensible conclusion is to move these massive

structures back to the other side of Rudloe Drive as per the Master Plan. • B1 and B8 Industrial usage in this area is plainly unworkable, as mentioned in previous letters. So Small Sensible Height Office Space, and Business Units, would be far more acceptable to the residents in Naas Lane, and more lucrative for R Hitchins, as there seems to be a need, after consultation in the Area. • We would encourage R Hitchins to stick closely to their Design and Access Statements made in 2007, in their Summary where it states" they aim to achieve a development with a strong identity and distinct sense of place, whilst at the same time integrating with the existing community" At this time, the only existing community in the area thats affected by this proposal, are those in Naas Lane, Just When will R Hitchens demonstrate, this integration?

I would like to object to these newly submitted plans as the new drawings do not show any substantial alterations that take in many of the points that were made on my previous objections. Mainly but not only, the mater of working hours, associated noise and ugly monstrosity being built. It will make all the noise from other areas rebound as well as funnel noise to the Nass lane residential corridor. Our voices seem to be ignored by the developers and they are making very minimal adjustments to the plans to try and appease the objectors. Many more adjustments and conditions need to be implemented before a development of the magnitude purposed can be even considered by my self, my wife and many of the residents of Naas Lane.

Well, these amendments from Robert Hitchins are really keeping us on our toes. This latest statement doesn't alter any of our previous objections. The working hours of Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays is totally unacceptable in a residential area. We will never be able to sit in our gardens, because of the noise and pollution. We will be subject to grinding, banging, crashing, sawing ,car noise and anything else that's based in these units. As mentioned in previous letters, if Robert Hitchins is intent on keeping these monsters in the present formation with the car park where it is, they will never be acceptable to us. As far as we are concerned, the only acceptable buildings next to a residential area would be low level offices with the parking facing towards Rudloe Drive. Then H.G.Vs and operational noise wouldn't be an issue. The architect speaks about the offices on the original plan being 2 storeys and more intrusive. Well what he fails to mention is that they were further away, and also that a lot of the parking was away from us. So noise from buildings of this type would have nowhere near the impact as the proposed buildings. If these were built with mature trees facing Naas Lane along with the existing bund in place and no windows on the south elevation this would probably be acceptable to most people along here. This option would both be more aesthetically pleasing from the roundabout and wouldn't produce more heavy traffic to carve up the road. Unlike the monstrosities proposed. We appeal to the planning department to put themselves in our shoes, and ask if they would be happy living with this in their backyard. I'm sure they wouldn't. Perhaps some visits to the homes on the border would be appropriate to see for yourselves the impact these buildings will have along with the excessive working hours.

We were given to understand from passed comments that there was going to be LOW level offices that may go there, that would of been far better as long as they were low, and set back further from our fences in Naas Lane. You have to understand our comments from coming from us resident...perhaps a meeting with the developer and our residents would be a good idea, where we can vent our objects personally and put both sides of views over in a constructive sensible manner.

6.0 OFFICER OPINION

- 6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that where regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 In terms of the development plan we are still working with the City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan 2002 which was also the relevant plan considered at the time the original application was determined, in 2003. The plan, under policies E1 and MU5 allocated the RAF Quedgeley site for a mixed use development including the allocated employment land. Additionally Policy ST12 identified the RAF Quedgeley site as a key priority for development and TR8 refers to the provision of the south west bypass linked to the phasing of the site.
- 6.3 The NPPF does not alter the requirement for applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise and is underpinned by a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of applicability to the planning system the NPPF refers to sustainable development comprising of economic, social and environmental roles.
- 6.4 The main issues for consideration with this application relate to the design of the buildings, parking and manoeuvring within the site, the impact upon trees and the impact upon amenity.

Design and Layout of the Buildings.

- 6.5 The site is to be accessed directly from Rudloe Drive. The road into the site has the subject of a previous approval and the junction is already in place. The application proposes 2 buildings that, for ease I shall refer to as unit 1 and unit 2. The buildings are to be sited gable end to the road with the parking and servicing areas set between the two buildings
- 6.6 Unit 1 is proposed as one large unit to be used for B1 purposes. The overall size and height of the building has been reduced since the original submission and as now proposed it would measure 40 metres by 70 metres. It is designed with a shallow pitched roof to an overall height of 9.5 metres and 7.5 metres to the eaves. The building is to be sited at a minimum of 25 metres from the rear

boundary and is to be set back just over 7 metres from Rudloe Drive. The part of the building facing Rudloe Drive will contain the office accommodation with a small area of first floor accommodation. This elevation will be constructed of brick with vertical cladding panels and contain windows and glazed panels to provide interest to the important road facing elevation. The south elevation facing the properties in Naas Lane is completely blank and constructed of metal cladding. The western elevation will be the most prominent as you travel along Rudloe Drive from the Naas Lane roundabout and we did raise concerns at the mass and prominence of the building from that approach. This is of particular concern given that the adjoining land remains undeveloped and therefore this elevation will be prominent until such time as the neighbouring land is built upon. The applicant has sought to address this by providing more detail and the use of two different coloured vertical cladding a variety of material to help “break up” this elevation into sections and therefore visually reduce its mass. . The eastern elevation faces into the parking area and uses the brick and again two different colours of cladding. This elevation also contains two small glazed “pedestrian” entrance doors into the building and 3 roller shutter doors.

- 6.7 Unit 2 is designed to accommodate 6 individual units and the building is not of regular shape like unit 1, but is designed with staggered and projecting elements. The overall length of the building would be 95 metres and the width varies between 30 and 32 metres. It is designed with a shallow pitched roof to an overall height of 9 metres and 7.3 metres to the eaves. The building is to be sited 23 metres from the rear boundary(at the closest point).The gable end of the building facing Rudloe Drive will be constructed of predominantly metal cladding with a small brick element to the lower half and contain windows facing onto the road. This elevation is similarly designed to unit 1 and together will provide a cohesive design to the road. The south elevation of the building facing the properties in Naas Lane is completely blank and constructed of metal cladding. The east elevation will be the most prominent as you are travelling along Rudloe Drive towards Naas Lane roundabout and will also be visible from newly built properties to the east. The applicant has again taken a similar approach as per the design of unit 1, with the long elevation broken up through the staggered elements of the design and the use of dark and light coloured cladding. The western elevation faces into the parking area and contains the entrances into the units with pedestrian door entrances and roller shutter doors. The material would comprise brick to the majority of the ground floor element of the building and again the use of two shades of the grey metal cladding.
- 6.8 A 3 metre high grassed and landscaped bund is proposed to the rear of the buildings with further planting around the buildings.
- 6.9 Overall these are large scale buildings compared to the domestic nature of the surrounding residential properties. However this part of the RAF Quedgeley site is allocated for employment purposes and larger building designs must be expected. The applicant has amended the proposals to reduce the size and mass of the buildings and with the use of a variety of materials this helps to create more interest to the elevations. At 9 and 9.5

metres in height I do not consider the buildings to be particularly high and they would be well within the limit of 17 metres set by the outline permission, as a maximum height for any of the buildings on the employment area.

Impact upon residential amenity.

- 6.10 Policy SD15 within the JCS is an overarching policy seeking to support the health and wellbeing of local communities and requires that new development does not result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupants.
- 6.11 Policy BE21 of the 2002 Plan seeks to ensure that new developments are acceptable in terms of impacts upon the amenity of neighbouring residents and policy FRP15 requires full consideration is given to potential noise impacts.
- 6.12 The application has generated significant levels of objection from local residents with particular concerns raised regarding the potential noise and disturbance from the site and the impact arising from the built form of the actual buildings. I will deal with each of these issues in turn.
- 6.13 Unit 1 would be set to the north of bungalows in Naas Lane (numbers 56-62), built on the site of the former Cotswold Lodge. 56, 58 and 60 are orientated so that their rear elevations face the site with their rear gardens joining the site boundary. The rear gardens are fairly small and at the closest point are of just over 7 metres in depth from the joint boundary. 62 is sited differently and at right angles to its neighbours, with its gable end set right up to the boundary of the site. The distance from these garden boundaries to the unit 1 varies between 25 and 38 metres.
- 6.14 Similarly unit 2 would also be set to the north of houses at 88 – 92 Naas Lane, which are two storey flat roofed, white rendered properties that have been built in the grounds of Quinton. Their rear elevations also face the site and distances from garden boundaries to the side elevation of unit 2 would be between 23 and 35 metres. There is a further two storey property at 74 Naas Lane, which has been built within the rear garden of Oaklands. This property faces towards unit 2 but is not set directly behind it, but would be the property closest to the parking/servicing area.
- 6.15 The two proposed units would clearly be visible to the properties to the south and their outlook would be very different to that at the moment. However the units would not be particularly high (at 9 metres), would be to the north of the existing residential properties and given the distances involved with at least 30 metres between buildings I do not consider that the units would be overly prominent or would result in overshadowing or loss of light to an unacceptable degree. Additionally a landscaped bund is proposed between the rear garden boundaries and the units, together with additional tree planting.
- 6.16 Residential properties are proposed as part of land parcel 4A2, to the eastern side of unit 2. Distances here would be in excess of 33 metres between buildings. The new dwellings would be separated from the site by their access

road and the landscape buffer containing the linear detention pond. I consider that this relationship would be acceptable.

- 6.17 There are additional houses now constructed to the north east of this site and to the northern side of Rudloe Drive and along Wycome Road. Again these are separated from the site by the linear balancing pond and additionally by Rudloe Drive and with the distances involved I do not consider that these properties would be affected in physical terms by the proposed buildings.
- 6.18 Given that the site is/will be adjoined on two sides by residential properties we need to carefully consider the impacts that may arise from the proposed use of the building for B1 and B8 purposes.
- 6.19 The whole of the employment land has the benefit of permission for B1 and B8 uses. This was granted under the original outline permission in 2003 and again in the renewal of that outline granted in 2014. Additionally the wider site is allocated/committed for employment purposes both in the City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan and The City Plan consultation document.
- 6.20 In broad terms B1 uses include office, research and light industrial uses that are generally considered appropriate in a residential area and some examples would include an accountant's office, a laboratory or a tv repairing place. B8 uses involve storage and distribution and are more akin to warehouses.
- 6.21 I understand that at this stage the proposal is a speculative development and proposed occupiers are not known. However the applicant has submitted a noise assessment and supplementary report. It should also be noted that as originally submitted the applicant was proposing a 24 hour use from the site but following discussions has now reduced the proposed operating hours to 0700-1900 M-F, 0900-1700 Sat, Sun & Bank Holidays. Deliveries would occur 0800-1800 M-F, 0800-1300 Sat with none on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- 6.22 The report includes an assessment of existing background noise levels at the site and considers noise arising from the units and particularly noise from fixed plant e.g. air conditioning and the use of the service yard including loading activity.
- 6.23 The advice from our Environmental Protection Manager is that the noise assessments have demonstrated that B1/B8 use of the units can comply with the most up to date guidance available in terms of the impact of noise, on the following basis.
- 6.24 The measured background noise levels (background = the noise normally present for most of the time at a given site) are given below. The predominant noise source in the area is from variable traffic levels.
- Daytime (07:00 – 19:00 hours) – 45 dB LA90;
 - Evening (19:00 – 23:00) - 42 dB LA90; and
 - Night-time (23:00 – 07:00) – 35 dB LA90

The final plant requirements for the units are unknown and therefore a condition would require a noise limit 5 dB(A) below the limits specified above. This would seek to ensure that the overall site noise limit was not exceeded, thus minimising any potential adverse effects.

- 6.25 It is anticipated that the any potential loading operations would be made during the daytime period and as a result loading operations have been assessed against a limit of 45 dB LAeq, 1 hour. It is considered that 4 deliveries per hour (i.e. 8 movements) / 1 every 15 minutes would represent a realistic worst case for site operations (on this basis the calculated LAeq, 1 hour and LAeq, 15 minute would be equivalent).

Based upon a B1 type of use and the boundary mitigation provided, with occasional delivery vehicles to the site, noise levels associated with the occasional deliveries would give rise to a facade level of 30 dB LAeq, T at the ground floor of the dwellings along Naas Lane. (Well below the background limit above)

Taking account of the potential B8 Use, calculations made at a distance of 60 metres between the dwellings and closest loading bay of Unit 1, with the boundary mitigation, indicates a façade level of 32 dB LAeq, at the ground floor of the dwellings. (Well below the background limit above)

The proposed boundary mitigation would also seek to provide partial screening to the upper floors of the dwellings along Naas Lane and the following noise levels have been calculated at the first floor levels:

- Typical B1 Use – 34 dB LAeq, T; (Well below the background limit above)
- B1 / B8 Use with electric forklift operating at Unit 1 – 37 dB LAeq,T. (Well below the background limit above)

- 6.26 The Environmental Protection Manager also requires that a condition be applied to require a noise management plan which specifies how noise from deliveries taken at site and deliveries dispatched from site shall be controlled so as not to cause a noise nuisance to neighbouring properties on Naas Lane .Furthermore it is recommended that hours of operation be restricted to 7.00am to 7:00pm Monday to Friday and 9.00am to 5.00pm Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays and servicing/deliveries to be restricted to 8.00am to 6.00pm Mondays to Fridays and 8.00 am to 1.00 pm on Saturdays.

- 6.27 With these restrictive conditions designed to protect residential amenity it is considered that an objection to the proposal on noise impact could not be sustained.

Parking and Access

- 6.28 Reserved matters approval has previously been granted for the road access from Rudloe Drive into this site area and the road spur is already in place. This part of Rudloe Drive has footpaths on both sides and the site is located centrally between two “traffic calming areas”. Additional information has recently been submitted in relation to parking and turning facilities and this is currently being considered by the Highway Authority. Their comments will be provided as part of the late material.

Trees and Landscaping

- 6.29 The proposal entails the removal of four oak trees and the group of three in particular, which comprise semi mature trees, are an important feature in the local area. It is very unfortunate that these trees are to be felled however the applicant is proposing new tree planting to Rudloe Drive, to the eastern side boundary and to the southern boundary between the proposed buildings and the residential properties in Naas Lane.
- 6.30 There is an existing walnut tree on the site located close to the southern boundary. It was originally proposed that this tree would be felled but following the reduction in the overall footprint of the building following the amended plans, this tree is now to be retained. The walnut is a “grade a” tree of the highest quality and again makes an important contribution to the local area. The Tree Officer has raised some concern at the closeness of the proposed unit and the landscaping bund to the proposed tree and the potential impact upon its roots. Further details from the applicant have been requested.
- 6.31 The applicant has provided some landscaping information and details of new and replacement tree planting. These details are still being discussed and Members will be updated at the meeting on both issues raised above.

7.0 CONCLUSION/REASON FOR APPROVAL

- 7.1 The principle of development for employment uses on the RAF Quedgeley site was established by the grant of outline planning permission in 2003 and the subsequent renewal in 2014. Those two permissions granted consent for B1 and B8 uses. Whilst residential development on the wider site has been ongoing since 2004, the employment site has lain largely undeveloped, other than the construction of the Asda store.
- 7.2 It is considered that the design, scale and siting of the buildings are acceptable for this allocated employment site and this together with the mix of materials should provide for interest to the road frontages and help to visually reduce their overall mass. However they will appear as much larger buildings compared to the domestic proportions and design of the surrounding residential properties.
- 7.3 The application has been subject to careful consideration of the potential noise impacts given the closeness of the site to existing, and still to be built, housing. With restrictive conditions in relation to noise levels, the management of the service area and hours for deliveries and the operation of the units themselves, it is considered that activities will be within acceptable limits.
- 7.4 Issues relating to parking and turning arrangements, the impact upon the walnut tree and landscaping proposals are still being discussed with the applicant and Members will be updated at the meeting.

7.5 Overall the proposals are considered to comply with the relevant national and local planning policies, and as such the application is recommended for approval.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER

That subject to no new material planning considerations being raised within the consultation period, and resolution of the outstanding issues in relation to trees, landscaping and parking/turning arrangements that committee resolve to grant reserved matters approval with delegated powers being granted to the Development Control Manager to issue the decision subject to the following conditions and any others that may be necessary.

Condition 1

Commence within time period.

Condition 2

Development in accordance with the approved plans

Condition 3

No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall:

- i. specify the type and number of vehicles;
- ii. provide for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- iii. provide for the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iv. provide for the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- v. provide for wheel washing facilities;
- vii. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction.

Reason

To ensure that appropriate measures are in place prior to the commencement of development to reduce the potential impact on the public highway and accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies in accordance paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 4

Submission of detailed drainage proposals

Condition 5

Within one month of the commencement of the development details or samples of materials to be used externally shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

To ensure that the materials harmonise with the surroundings in accordance with policy BE.20 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition 6

Prior to the first use of the buildings a noise assessment shall be carried out in accordance with BS4142:2014. Noise associated with plant and machinery incorporated into the development shall be controlled such that the Rating Level, measured or calculated at 1-metre from the façade of the nearest existing noise sensitive premises, shall not exceed a level 5db below the existing typical LA90 background noise level. Rating Level and existing background noise levels to be determined as per the guidance provided in BS 4142:2014. In addition, there should be no tonal element to the noise.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of existing residential property in the locality in accordance with policy BE.21 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition 7

Prior to the first use of the buildings here by permitted a noise management plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority which specifies how noise from deliveries taken at site and deliveries dispatched from site shall be controlled so as not to cause a noise nuisance to neighbouring properties on Naas Lane. The use of the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of existing residential property in the locality in accordance with policy BE.21 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition 8

The loading and unloading of service and delivery vehicles together with their arrival and departure from the site shall not take place outside the hours of 8.00 am to 6.00 pm Mondays to Fridays and 8.00 am to 1.00 pm on Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of existing residential property in the locality in accordance with policy BE.21 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition 9

The use hereby permitted shall only be allowed to operate between the hours of 7.00am - 7:00pm Monday to Friday and 9.00am – 5.00pm Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of existing residential property in the locality in accordance with policy BE.21 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition 10

Within three months of the commencement of the development a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with a timetable to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

To ensure that appropriate measures are in place prior to the commencement of development in the interests of visual amenity and to ensure dwellings have satisfactory privacy in accordance with policies BE.21 and BE.4 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition 11

During the construction phase no machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out and no deliveries taken at or despatched from the site outside the following times: Monday-Friday 8.00 am-6.00pm, Saturday 8.00 am-1.00 pm nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason

To protect the amenity of local residents in accordance with policy BE.21 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition 12

No materials or substances shall be burnt within the application site during the construction phase.

Reason

To safeguard residential amenity and prevent pollution in accordance with policy BE.21 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Condition 13

The development shall not be occupied until details of a lighting scheme to illuminate the external areas of the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the lighting fixtures, their location on the site/on the buildings, and the extent of illumination. The scheme is also to include details on how the impact of floodlights and external lighting will be minimised. The approved lighting scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the use of the development and maintained for the duration of the use of the site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of crime prevention and residential amenity in accordance with Policy BE.5 and BE21 of the City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan 2002.

Condition 14
Tree protection measures

Condition 15
Replacement tree planting and full landscaping details.

Decision:

Notes:

Person to contact: Joann Meneaud
(Tel: 396780.)

15/00112/REM

**Land To East West Of A38 And
Naas Lane
Quedgeley
Gloucester**

Planning Committee 12.01.2016

