



## **PLANNING POLICY SUB COMMITTEE**

**MEETING** : Thursday, 17th November 2016

**PRESENT** : Cllrs. Taylor (Chair), D. Brown and Dee

### **Officers**

Anthony Wilson, Head of Planning  
Philip Bylo, Interim Planning Policy Manager  
Adam Gooch, Senior Planning Officer  
Tony Wisdom, Democratic Services Officer

**APOLOGIES** : Cllrs. Lewis and Lugg

### **8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Adam Gooch declared a non-pecuniary interest as a relative of his was advising residents in SA13 on property matters.

### **9. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Mr Nick Hartshorn of Brooklyn Villas asked, that after 18 years of living at land east of Waterwells, if he could be told why his property had been excluded from the City Plan and both his and his neighbours' properties, gardens and private drive were proposed to be subject to a protection order. The land had been allocated for employment purposes and he had been told that the land was unallocated in the draft City Plan.

The Head of Planning replied stating that the City Plan was a draft for consultation and the previous 2002 plan had not been fully adopted. The employment allocation on this site had never been implemented and the draft City Plan allocates land either side of the residential properties for residential use.

He stated that where residential development existed land was not generally specifically allocated.

He explained that the heritage issues raised were part of a range of issues that the Local Planning Authority was required by government to consider. It was one constraint but would not in itself preclude development if the benefits of a scheme outweighed those considerations. In this case the heritage asset involved was a medieval strip field pattern.

**PLANNING POLICY SUB COMMITTEE**  
**17.11.16**

He advised that the City Plan consultation included a 'call for sites' and the land could be put forward as part of this call.

Mr Hartshorn believed that the draft City Plan would not move matters forward as he had been told in the past that a comprehensive scheme was required.

The Head of Planning advised that land to the south was within Stroud District and the plan could not put forward sites outside the City boundaries. The City Council was in discussion with Stroud District Council as there was a legal duty to co-operate with neighbouring authorities. Gloucester could not meet its housing needs from within its own boundaries and would have to rely on neighbouring authorities to meet those needs in the future.

He stated that the City Plan did not preclude development of that land which was an issue that could be addressed in the future. He noted that the removal of the employment allocation and the adjacent allocations for residential use would result in a better use and environment for Mr Hartshorn and his neighbours.

**10. PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS**

There were no petitions or deputations.

**11. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2016 were confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**12. DRAFT GLOUCESTER CITY PLAN - PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

The Interim Planning Policy Manager introduced the report which invited the Sub-Committee to recommend to Council that the Draft City Plan be approved for the purposes of a six week period of public consultation.

He advised that the first full draft of the emerging City Plan was appended to the report and the emerging City Plan had been the subject of three previous consultations.

He noted that references to the strategic allocation at Twigworth would be removed prior to consideration by Council on 1 December as the allocation had not been agreed by Tewkesbury Borough Council.

The Chair referred to Policy D8, Community Facilities and noted that the wording was misleading as it did not make clear that points 1,2 and 3 were requirements and point 4 was an alternative to those points. The Head of Planning undertook to address the issue.

Councillor Dee was disappointed by the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council not to accept the Twigworth strategic allocation and stated that he had very little confidence in going ahead with further joint planning. He stated that if the authorities did not work in harmony for the next phase there was a risk that the City would run out of developable land and would become a mere bystander.

**PLANNING POLICY SUB COMMITTEE**  
**17.11.16**

The Head of Planning noted that there would be potentially five or more partner authorities for the next phase of strategic planning. He believed that the timescale for the JCS would be extended following Tewkesbury Borough Council's refusal to accept Twigworth and the Ministry of Defence's revised plans for withdrawing from Aschurch. He noted that there was a risk of the Inspector finding the JCS unsound due to the lack of a land supply.

The Chair asked what would be the impact on the City Plan should the JCS process stall. The Head of Planning advised that consultations on the City Plan could continue.

Councillor Dee expressed concerns regarding development to the south of the City as transport and road systems were inadequate.

He noted that the JCS situation should not in any way reflect on the Officers involved. He believed that the City Council had given more than its fair share to keep the JCS moving.

He called for some formal recognition from the Government that the City had no current development plan through no fault of its own and needed to be protected from marauding developers.

The Head of Planning noted that should the JCS stall, applications would still come forward for the strategic allocation sites.

**RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND to Council to**

- (1) approve the Draft Gloucester City Plan for the purposes of a six-week period of public consultation (Appendix 1).
- (2) note the representations made to the City Plan Part 1 during the public consultation period (Appendix 2); and
- (3) endorse the resulting officer responses set out within the response schedule (Appendix 2).
- (4) delegate authority to the Managing Director of the Council in consultation with the relevant Leaders of the Council to make minor changes to the draft City Plan and Proposals Map in terms of formatting, presentation and accuracy, including any minor changes following the considerations at Planning Policy Sub-committee and Council, prior to publication for public consultation purposes.

**13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Thursday, 16 March 2017 at 6.00 pm.

**PLANNING POLICY SUB COMMITTEE  
17.11.16**

**Time of commencement: 6.00 pm  
Time of conclusion: 6.30 pm**

**Chair**