

GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE : **PLANNING**

DATE : **7TH FEBRUARY 2017**

ADDRESS/LOCATION : **UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE,
OXSTALLS LANE**

APPLICATION NO. & WARD : **16/01241/REM
LONGLEVENS**

EXPIRY DATE : **16TH JANUARY 2017**

APPLICANT : **UNIVERSITY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE**

PROPOSAL : **Application for approval of the reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the Business School & Growth Hub building, pursuant to outline permission ref 15/01190/OUT, at the University of Gloucestershire, Oxstalls Campus**

REPORT BY : **ADAM SMITH**

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

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application site comprises part of the existing Oxstalls campus, primarily the land north of the east-west running footpath between Estcourt Road and Oxstalls Way. The application is for reserved matters approval pursuant to the University's outline planning permission ref. 15/01190/OUT granted earlier this year. That outline permission also included the means of access, so this application seeks approval of the remaining reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
- 1.2 The proposal is for the business school element of the permission. This is proposed to be built out in phases, with this application comprising the first phase of 5350m² (the outline permission allowing for a scheme of 10,000m²). A second phase may come forward in the future as a further reserved matters application.
- 1.3 The proposed scheme continues the basic layout of the indicative masterplan with the building sited on the hockey pitch area and a car park of 184 spaces up the east side of the site, accessed across the east-west running public

footpath from the existing campus. Vehicular access would therefore ultimately be gained from the existing Oxstalls Lane junction.

- 1.4 The building would comprise of 3 storeys, with the main body of the building between 12 and 12.7m in height, up to 14.7m at maximum including the roof level plant housing. It would be sited fronting the public footpath, with the zone for the phase two building behind/to the north.
- 1.5 The existing bund around the hockey pitch would mostly be retained, with two incursions – the southernmost section removed to allow for the car park access road, and a section mid way along its eastern arm removed to allow an access through between the building and the car park.
- 1.6 The application is referred to the planning committee given the scale and local interest.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

University campus

- 2.1 I understand that a college was first built on the site in around 1955 and expanded in the 1960s and 1980s. Recent planning history comprises the following:

92/01833/OUT

- 2.2 Outline application for the erection of a retail store, petrol filling station, construction of car park with associated landscaping. Refused 16.02.1994 and dismissed at appeal.

98/00451/FUL

- 2.3 Demolition of existing buildings, erection of learning centre, sports, science building, provision of car parking, artificial turf pitch & ancillary landscaping. Granted subject to conditions and a s106 to secure an inter-campus bus service and restrict the access to the Oxstalls Lane junction 19.04.1999.

00/00467/OUT

- 2.4 Erection of replacement student residences comprising of 5 no. three storey blocks – for a total of 40 bedrooms (Outline application although approval of access and siting sought at this stage). Granted subject to conditions 08.08.2000.

00/00766/FUL

- 2.5 Formation of floodlit all weather sports pitch (8 no. 12m high floodlights). Granted subject to conditions 05.07.2001.

01/00244/FUL

- 2.6 Erection of replacement student residences comprising 2 no. 2 storey blocks and 5 no. 4 storey blocks and a single storey common room / offices (revised proposal). Granted subject to conditions 03.07.2001.

05/00964/FUL

- 2.7 Erection of three storey extension with a two storey link to existing academic building with landscaping and ancillary works. Granted subject to conditions and 106 to provide funds for parking survey and parking zone 17.03.2006.

06/00007/FUL

- 2.8 Erection of a two storey extension Sports Science building. Alterations to internal access road and compensatory landscaping. Granted subject to conditions 01.03.2006.

14/00882/FUL

- 2.9 Construction of new performing arts centre with link to existing building and provision of replacement car parking spaces. Granted subject to conditions 27.10.14.

15/01162/FUL

- 2.10 Installation of mobile floodlights to grass area north of All Weather Pitch. Granted subject to conditions 29.10.15.

Oxstalls tennis centre

97/00023/OUT

- 2.11 Outline application for construction of tennis centre and replacement changing facilities. (County Council scheme). Granted subject to conditions 21.08.97.

99/00174/DCC

- 2.12 Reserved matters for construction of tennis centre and replacement of existing changing facilities. Approved subject to conditions 09.06.99.

11/00400/DDD

- 2.13 Erection of 9 no. 10m high lighting columns to outdoor tennis courts. Granted subject to conditions 11.05.11.

Bishops College

- 2.14 It appears from the history as though the school dates from the mid/late 1960s. There have been several proposals to extend and alter the complex.

03/EDP/901/79

- 2.15 Construction of an 'all weather' recreation (football training) area incorporating floodlights and boundary fencing. Granted subject to conditions 15.09.79.

1924305/MLA

- 2.16 Installation of 8 no. floodlighting columns (15m high). Granted subject to conditions 10.08.93.

95/00138/CPO

- 2.17 Erection of sports hall. Granted subject to conditions 4th May 1995.

95/00222/CPO

- 2.18 Extensions to school to provide additional teaching and office accommodation. Granted subject to conditions 18th July 1995.

- 08/00143/FUL
- 2.19 Erection of a 15 metre high wind turbine with 3 x 2.28m blades. Granted subject to conditions 25th March 2008.

- 16/00631/OUT
- 2.20 Outline application (with all matters reserved other than means of access) for redevelopment of part of the Former Bishop's College site for residential use creating up to 90 new homes and provision of open space. Pending consideration – endorsed by Planning Committee, awaiting s106 agreement.

Debenhams Playing field

P/689/64

- 2.21 Outline application for use of land for the erection of 10 houses. Refused 16.12.64.

Current University scheme

- 15/01190/OUT
- 2.22 Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of a new 10,000sqm business school, the provision of new student accommodation (up to 200 beds) & the creation of additional car parking at the University of Gloucestershire Oxstalls Campus, Oxstalls Lane & the Debenhams Playing Field, Estcourt Road. Provision of new and improved sports facilities at Oxstalls Sports Park, Debenhams Playing Field, Oxstalls Campus & Plock Court Playing Fields, including on land currently occupied by the Former Bishops College, to include - the provision of new multi use sports hall, 2 x 3G all weather sports pitches with associated 500 seat spectator stand, floodlighting, replacement cricket pavilion & additional parking; improved vehicular access at Oxstalls Lane, Plock Court & Estcourt Road, new vehicular access at Estcourt Close, improved pedestrian & cycling connections & associated highways, landscaping & ancillary works. Granted outline planning permission subject to conditions and a legal agreement 28th July 2016.

- 16/00945/REM
- 2.23 Reserved matters application for the approval of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the Sports Hall, Plock Court access road and Pavilion development (pursuant to outline permission ref. 15/01190/OUT). Granted subject to conditions 6th December 2016.

- 16/01012/REM
- 2.24 Application for approval of reserved matters of appearance, landscape, layout and scale for 2 no. sports pitches and associated development including floodlights, storage equipment, noise barrier and boundary fencing (pursuant to outline planning permission ref. 15/01190/OUT). Granted subject to conditions 6th December 2016.

16/01048/FUL

2.25 Variation of condition 42 of permission ref. 15/01190/OUT to alter the timescale for the dismantling of the existing University artificial grass pitch and construction of the proposed new artificial grass pitches at Plock Court/former Bishops College. Pending consideration.

16/01106/REM

2.26 Reserved Matters Planning Application (for approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) relating to the provision of the first 5 metres of access road from Estcourt Close, into Debenhams Field, to serve the proposed student accommodation, with associated fencing and temporary gate, and other associated works, pursuant to outline planning permission ref. 15/01190/OUT. Approved 16th December 2016.

16/01242/FUL

2.27 Variation of Conditions 54, 57 and 59 of permission ref. 15/01190/OUT to allow for the phased provision of car parking and the phased / amended provision of cycle parking relating to the phased implementation of the University business school. Pending consideration.

3.0 PLANNING POLICIES

3.1 The following planning guidance and policies are relevant to the consideration of this application:

Central Government Guidance - National Planning Policy Framework

3.2 This is the latest Government statement of planning policy and is a material consideration that should be given significant weight in determining this application.

Decision-making

The NPPF does not alter the requirement for applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

In assessing and determining applications, Authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

For decision-making, this means:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
- where the development plan is absent, silent, or relevant policies are out of date, granting planning permission unless:
 - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole; or
 - specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

Authorities should look for solutions rather than problems and decision-takers should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

Core planning principles

Planning should:

- Be genuinely plan-led;
- Be a creative exercise in ways to enhance and improve places;
- Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs;
- Secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity;
- Take account of the different roles and character of different areas;
- Support the transition to a low carbon future, take account of flood risk and encourage the use of renewable 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 in a manner appropriate to their significance;
- Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible 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 to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.

The NPPF includes relevant policy on;

Promoting sustainable transport, including the statement that development should only be prevented on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

Requiring good design

Promoting healthy communities

Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Planning obligations and conditions

Planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Planning conditions should only be imposed where they are

- Necessary;
- Relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted;
- Enforceable;
- Precise; and
- Reasonable in all other respects.

The National Planning Practice Guidance has also been published to accompany and in part expand on the National Planning Policy Framework.

For the purposes of making decisions, the NPPF 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 NPPF. In these circumstances due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

The Development Plan

- 3.3 Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 has established that - "The development plan is
- (a) The regional spatial strategy for the region in which the area is situated, and
 - (b) The development plan documents (taken as a whole) which have been adopted or approved in relation to that area.
- If to any extent a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy that is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published (as the case may be). If 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."

Local Plan

- 3.4 The statutory development plan for Gloucester remains the City of Gloucester Local Plan (Adopted 1983 and partially saved until the Local Development Framework is adopted). Under the terms of the NPPF, weight can be given to these policies according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
- 3.5 Subsequent to the 1983 plan there has also been the City of Gloucester (Pre-1991 Boundary Extension) Interim Adoption Copy October 1996), and City of Gloucester First Stage Deposit Local Plan (June 2001).
- 3.6 Regard must also be had to the 2002 Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan. This has been subjected to two comprehensive periods of public and stakeholder consultation and adopted by the Council for development control purposes. This cannot be saved as it is not a formally adopted plan, however with it being adopted for development control purposes it is still judged to be a material consideration.
- 3.7 2002 Plan Policies
- FRP.1a – Flood risk
 - FRP.6 – Surface water run-off
 - FRP.8 – Renewable energy
 - FRP.9 – Light pollution
 - FRP.10 – Noise
 - FRP.11 – Pollution
 - B.7 – Protected species

B.10 – Trees and hedgerows on development sites
 BE.1 – Scale, massing and height
 BE.2 – Views and skyline
 BE.4 – Criteria for the layout, circulation and landscape of new development
 BE.5 – Community safety
 BE.6 – Access for all
 BE.7 – Architectural design
 BE.8 – Energy efficient development
 BE.12 – Landscape schemes
 BE.21 – Safeguarding of amenity
 TR.9 – Parking standard
 TR.10 – Parking provision below the maximum level
 TR.11 – Provision of parking for people with disabilities
 TR.12 – Cycle parking standards
 TR.31 – Road safety
 TR.32 – Protection of cycle/pedestrian routes
 TR.33 – Providing for cyclists/pedestrians
 TR.34 – Cyclist safety
 TR.38 – Public footpaths

Emerging Plan

- 3.8 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.

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

- 3.9 The following policies are of relevance and the plan is subject to representations through the consultation which affects the weight that can be attributed to the policies:

SD1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 SD4 – Sustainable design and construction

SD5 – Design requirements
SD7 – Landscape
SD10 – Biodiversity and geodiversity
SD15 – Health and environmental quality
INF1 – Access to the transport network
INF2 – Safety and efficiency of the transport network
INF3 – Flood risk management
INF4 – Green infrastructure

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 The Highway Authority makes the following comments;

I can confirm that the submitted layout of the site as shown on the proposed site layout plan is generally acceptable and the safety issues raised in the Road Safety Audit have been addressed with the exception of forward visibility along the proposed road leading up to the proposed crossing which has not been shown on the submitted crossing detail drawing. The road safety audit also raised concerns with regard to the approach gradient and drainage of the existing footway/cycle way due to the installation of the raised table at the crossing and lighting as an existing lamp column from the public highway will also be removed to facilitate the works. I do not consider that the gradient, drainage and lighting needs to be dealt with by planning condition as a highway works legal agreement (another legislative process required) will be required to undertake the works to National Cycle Route 41 and the technical specification of the works to the existing footway/cycleway will be required. I consider that the forward visibility safety issue can be addressed by planning condition and can be achieved without significant amendment to the scheme to ensure that no landscaping/trees/boundary features are above the recommended heights referred to in the condition below.

The cycle parking details shows that secure and undercover cycle parking will be provided and is acceptable.

I also refer to the Local Highway Authority response to the variation of conditions application (16/01242/FUL) relating to the provision of parking and consider that an additional condition would be required to deal with the loss of 30 parking spaces as a result of the pedestrian route and access to the proposed business school.

No Highway objection is raised subject to conditions to secure suitable forward visibility splays at the public footpath crossing, and secure provision of 181 parking spaces (* Officer note – this can now be the full 184 spaces).

4.2 The Lead Local Flood Authority raises no objection subject to conditions to secure a detailed design for the surface water drainage and a SuDS maintenance plan. They have confirmed that this recommendation is the same having reviewed the amended plan.

4.3 The Urban Design Officer made the following comments;

The overall design is interesting and modern and will greatly enhance the existing facilities within the university. There are very few impacts on existing surrounding residents and the layout and functioning of the site has been carefully considered. The principal materials have changed throughout the design process and on balance, I feel that a lighter effect is more positive than the darker version we had previously seen.

There are two specific comments on materials which I feel should be considered. I support the use of timber for the interesting window reveals but I would caution that this material will weather in a very uneven pattern over time, particularly given the overhangs involved. I would advise that this material is not left to weather naturally, but treated with either some kind of preservative or painted with a light stain. There are no ideal solutions, given this is a natural material which will alter over time. The only way to remove the issue would be to alter the material, paint the timber or use an alternative timber-effect material.

The other major issue is the use of the silicone resin render system. Over time (within possibly only a few years), there will be issues of staining and discolouration which will subsequently require on-going regular cleaning and maintenance. Given the large expanse of this material proposed, it could be sensible to consider an alternative material, which has the same general effect. One option would be to consider Petrarch reconstituted stone cladding panels. I have a sample of the 011 Parchment Riven Matt material (off-white) in the office which could be suitable (<http://omnisexteriors.com/rainscreen-panels/petrarch/>). The major benefit of this type of system would be its robustness and lack of maintenance requirement. Any staining which do occur could be easily jet washed away. This type of material generally comes in large format panels and is quick to install.

Given the scale of this development, I would recommend the usual condition relating to the submission of the main external materials, prior to approval, including the facing materials of the building and the range of public realm materials.

Finally, the Urban Design Officer raised no objection to the lighting scheme.

4.4 The Environmental Health Officer raises no objection and notes the controls imposed in the outline permission conditions as to construction.

The Officer is also happy with the light spill information as to impacts on amenity.

- 4.5 The Landscape Architect assisted with the initial planting proposals to examine their suitability to provide an attractive landscape buffer and seek to avoid future shading problems to the rear gardens of the adjacent houses, and suggested the applicant consider alternative species.

The Landscape Architect is now happy with the planting proposals and raises no objection.

- 4.6 The Drainage Engineer initially raised several queries around an apparent reduction in the quality of the scheme from the outline stage indicative drawings – on water quality treatment, appearance (i.e. looking engineered not naturalistic), and biodiversity potential.

He requested several improvements but overall on the basis of the revised submission he has no objection overall to the proposals. The main considerations of flood risk, flow rate, attenuation, water treatment and basin design have all been addressed.

- 4.7 The City Archaeologist raises no objection. Archaeological evaluation of this area has identified nothing of significance.

- 4.8 The Neighbourhood Services Manager raises no objection.

- 4.9 The Tree Officer raises no objection.

5.0 PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.1 299 neighbouring properties were notified and press and site notices were published. A further consultation has been held on the amended plans.

- 5.2 8 representations have been received in total:

- Opening up the brook to informal recreation allows fairly easy access to the allotments along the brook;
- The brook is easy to cross;
- The Allotment Association recommended a combination of metal fence screened by thorny hedge as most appropriate. This would provide security and protection to the wildlife along the brook;
- The Allotment Association does not accept the proposed hedge without a fence;
- In the short term it will take time to mature as a barrier, in the long term there is little confidence that the hedge will be given the requisite maintenance to maintain it as an adequate barrier;
- Some years ago the Council determined that a secure boundary was needed along the ash path between Estcourt Road and Plock Court and a metal fence provided. If public access is created within a few yards of the allotments the same level of security is required;
- Request that provision of a metal fence is made a condition of any approval;

- Path at either end of site should be locked when not in use and switching off lighting would be beneficial to ecology;
- Matter of cars entering/leaving the college needs to be addressed before any planning is passed. It will be made worse with proposals of lights, insufficient parking spaces and more students parking off campus in residential streets;
- I see no mention in the proposal for altering the Oxstalls Lane/Cheltenham Road junction. This is a dangerous junction where I have witnessed several accidents. Nothing yet has been done to address the problem. I have serious concerns that the proposals could double the amount of traffic using the junction. Until I hear that Highways will definitely be making this junction safe, either with traffic lights or a roundabout, I will object to any further extension plans;

2 comments in the reconsultation on revised plans:

- Disappointed at decision to build car park behind Oxstalls Way;
- Can spoil from removed bund be relocated to rear of Oxstalls Way up to a height of 2m (saving transport costs mitigating impact from headlights, car doors, radios, alarms);
- Service road crossing public footpath is accident waiting to happen;
- Querying the proposals relating to vehicular access to and from the site and traffic flow proposals generally on the public roads in the vicinity;

5.3 The full content of all correspondence on this application can be inspected at Herbert Warehouse, The Docks, Gloucester, prior to the Committee meeting.

<http://planningdocs.gloucester.gov.uk/default.aspx?custref=16/01241/REM>

6.0 OFFICER OPINION

6.1 It is considered that the main issues with regards to this application are as follows:

- Design and landscaping
- Traffic and transport
- Residential amenity
- Drainage

6.2 The principle has already been agreed and the layout follows the broad principles of the indicative masterplan. A s73 application (ref. 16/01242/FUL) was submitted concurrently with the reserved matters application seeking to allow for the phased provision of car parking and the phased and reduced provision of cycle parking relating to the phased implementation of the University business school.

Design and landscaping

6.3 The location of the site and the extension of the University complex in my view gives the architect some scope to design an interesting modern building. Notably, the design includes a focal point to draw attention to the main access

viewed from the south, with an oversailing second floor as a distinct 'framed' feature providing a covered entrance area. The main part of the building is envisaged with a white render cladding, with the projecting sections as polished mirrored metal, and broken up with deep window reveals. The window reveals would be in a timber cladding that would also be used sporadically at ground floor.

- 6.4 The Urban Design Officer raised several issues around materials. The architect has responded to these noting that the materials have good anticipated design lives when installed appropriately and a maintenance regime is adhered to – which has been discussed with the University and prepared. Access to all parts of the building has been allowed for in this respect. They have also sought to detail the building to limit deterioration from staining, discolouration and weathering.
- 6.5 The building design proposed is considered to be of good quality and while there may be further discussion about the final specification of the material and dealing with weathering of the surfaces, it is acceptable in Officers' view and this detail can be managed by condition. The scheme delivers several tangible urban design benefits to the area in opening out the surroundings of the public footpath, removing the existing fencing and providing natural surveillance.
- 6.6 Phase 2 of the business school may come forward in future as a further reserved matters application, but it is envisaged as a block of comparable proportions with a link corridor off the north side of the Phase 1 block. Officers support the early consideration to delivery of Phase 2 at a masterplanning level and do not envisage any major issues in this respect.
- 6.7 The provision of new planting is generally considered acceptable. Two specific areas merit further consideration. The proposed planting to the eastern boundary has been subject to detailed scrutiny given its value in screening the car park and its proximity to the neighbouring residential properties. This is discussed further in the 'residential amenity' part of the assessment below, but in general design/landscaping terms it should enhance the appearance of this boundary. Secondly, most of the existing bund and its planting are to be retained. Again this has merits in screening the building from views from residential properties. In general design/landscaping terms this is desirable to maintain the existing tree cover and its associated benefits in greening the area. The tree removal associated with the proposals is acceptable to the Tree Officer.
- 6.8 A bridge crossing the brook between the northern part of the business school area off the circulatory footpath and into Plock Court, was shown in the original drawings. It has now been removed. It would provide benefits to circulation within the area and I believe the University is still considering making this proposal separately in the future. Although it would be beneficial I do not consider it mandatory to include in this application.

- 6.9 The boundary to the allotments has been commented on in several representations. Details of security measures along this boundary are required by the outline permission. The University has agreed to include a post and wire fence within the 'boundary' hedge to the brook. In Officers' view this is sufficient to maintain a reasonable level of security and is not a reason to withhold reserved matters approval.
- 6.10 Subject to conditions, the proposals are considered to comply with the above cited policy context in terms of design and landscaping and no objection is raised in these respects.

Traffic and transport

- 6.11 The means of access and scale of the development were agreed at outline stage. At this reserved matters stage the Authority is considering layout and how this might impact on traffic/highways considerations. The broad highways arrangements remain as indicated in the outline application – access onto the main existing campus from Oxstalls Lane would facilitate access up to the northern part of the campus. From here a new crossing over the public right of way would facilitate access into the new car park along the eastern part of the site.

Parking provision

- 6.12 The proposed car park provides for 184 spaces including 9 spaces for disabled persons. There is also provision of covered shelters and hoops for 80 bicycles, plus 5 lockable cycle lockers.

The additional loss of car parking

- 6.13 The proposal would lead to a loss of existing car parking where the access road meets the public footpath, where the car park south of the footpath is proposed to be altered. This would result in a loss of 30 existing spaces. The applicant's proposal is that this shortfall can be made up by increasing parking elsewhere by 30 spaces. This is theoretically manageable under conditions of the outline planning permission and there is a separate pending application ref. 16/01242/FUL to vary the parking condition so that phased provision of car parking alongside phased provision of the business school building is delivered. Officers asked however, for an indication of how this could be achieved so that there is comfort that there is a deliverable option to provide replacement parking given the somewhat constrained site. Indicative drawings provided show several locations for replacement parking by extending the overspill car park area at the south of the campus, extending the proposed car park rear of the existing student halls and extending the proposed business school car park. These options would all require detailed assessment if and when they are proposed, nevertheless I consider it is sufficient to give comfort that the quantum of additional replacement car park is broadly achievable.
- 6.14 The key in this regard is that the outline conditions continue to require an overall level of parking. The issue is also being addressed under the associated planning application seeking to vary the car parking provision conditions. In relation to the current reserved matters application, because it is this detailed layout that leads to the loss of the 30 existing spaces and it could

be the case that only this first phase of the business school is ever implemented, I consider the car parking loss needs to be made up by provision at this reserved matters stage. The submitted plans now show 184 car parking spaces. This is based on a pro-rata provision of parking for phase 1 of the business school at 154 spaces plus the 30 spaces lost. As such, the proposals show that the required parking provision and making up the shortfall can both be achieved, and I recommend that a condition is imposed on the reserved matters approval requiring provision of all 184 spaces before occupation.

- 6.15 Whether or not the associated variation of condition application is granted, there is no conflict between this reserved matters application and the outline permission. The conditions prevent occupation of the business school until sufficient provision is made. This reserved matters application does not inhibit that mechanism.

The vehicular crossing at the public right of way

- 6.16 As indicated at outline stage the design provides for a vehicular access crossing the public right of way. The basic principle of this is accepted. The issue now is assessment of the detail in terms of safety. The Highway Authority requested a road safety audit. This has been done and the Highway Authority is satisfied with the recommendations made, which are;

Suitable visibility splays for drivers on the approach to the crossing and railings to be positioned outside the visibility splay;

Forward visibility of 25m to be provided for drivers on the car parking access road approach to the crossing;

Appropriate road markings and signage provided to ensure that drivers are aware that they are required to give way to cyclists;

Raised table crossing to be surfaced in a contrast colour paving, and provision of cycle symbol road markings;

Preferred maximum gradient of 3% along the shared route with an absolute maximum of 5%;

The 'potential barrier control' to be removed or relocated to avoid conflict with the give way at the crossing, and avoid the potential for unnecessary reversing manoeuvres;

Swept path analysis to be undertaken for large vehicles and the road widened if necessary to avoid a large vehicle encroaching into the opposing traffic lane;

Adequate street lighting to be provided on the approaches to the crossing and crossing itself;

Adequate surface water drainage provided to ensure there is no ponding;

The Highway Authority is satisfied with the details included in the proposals with the exception of the visibility on the approach – therefore a condition is proposed to secure this.

- 6.17 On other highways matters raised in representations, the outline planning permission requires the adapted Cheltenham Road/Oxstalls Lane junction to be implemented before occupation of the business school. There are no

proposals to alter this and the University will still need to comply. Impact of the development in principle, including traffic flows and impact on the highway network, as raised in one representation, has already been agreed. In addition to the requirement to construct the new junction, other outline conditions include requirements to undertake surveys at certain points to establish on street parking demand generated by the development and if blocked or congested streets are identified, put forward a scheme of mitigation, and submission of a Construction Method Statement for approval prior to commencing development, including site operatives parking, construction routing, etc.

- 6.18 Subject to conditions the proposal is considered to comply with the above policy context in terms of highway safety and no objection is raised in this regard.

Residential amenity

- 6.19 The nearest residential properties are those immediately bordering the site to the north and east at Oxstalls Way, Glevum Close and Laura Close. To the east, the business school building would be approximately 65m from the nearest property boundaries and around 70m to the nearest residential building. To the north the business school building would be around 160m away from the nearest property boundaries. In terms of the business school car park there would be a separation on at least 10m between the car park and the neighbouring property boundaries.

- 6.20 The building is proposed between 12 and 12.7m in height over 3 storeys with the areas of enclosed plant taking the maximum height to 14.7m. As a comparison the existing floodlights are 16m high I am advised. The existing bund and tree planting provides a substantial screen. It is proposed that this bund is partially removed in two sections – in each instance a width of about 35m is to be taken out, with the slope cut back to a 1:3 gradient maximum. New planting is proposed on the newly-exposed slopes. The practical effect of this would be that the removed area at the south would expose the front part of the proposed business school somewhat in views from the east. However at the proposed scale and the separation of around 70m to the boundaries here, this is not harmful in my view. The other removed section mid way up the bund, is unlikely to expose views of this first phase of the proposed business school to any great degree other than for residents around 75m away. It would expose views of the proposed plot for Phase 2. While there is no certainty over the precise height, massing and siting of this Phase 2 building, the agreed outline principles, the current Phase 1 scheme, the arrangement and treatment of the opening of the bund and the separation distances involve lead me to conclude that it is unlikely that this new opening would create any significant impacts on amenity for residents in line with the opening when Phase 2 is brought forward. Overall the proposed building and works to the bund would not cause any significant harm to the amenities enjoyed by residents of properties on the locality.

- 6.21 As noted the car park is proposed to be sited around 10m off the boundary with the neighbouring residential properties with a landscaped area between

as required by the outline permission. There is an existing band of trees along this boundary and additional tree planting is proposed here in the form of individual trees and a continuing strip of shrubs and trees closer to the boundary. I have sought the advice of the Landscape Architect on this and some tweaks were made to the planting proposals in response to this advice. It is now considered that the proposals strike the right balance creating a landscaped buffer to mitigate the visual impacts of the car park beyond the end of residential gardens, while also avoiding planting that might dominate those gardens.

- 6.22 The outline permission obliges the developer to implement these measures in full in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development whichever is sooner, and maintain them for the duration of the use.
- 6.23 Details of the car park lighting have also been provided. This shows an arrangement of lighting fixtures through the car park on 6m columns and with 0° inclination. There is no objection from the Urban Design or Environmental Health Officers to the lighting proposals. I recommend that the specification is secured by condition. The plan demonstrates that the light spill reduces down to at maximum 1lux at the site perimeter. It is shown at around 0.1 to 0.6 lux at the end few metres of residential gardens and at 0.1 or 0 lux at the properties themselves. I am currently in discussions with the applicant about whether a limitation can be agreed on the timing of use of the car park lighting. This might for example require the lights to be off between 10pm and 7am and otherwise to be operated on a photocell type system where they only operate during hours of darkness, although I understand that the library is open 24/7 and there would be a safety issue with lights being switched off. I will update Members at the meeting.
- 6.24 There is no objection from the Environmental Health Officer to the scheme overall and in the proposed arrangement it is not considered that the comings and goings at the car park would cause significant harm to the amenities of local residents. The broad principles of this arrangement were considered acceptable at outline stage.
- 6.25 One representation refers to the impact of the car park and a suggestion of creating a new bund rear of Oxstalls Way. This could have the effect of providing a solid screen to neighbours. However it is questionable whether such a bund would be viewed favourably by all residents and fundamentally it is not part of the submitted application. For the reasons set out above I consider that the impact of the submitted scheme on residential amenities is acceptable, and the suggested works are not necessary to make the development acceptable.
- 6.26 The proposal is considered to comply with the above policy context in terms of amenity and no objection is raised in this regard.

Drainage

- 6.27 The principle of development in respect of flood risk is accepted already subject to certain conditions. Condition 32 of the outline permission requires details of the drainage system.
- 6.28 Part of the system is an attenuation basin that is included in the reserved matters plans. The arrangement has been amended to move away from a rather rudimentary engineered option to a more naturalistic, planted design. Officers are grateful for the improvements and are now satisfied with this aspect. The technical merits of the system would be assessed in detail pursuant to the outline condition but the Drainage Engineer is content that a workable system can be designed in this layout arrangement and raises no objection.
- 6.29 The proposal is considered to comply with the above policy context in terms of drainage and no objection is raised in this regard.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 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.
- 7.2 The scheme complies with the outline permission whether the associated s73 application is granted or not, and subject to several further conditions to secure/ensure specific details it is considered acceptable in terms of design, highways impact, residential amenity and drainage, and raises no new concerns that are not already assessed in and/or addressed by conditions of the outline permission. The proposal would comply with the above Policy context subject to these conditions.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MANAGER

- 8.1 That reserved matters approval is given subject to the following conditions:

Condition

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the plans referenced;

Proposed site layout ref. UoG ASL 00 00 DR A 0003 received by the Local Planning Authority on 25th January 2017

Level 00 Plan ref. OX ASL 00 00 DR A 0100 Rev. B received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th October 2016

Level 01 Plan ref. OX ASL 00 01 DR A 0101 Rev. B received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th October 2016

Level 02 Plan ref. OX ASL 00 02 DR A 0102 Rev. B received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th October 2016

Roof Plan ref. OX ASL 00 03 DR A 0103 Rev. C received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th October 2016

Elevation ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR A 0130 received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th October 2016

Elevation ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR A 0131 received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th October 2016

External works general arrangement: materials and finishes ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR L 0001 Rev. E received by the Local Planning Authority on 9th January 2017

External works general arrangement: materials and finishes ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR L 0002 Rev. E received by the Local Planning Authority on 9th January 2017

External works planting plan (sheet 1) ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR L 0003 Rev. D received by the Local Planning Authority on 9th January 2017

External works planting plan (sheet 2) ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR L 0004 Rev. D received by the Local Planning Authority on 9th January 2017

External works planting schedule ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR L 0005 Rev. C received by the Local Planning Authority on 9th January 2017

External works typical sections sheet 1 ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR L 0006 Rev. C received by the Local Planning Authority on 9th January 2017

External works typical sections sheet 2 ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR L 0007 Rev. B received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th October 2016

External works cycle parking ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR L 0008 Rev. B received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th October 2016

External works pedestrian route through main car park ref. OX ASL 00 XX DR L 0009 Rev. B received by the Local Planning Authority on 25th January 2017

Crossing detail ref. UOG-ARP-00-XX-DR-C-1500 Issue 01 received by the Local Planning Authority on 5th October 2016

except where otherwise required by conditions of this approval.

Reason

To ensure the works are carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

AMENITY

Condition

Lighting proposals to the car park shall be implemented in accordance with that shown on plan ref. D11-10749 Rev. C received by the Local Planning Authority on 19th January 2017 unless an alternative specification is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any such further submission shall include a light spill plan and fixture specification as per the above referenced plan.

Reason

To safeguard the amenities of the area in accordance with Policies FRP.9, FRP.10, FRP.11 and BE.21 of the 2002 City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan, Policy SD15 of the Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document 2014 and Paragraphs 17, 109, 120 and 123 of the NPPF.

Condition

A condition if it can be agreed with the applicant to limit the times of operation of the car park lighting.

DESIGN

Condition

The 1.2m high timber post and wire fence at the western part of the site parallel to the brook (the 'allotments boundary') shall be implemented in its entirety prior to the occupation of the business school or to an alternative timetable that has been agreed to in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of security of the locality and designing out crime in accordance with Paragraphs 17 and 58 of the NPPF, Policy SD5 of the Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document 2014 and BE.5 of the 2002 City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan.

DRAINAGE

Condition

No building shall be occupied until a SuDS maintenance plan for all SuDS/attenuation features and associated pipework has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved SuDS maintenance plan shall be implemented in full in accordance with the agreed terms and conditions and shall operate for the lifetime of the development.

Reason

To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage as well as to reduce the risk of creating or exacerbating a flooding problem and to minimise the risk of pollution, in accordance with Policies

FRP.1a, FRP.6, FRP.11 of the City of Gloucester Second Deposit Local Plan 2002 Policy INF3 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy Submission Version 2014 and Paragraph 103 of the NPPF.

HIGHWAYS

Condition

Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted plans, prior to the proposed access road crossing National Cycle Route 41 being brought into use forward visibility splays extending from a point 2.4m back along the centre of the cycle route on the eastern side measured from the edge of National Cycle Route 41 where it joins the new access road crossing (the X point) to the centre of approaching traffic lane along the road serving the car park for 25m distant to the north (the Y points) shall be provided. The area between those splays and the carriageway shall be kept clear of any obstruction and thereafter maintained so as to provide clear visibility between 1.05m and 2.0m at the X point and between 0.26m and 2.0m at the Y point above the adjacent carriageway level.

Reason

To reduce potential highway impact by ensuring that adequate visibility is provided and maintained and to ensure that a safe, suitable and secure means of access for all people that minimises the conflict between traffic and cyclists and pedestrians is provided in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition

Phase 1 of the business school building hereby approved shall not be occupied until space has been laid out within the site for a minimum of an additional 184 cars (including disabled spaces) to be parked within that phase.

Reason

To reduce potential highway impact by ensuring that vehicles do not have to reverse to or from the public highway and to ensure that a safe, suitable and secure means of access for all people that minimises the conflict between traffic and cyclists and pedestrians is provided in accordance with Paragraphs 32 and 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework and re-provide 30 existing car parking spaces removed as a result of the approved layout.

NOTE

It is recommended that the applicant investigates maintenance of the watercourse that runs adjacent to the north boundary of the site into the Wotton Brook and any responsibilities for it.

Decision:

Notes:

.....

.....

Person to contact: Adam Smith
(Tel: 396702)

16/01241/REM

**University Of Gloucestershire
Oxstalls Lane
Gloucester
GL2 9HW**

Planning Committee 07.02.2017

