

## **LATE MATERIAL (APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION)**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE: 6 SEPTEMBER 2016**

#### **ITEM 5 – 16/00631/OUT – FORMER BISHOP’S COLLEGE, ESTCOURT ROAD**

One additional letter has been received;

I remain very concerned that the traffic impact of the proposed development has not been properly assessed.

My purpose in writing is not to ask you to refuse the application, but to consider deferring it until such time as traffic impact can be adequately dealt with.

The issue is best summarised by the bullet point at the top of page 32 of the Committee report: “When College was operating, access via Estcourt Close was restricted for safety reasons to only allow teachers, disabled and service vehicles onto the site. All students entered the site using the pedestrian access in Estcourt Road. Also the flows were only for school periods and should be averaged over a year. These have not been considered”.

I (and no doubt others) raised the matter with the County Council officers at the exhibition of the proposals in July last year, and it was discussed again at the public meeting called by Paul James and Kathy Williams on 27 July this year. There was however no recognition of the issue in the Transport Statement which accompanied the planning application.

I have examined the response of County Highways dated 12 August 2016. Having been in the planning profession for over forty years I am well aware that planning officers do not often disregard the advice from statutory consultees. Here however the advice is not sound; the issue is acknowledged, but dealt with in a wholly unsatisfactory way. The key to it is in the following paragraphs:

“I note that there are a number of comments raised about the suitability of this approach as the school operated in such a way that the vehicle access from Estcourt Close was used only by staff, visitors and a limited number of pupils with most pupils who arrive by car or bus being dropped off close to the pedestrian link from the service road of Estcourt Road. This is accepted however it does not materially change the conclusions that are made within the TA. The site access would have been used by staff and visitors which are likely to have amounted to a number of vehicle movements broadly similar to the number anticipated from the proposed development. Whilst the TA has addressed the number of movements from the permitted use it is accepted that it has not fully considered the nature of these movements and their impact on Estcourt Close. I have however made my own assessment of these matters and consider that the overall conclusion that a suitable means of access is provided is still correct.

Notwithstanding the comparison to the previous use the number of vehicle movements generated by the proposed development is not considered to be significant and could be safely accommodated by the existing network”.

This clearly demonstrates a serious lack of sound reasoning. Furthermore, there are no figures, either from the applicants or County Highways themselves, to support the lazy and unwarranted conclusions in the sections I have underlined above.

It might be that a proper assessment of traffic impact would find that the traffic impact would be acceptable. The point is however that the work needs to be done to an appropriate standard. Quite plainly this is not the case.

Another local resident proposes to speak at Committee on a broader range of matters. I very much hope that members of the Committee will take full account of this particular issue when reaching their decision.

Highways matters are addressed in the report and no changes are proposed in relation to these comments.

The Officer recommendation has however been refined to seek delegated powers to amend or add conditions to deal with the outstanding matters;

#### **Amended recommendation**

That, subject to confirmation that the Council's Drainage Engineer is satisfied as to the future provision of an acceptable sustainable urban drainage strategy, and securing of a legal agreement or agreements to provide the following;

1. A proportion of affordable housing (as set out in the report factoring in vacant buildings credit as required)
2. A package of mitigation for open space requirements that the Committee delegates to the Development Control Manager to finalise
3. A financial contribution towards education on the basis set out in the report
4. A financial contribution towards libraries on the basis set out in the report

and delegation from the Committee to the solicitor for the incorporation of such additional provisions in the proposed planning obligation that may be deemed necessary by the solicitor, planning permission is granted subject to the conditions in the report with delegated powers granted to the Development Control Manager to amended or add conditions as necessary to deal with the outstanding matters;

#### **ITEM 7 – 16/00829/FUL – LAND AT THE DOCKS (FORMER BRITISH WATERWAYS CAR PARK)**

##### **Changes to the proposal;**

In light of the original Officer recommendation the applicants now propose the replacement of the coloured asphalt with resin bound gravel.

These arrangements would still be of a lesser quality than the previous scheme and would not meet the aspirations for pedestrian squares and trafficked areas in the Docks public realm guidance. It also remains the case that this treatment would also not necessarily be an interim scheme – it could remain in perpetuity. It would however be an improvement over the coloured asphalt and would tie in as a material

used elsewhere in the Docks and referenced within the public realm guidance for Dock edge areas.

Officers have also discussed with the applicant the treatment of the retained rail tracks. The existing brick setts between and alongside the tracks would be retained and repaired locally where required. This would deal with the issue where the tracks extend out into the existing granite setts in front of the Barge Arm building.

The Canal & River Trust has considered the amended scheme and is happy to deal with the approval of materials by condition given the circumstances.

### **Amended recommendation**

**That planning permission is granted subject to the conditions in the report as amended by those below;**

#### Amended Condition 2

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan referenced M 5392-100 Rev. D08 - Interim Landscape Proposal received by the Local Planning Authority on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2016 except where otherwise required by conditions of this permission.

#### Reason

To ensure that the works are undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

#### Amended Condition 5

The railway tracks across the site shall be retained in full in situ as an exposed surface feature and only localised repairs shall be undertaken to the tracks or the retained brick setts between and alongside the tracks, unless an alternative methodology for their treatment is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority under which circumstances works shall be undertaken to the railway tracks and brick setts between and alongside only in accordance with the approved methodology.

#### Reason

In the interests of good design and protecting the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings, in accordance with Policies SD5 and SD9 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy Submission Version November 2014, Paragraphs 17, 58 and 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies BE.5, BE.17, BE.23 and BE.29 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002) and the National Planning Policy Framework.