



PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING : Tuesday, 1st March 2016

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

Officers in Attendance

Jon Sutcliffe, Development Control Manager
Michael Jones, Solicitor, One Legal
Nick Jonathan, Solicitor, One Legal
Adam Smith, Principal Planning Officer, Major Developments
Joann Meneaud, Principal Planning Officer
Anthony Wilson, Head of Planning
Louise Follett, Senior Planning Policy Officer
Jamie Mattock, Highways Officer
Tony Wisdom, Democratic Services Officer

APOLOGIES : None.

86. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Williams, declared a non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 7, University of Gloucestershire and withdrew to the public gallery during the consideration of the application.

Councillor Lewis declared a personal interest in agenda item 7, University of Gloucestershire.

87. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 February 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

88. LATE MATERIAL

Members' attention was drawn to the late material in respect of agenda items 6, 7 and 9 which had been published on the internet as a supplement to the agenda.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

89. UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE OXSTALLS CAMPUS, FORMER DEBENHAMS PLAYING FIELD, FORMER BISHOPS COLLEGE, PLOCK COURT -15/01190/OUT

Councillor Williams, having declared a non-prejudicial interest in this application, withdrew to the public gallery during the consideration of this item.

Councillor Lewis having declared a personal interest remained in the meeting and participated in the consideration of the application.

The Principal Planning Officer presented his report which detailed an outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of a new 10,000 sqm business school, the provision of new student accommodation (up to 200 beds) and the creation of additional; car parking at the University of Gloucestershire Oxstalls Campus, Oxstalls Lane and the Debenhams Playing Field, Oxstalls Campus and Plock Court Playing Fields including on land currently occupied by the former Bishops College to include – the provision of new multi-use sports hall, 2x 3G all weather sports pitches with associated 500 seat spectator stand, floodlighting, replacement cricket pavilion and additional parking; improved vehicular access at Oxstalls Lane, Plock Court and Estcourt Road, new vehicular access at Estcourt Close, improved pedestrian and cycling connections and associated highways, landscaping and ancillary works.

He drew Members' attention to the late material which contained a clarification of paragraph 6.99 of the report by the University and an amended recommendation.

Councillor Porter as a Ward Member was invited to address the Committee.

Councillor Porter stated that he had been excited by the original proposals and the potential financial benefits that they would bring to the City. His excitement had waned as the proposals were developed and the extent of the potential impact on the community became apparent.

Many hours had been spent in trying to find ways to mitigate these impacts but the University remained intransigent. Originally free parking had been proposed for residents, which then became an offer by the University to support free parking for a limited time and now the offer had been withdrawn completely.

He stated that residents considered on-street parking to be a nightmare at the present time with both staff and students trying to avoid paying parking charges.

A new on-site car park was proposed but the access would cross a busy sustainable transport route where he had personally sustained injuries from an accident.

He believed that the proposed access arrangements were too complex and would cause delays to other road users.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

He stated that the proposed student accommodation blocks were too close to houses on Estcourt Road and would be better sited behind the business school or moved to the east. He stated that the University had refused both suggestions.

The access off Tewkesbury Road had not been designed for the volumes of traffic proposed and he had suggested an alternative.

He noted that more than 200 representations had been received and the majority wished the development to go ahead but with appropriate mitigation measures and the proposals put forward by the local community would be both better and cheaper.

John Bond of Estcourt Close addressed the Committee in opposition to the application on behalf of Oxvoice and Estcourt residents.

Mr Bond believed that consultation had been inadequate and there had been no opportunity for discussions with local residents. The Stakeholder Group had only met on one occasion. Many local people were still unaware of the potential impacts of the proposals and the situation may have been different if the matter had not been handled with such haste and consideration had been given to alternatives that had been put forward.

He believed that the application should be deferred to await the anticipated application for Bishop's College.

There were eight new proposals in the amended scheme and there had been no explanations provided or any supporting information provided.

He believed that an access off Estcourt Close could be avoided and suggested a new access via Estcourt Road which could be achieved between the roundabout and the last house on Estcourt Road.

He noted that the Debenham's Field was designated for sports use only in the local plan and he noted that there had always been a cricket pitch on Plock Court so it would not mitigate the loss on Debenham's Field.

He considered that the design and position of the student halls would adversely affect residents.

He questioned the use of Estcourt Close as an access as it had previously been required only to provide access to the relocated allotments in the original plans for the application.

He noted that there had been no mention of the interests of local people in the proposed conditions.

He noted that Debenham's Field was the subject of a restrictive covenant which would require to be resolved by the Land Tribunal before development could start.

Stephen Marston, Vice-Chancellor of the University, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

Mr Marston stated that the proposal would bring benefits to the City and was important for the future success of the University. The application would enable the business school to be relocated from Cheltenham and would provide better sports facilities. It was important to the future of the University and also to the City and the County.

The proposal would support jobs in the City and the students had spending power of over £2 million. They would also want to find jobs within the county.

The Growth Hub provided a wide range of services to business and the proposed enhanced sports facilities would be dual use and the University was working with the Aspire Trust to that end.

Mr Marston stated that the University wished to maintain relationships with the local community and he did not believe that the University had been intransigent.

The allotments would not be relocated and the University had not withdrawn from a possible Controlled Parking Zone. The Local Enterprise Partnership had invested £5 million in the project.

In conclusion he noted that sixty six conditions were proposed to ensure the development was well managed and potential adverse impacts were mitigated.

The Chair questioned the provision of parking and the County Council Highways Officer advised that the University had undertaken extensive surveys in June and October and further surveys would be required by condition within three months of occupation.

She made reference to government guidance in paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework and advised that there was no evidence that on-street parking was causing a road safety issue.

The Vice Chair stated that he had witnessed parking issues on Oxstalls Way and he believed that more work should be undertaken on parking as the development should not be at the expense of local residents.

The Highways Officer noted that a number of adjacent streets were congested and the University had indicated a willingness to work with the Highway Authority. There were a number of possible solutions including the possibility of a Controlled Parking Zone.

Councillor Hilton believed that it was County Council policy to consider Controlled Parking Zones only in areas where more than half the homes did not have off-street parking.

Councillor McLellan referred to the parking survey requested within three months of occupation and noted that it could take a long time to put a Traffic Regulation Order into place.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

The Vice Chair referred to the restriction on first year students having cars on site and asked how many sanctions had been taken. The Principal Planning Officer advised that in the period from September to February at the Oxstalls campus, fifteen Warning One and four Warning Two notices had been issued and no evictions had been considered to be necessary.

The Chair raised the following issues:-

Cheltenham Road traffic lights – the Highways Officer confirmed that the proposals were completely acceptable. The Vice Chair noted a number of accidents had been caused by drivers failing to cancel their direction indicators, and the junction proposals were a big benefit of the scheme.

Estcourt Close access to student accommodation – the Highway Authority was not supportive of intensifying use of the existing allotment access and there would be very little trip generation from student accommodation using the Estcourt Close access.

Consultation on amended proposals – The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that interested parties had been re-notified of the amendments and a further period allowed for representations.

Loss of cricket pitch – The Principal Planning Officer advised that he taken this matter up with Sport England who supported the proposals ‘in the round’ and the Gloucestershire Cricket Board had taken the same view. The Vice Chair believed that it would take years to restore the pitch at Debenham’s Field to playable standard.

Plock Court access – the Highways Officer indicated that the capacity analysis was acceptable.

The Vice Chair expressed concern at the proximity of the proposed access road to the Tennis Centre.

Councillor McLellan agreed with the Vice Chair and asked if the 500 seat stand had been taken into account. He was advised that the impact would be less outside peak hours and the Highways Officer had recommended an Event Management Plan to manage larger events.

The Solicitor advised Members that the existence of restrictive covenants must not be taken into account in the determination of planning applications. With regard to the suggestion that the application be deferred to await an application for Bishop’s College, he reminded Members to consider the application before them and stated that it would not be reasonable to defer the application to await an application on adjoining land.

Councillor Hilton believed that the application was an improvement on the super store previously proposed for the site. He was pleased that the University had listened to concerns about relocating the allotments. He noted that the proposed 200 bed student accommodation was intended for first year students and the University would be looking in the City for accommodation for

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

second and third year students. He called for such accommodation to be purpose built to avoid taking up badly needed family accommodation in the City.

The Chair noted that the planning process had ensured that statutory consultation had been undertaken on this application and he hoped that the University would undertake consultation on the reserved matters application.

The Solicitor advised that, due to legal reasons, paragraph 6.184 of the report should include reference to Section 1, The Localism Act 2011.

RESOLVED that subject to the completion of a planning obligation to secure the community liaison group, on site student management team and taxi management (and also delegate to the Development Control Manager in consultation with the Planning Solicitor) the incorporation of such additional provisions in the proposed planning obligation that may be deemed necessary by the Solicitor), outline planning permission be granted subject to the conditions in the Committee report with the following amendments:-

Amended Condition 48

Prior to occupation of the proposed student accommodation details of the access from Estcourt Close to the student accommodation including measures to limit vehicular access so as to provide only for permitted users, and measures to restrict vehicular access from the existing access serving the Estcourt Park allotments to the north of Estcourt Road, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and completed in all respects.

Reason

To ensure safe and suitable access to serve the proposed development and to minimise conflict between traffic, pedestrians and cyclists in accordance with Paragraph 32 and 35 of the NPPF.

Amended Condition 65

Prior to occupation of the business school, the student accommodation, or the sports hall, a Travel Plan for that use shall be submitted in accordance with the approved Travel Plan Framework and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, setting out;

- i. objectives and targets for promoting sustainable travel,
- ii. appointment and funding of a travel plan coordinator,
- iii. details of an annual monitoring and review process,
- iv. means of funding of the travel plan, and;
- v. an implementation timetable including the responsible body for each action.

The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the details and timetable therein, and shall be continued thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure that the opportunities for sustainable transport modes are taken up in accordance with paragraphs 32 and 36 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

90. BAKERS QUAY - 15/01144/FUL & 15/01152/LBC

The Principal Planning Officer introduced his report which detailed an application for alteration, including partial demolition, refurbishment and restoration of Downings Malthouse and Downings Malthouse extension, the demolition and redevelopment of Provender Mill and the restoration and extension of the Transit Shed to provide commercial floorspace for A3/A4 purposes at ground floor level in Downings Malthouse, Provender Mill and the Transit Shed, conversion of basement and ground floors of the Downing Malthouse extension for ancillary car parking and the upper floors of Downings Malthouse, Downings Malthouse extension and new build Provender Mill to provide 162 new residential units and the restoration of four three storey cottages. The development of the 105 bed hotel and freestanding unit for use for A3/A4 purposes on the site together with ancillary parking, turning, access and landscaping.

He advised that the associated application for Listed Building Consent (15/01152/LBC) was also presented for Members' consideration. He drew Members' attention to the late material which contained a further representation, consultee responses and a revised recommendation.

Adrian Goodall of Rokeby Merchant addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Mr Goodall advised that the original proposals had been presented to the Regeneration Company three years ago and it had taken one year to address land ownership issues with a further two years to develop the master plan.

He stated that it was challenging to find viable uses for heritage assets and he believed that the new build element would be acceptable and viable. This element would generate the funding needed to enable the external retention of the heritage assets.

He noted that the new build option for Provender Mill sought to retain the massing, elevator shaft and gable ends of the original building.

In conclusion he noted that the overall viability of the proposals was very fragile but Rokeby Merchant were fully committed to the whole scheme and could and would only take their profit on completion of the development. He had offered a 'best endeavours' commitment to build out the whole programme.

He explained that the developers were unable to offer any affordable housing but they were working with the Homes and Communities Agency to provide starter homes. He confirmed that if permission was granted work would start in the summer.

Councillor Smith believed that the proposal contained some delightful features but expressed concern regarding the balconies proposed for Provender Mill and the

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

design of the drive through café. She was pleased that the overall scheme retained much of the heritage and was in keeping.

Councillor Hilton complimented the developers and their architects on their plans for the buildings which were in a state of disrepair following several fires and a long period of disuse. He welcomed the provision of the hotel, restaurants and residential accommodation.

Councillor McLellan welcomed the proposals for the derelict site and was pleased to see the condition requiring that a charge be made for parking. He believed that the proposed drive through café was out of keeping.

He noted that the access road which was shared with Gloucester Quays was often closed when large events were held at the Quays and the car park was full. He was advised that was a matter for the applicants to agree with Gloucester Quays.

He asked if the development would address the deterioration of the heritage buildings. The Principal Planning Officer advised that this was critical and the applicant had offered to undertake maintenance to prevent further deterioration during the first phase and had offered 'best endeavours' to comply with a scheme of works to build out the whole scheme.

The Solicitor explained that 'best endeavours' was a recognised term that meant that the applicant would do all that they could and this could be enforced through the courts. The best endeavours obligation is a continuing obligation that requires the counterparty to exhaust all courses of action and is therefore one of the highest forms of obligation recognised in the law. It should be contrasted with the much lower level of performance expected in the case of the exercise of reasonable endeavours.

Councillor Chatterton echoed the earlier comments regarding the balconies and referred to paragraph 6.64 of the report and suggested that the approval of Historic England be required for the external cladding, window, balcony and hoist arrangement and finish. He was advised that this could be achieved through proposed condition 7.

The Vice Chair welcomed the proposals with the exception of the drive through café and believed that the proposed atrium would be stunning.

Councillor Hobbs welcomed the application which exceeded what he believed could be achieved for the site. He expressed concerns relating to floodlighting and to pedestrian linkages from St Ann Way.

He was advised that the provision of lighting would be controlled by proposed condition 13 and the Development Control Manager noted that the pedestrian linkage would be outside the application site but the applicant could be asked if a solution could be found.

Councillor Williams welcomed the application but expressed concerns regarding highways and potential for problems for residents accessing their properties when big events were happening.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

The Principal Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the proposed apportionment of £67,810 contained within the late material and sought Members' views.

Members accepted the viability issues with the development.

Members had before them the detailed written advice from the Solicitor relating to the relevant tests concerning planning obligations and also the views of the Solicitor on the points raised by Historic England.

Members agreed that the funding be apportioned as follows:-

£10,000 for improvements to the play area at Gloucester Park and improvements to the youth sports area at Bakers Field adjacent to Gloucester Park;

£5,000 to libraries for improvements to IT and digital technology and increased services to improve customer access to services for Gloucester Library;

£52,810 for affordable housing projects within Westgate Ward.

RESOLVED that

1) 15/01152/LBC

Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the conditions in the report.

2) 15/01144/FUL

Subject to completion of a planning obligation to secure £67,810 of Section 106 contributions apportioned as detailed above along with a satisfactory review mechanism to revisit the Section 106 obligations in the future, and secure a mechanism to secure completion of the whole development, also with authority delegated to the Development Control Manager, in consultation with the Planning Solicitor, to incorporate such additional provisions in the proposed planning obligations that may be deemed necessary, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions listed in the report with the following amendments:-

Amended Condition 33

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details for the disposal of surface water have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted shall include proposals for the disposal of surface water in accordance with the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), modelling/simulation of the scheme to demonstrate it is technically feasible, a SUDS maintenance plan for all SuDS/attenuation features and associated pipework, and where surface water requires disposal off site (i.e. not infiltrated) evidence of consent to discharge/connect through 3rd party land or to their network/system/watercourse, and shall be implemented for each phase prior

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

to the first occupation of buildings within that phase for the uses hereby permitted and maintained thereafter for the life of the development.

Reason

To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage, to reduce the risk of creating or exacerbating a flooding problem and to minimise the risk of pollution in accordance with Policies SD15 and INF3 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy Submission Version November 2014, Paragraphs 100 and 103 of the NPPF and Policies FRP.1a, FRP.6 and FRP.11 of the City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan 2002. This is required pre-commencement given the facilities involve below ground works and a fairly large spatial extent so their arrangement needs to be agreed at the start to avoid any abortive works or other conflicts as a result of starting development.

Amended Condition 35

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, development of a Phase other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until parts 1 to 4 have been complied with for that Phase. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the Local Planning Authority in writing until part 4 has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

1. Site Characterisation

Once buildings have been demolished and structures removed, supplementary site investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

- human health,
- property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
- adjoining land,
- groundwaters and surface waters,
- ecological systems,
- archeological sites and ancient monuments;

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's '*Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11*'.

2. Submission of Remediation Scheme

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must accord with the provisions of the EPA 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

3. Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report (elsewhere referred to as a validation report) that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

4. Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of part 1, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of part 2, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with part 3.

5. Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance

A monitoring and maintenance scheme to include monitoring the long-term effectiveness of the proposed remediation, and the provision of reports on the same must be prepared, both of which are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of the measures identified in that scheme and when the remediation objectives have been achieved, reports that demonstrate the effectiveness of the monitoring and maintenance carried out must be produced, and submitted to the Local Planning Authority. This must be conducted in accordance

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's *'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'*.

Reason

To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Policy SD15 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy Submission Version November 2014, Paragraphs 17, 120, 121 and 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy FRP.15 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

Amended Condition 37

Prior to the proposed development being brought into beneficial use details of proposed highway improvement works to Merchants Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which shall include an extension to existing access restrictions broadly in accordance with plan no PL-MP-01 Rev B and an interim scheme of highway improvement works. The interim scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any buildings within the first Phase of development, and the permanent scheme of improvement works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of any units within Downings Malthouse or Downings Malthouse Extension.

Reason

To ensure safe and suitable access is provided and create safe and secure layouts that minimise conflicts between traffic, pedestrians and cyclists in accordance with Paragraph 32 and 35 of the National Planning policy Framework, to ensure provision for users of the first Phase of development and provision of overall improvements at an appropriate point to minimise the risk of damage during development works for adjacent buildings.

New condition 46

No development of a phase including external car parking other than site remediation, demolition or infrastructure provision shall commence until a Car Park Management Plan for that part of the development, setting out arrangements for charging, managing and maintaining the car park, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Car Park Management Plan, once approved, shall be implemented prior to the any use hereby approved within that phase being commenced, and retained for the duration of the use.

Reason

To ensure that the development does not undermine the strategic approach to car parking and congestion control in the central area and to encouraging sustainable forms of travel in accordance with Policies TR.13, TR.16, TR.17, TR.18 and TR.19 of the 2002 City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan, Policy INF1 of the Joint Core Strategy Submission Document 2014 and Paragraphs 29, 30, 32, 34, 35 and 40 of the NPPF.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

91. LAND AT WINNYCROFT LANE, MATSON - 14/01063/OUT

The Chair advised that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda by Officers prior to the meeting to enable further work to be undertaken relating to viability issues.

92. 126 TREDWORTH ROAD - 15/00797/COU

The Development Control Manager presented the report which detailed an application for the proposed change of use from florist to takeaway and construction of a flue at 126, Tredworth Road.

He drew Members' attention to the late material which contained an additional proposed condition.

He advised that the applicant had amended the plans to move the flue as far back from the street frontage as possible. The applicant had also proposed to clad the flue in glass reinforced plastic and paint the top of the flue to ensure that it blended in with the side elevation as much as possible.

Dr Kirby addressed the Committee in opposition to the application.

Dr Kirby stated that he had found the Council's website to be deeply unfriendly to users. He advised that he ran a small business and that he was a landlord owning much of the property in the vicinity.

He believed that the proposed use would cause disruption and increase traffic. The existing use as a florist was a gentler trade generated fewer journeys than a takeaway.

The takeaway would generate white noise from the machinery and smells from the extraction plant.

He expressed concerns regarding traffic which was exacerbated by illegal parking around the dangerous junction which already saw serious accidents at regular intervals. He believed there was a disconnection between the perceptions and reality of the traffic situation.

Councillor Hobbs expressed concerns regarding increased traffic generation and poor parking provision. He referred to the convenience store on the other side of Tredworth Road and was not convinced that the highway engineers were correct.

Councillor Etheridge used Tredworth Road on a regular basis and it frequently took ten or twelve minutes to pass through the junction with a large vehicle.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

The Development Control Manager referred to Dr Kirby's comments regarding the existing use as a florist. He advised that the premises had the benefit of permitted general Class A1 open retail use and could be used lawfully for any use within that Class. He noted that the proposed takeaway would not be open during the morning peak period and advised Members that the decision should be made on the basis that the existing parking restrictions were complied with.

Councillor Toleman noted that the Committee would have to take note of the highway officer's views and the future of the takeaway would be determined by market forces.

Councillor McLellan believed that more people would drive to a takeaway than a general convenience store.

Councillor Smith believed it unlikely that the premises would revert to a convenience store as one existed over the road. She expressed concerns that illegally parked cars could obstruct the view of the road for children using the pedestrian crossing.

The Vice Chair asked where delivery vehicles and staff would be able to park.

The Solicitor advised the Committee to determine the application on planning grounds not on enforcement issues and he noted the need for Members to provide robust reasons should they be minded to refuse the application.

Councillor Brown stated that parking was permitted on double yellow lines for fifteen minutes for loading and unloading.

Councillor Hilton noted that people would park near the controlled pedestrian crossing creating a road safety hazard.

Members agreed to defer the application as there was insufficient information on road safety with particular reference to the safety of pedestrians.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred as there was insufficient information on road safety with particular reference to the safety of pedestrians.

93. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

The Head of Planning introduced Mr John Baker of Peter Brett Associates who provided the Committee with an update on progress in producing a draft charging structure for the authorities within the Joint Core Strategy.

The Chair thanked Mr Baker for the presentation

94. DELEGATED DECISIONS

PLANNING COMMITTEE
01.03.16

Consideration was given to a schedule of applications determined under delegated powers during the month of January 2016.

RESOLVED that the schedule be noted.

95. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 12 April 2016 at 6.00pm.

Time of commencement: 6.00 pm

Time of conclusion: 10.02 pm

Chair