

GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL

COMMITTEE : **PLANNING**

DATE : **4 APRIL 2017**

ADDRESS/LOCATION : **ALLSTONE SAND AND GRAVEL, MYERS ROAD, GLOUCESTER**

APPLICATION NO. & WARD : **16/00948/OUT ELMBRIDGE**

APPLICANT : **SIMON FORD**

PROPOSAL : **Outline application for housing and student accommodation; car parking, road, footpath and drainage infrastructure; ground works; provision of open space and landscaping; and demolition of existing buildings and structures. (All matters reserved)**

REPORT BY : **RON MOSS**

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

1 SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application site lies to the east of the city and is 5.5 ha in area. There are a mix of uses in the area. To the north of the site are residential dwellings and the recreation ground Armscroft Park, while to the south the site is immediately bordered by the Gloucester to Birmingham railway line, with an element of vacant land, a Mercedes show room, Costa coffee shop and drive thru and Morrisons supermarket with petrol filling station lying just beyond. This area of land is known as the railway triangle as it is bordered on three sides by the railway line and the above mentioned uses are part of the regeneration of the area. Further south is then Metz way which is an elevated road section at this point.

- 1.2 To the east of the application site there is an area of trees and Wotton Brook, along with more residential development. At this point the ground drops down to the brook. Then to the west the site tapers to the point where it meets Horton Road, in close proximity to the level crossing here. The site

would encompass part of the car park of the Irish social club, which is a three storey building that borders the site to the west.

- 1.3 The site was originally used in conjunction with the railways, but now contains a number of commercial and industrial uses, including waste recycling and transfer, skip storage and hire, aggregate storage, a concrete batching plant and coal merchants. The main structures on the site are large blue steel framed building on the eastern half of the site used for processing waste and transfer, and the concrete batching plant itself. Towards the western end of the site there are large piles of aggregate. In terms of gradient, the site is predominantly level, but rises in the northwest corner where it takes access from Myers Road and falls to the east towards Wotton Brook.
- 1.4 In terms of the development itself the application proposes the demolition of all the structures on the site and an outline residential application for up to 200 dwellings and 200 units of student accommodation with all matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved. It further proposes car parking, an internal road, footpath and drainage infrastructure, groundworks, the provision of 0.76ha of open space and landscaping.
- 1.5 The application is accompanied by an illustrative master plan that indicates how the site could be developed. The housing is shown in the middle and eastern sections of the site, being predominantly two and three storey dwellings and small apartment blocks. Then to the west of the site would be the student accommodation in blocks up to 5 storeys in height. In the very far east section the currently wooded area would remain as such, while an area of public open space would also be set out here, just to the south.. A landscape strip is proposed next to the southern boundary with the railway line.
- 1.6 The development is shown to gain access from Myers road at the same point as the site currently gains access. Routes are then shown running eastwards and southwards from this access point. The plan also shows provision for a footpath/cycle route linking from Horton Road and crossing the site just to the north of the southern landscape corridor to link with Blinkhorns Bridge Lane to the east. It would link to Armscroft Park via a shared surface element. An emergency vehicle access point is shown to the north next to Gloucester Old Boys Rugby club.
- 1.7 An Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion was also undertaken and your officer confirms that an Environmental Statement was not required.
- 1.8 The application is referred to the Planning Committee due to the scale of the proposed development.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.1 The site has a large history of commercial and industrial uses since 1968

when planning permission was granted for the change of use from locomotive sheds to a distribution depot.

2.2 In 1997 planning permission was granted for the erection of a two storey workshop with ancillary offices, the installation of weighbridge and aggregate bays, construction of a parking area, landscaping and planting works, demolition of a storage building and open store.

2.3 In March 2011 planning permission was granted for use of part of the site to provide a facility for crushing and screening of inert waste materials to provide secondary aggregates for a temporary 18 month period. A couple of further time limited extensions to this permission have been approved.

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

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.

3.2 The NPPF sets out the following 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 further 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.

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

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

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.

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).

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 it has been adopted for development control purposes.

2002 Plan Policies

- H4 – Housing Proposals on Unallocated Sites
- H7 – Housing Density and Layout
- H8 – Housing Mix
- H11 – Improving Residential Environments
- H15 – Provision of Affordable Housing
- B.7 – Protected species
- B.10 – Trees and hedgerows on development sites
- FRP.1a – Development and flood risk
- FRP.3 – Obstacles in the flood plain
- FRP.5 – Maintenance of water courses
- FRP.6 – Surface water runoff
- FRP.9 – Light pollution
- FRP.10 – Noise
- FRP.11 – Pollution
- FRP.15 – Contaminated land
- BE.1 – Scale, massing and height

BE.2 – Views and skyline
 BE.4 – Criteria of the layout, circulation and landscape of new development
 BE.5 – Community safety
 BE.6 – Access for all
 BE.7 – Architectural design
 BE.12 – Landscape schemes
 BE.15 – Provision of Open Space in Major Development
 BE.21 – Safeguarding of amenity
 BE.31 – Preserving sites of archaeological interest
 BE.32 – Archaeological assessment
 BE.33 – Archaeological field evaluation
 BE.34 – Presumption in favour of preserving archaeology
 BE.36 – Preservation in situ
 BE.37 – Recording and preserving archaeology
 TR.1 – Travel plans and planning applications
 TR.2 – Travel plans – planning obligations
 TR.9 – Parking standards
 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 – Provision for cyclists/pedestrians
 TR.34 – Cyclist safety
 OS.2 – Public Open Space
 OS.3 – New Housing and Public Open Space
 OS.5 – Maintenance Payments for Public Open Space
 A.1 – New Housing and Allotments

3.3 Emerging Plans

On adoption, the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy and Gloucester City Plan 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

Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (Main Modifications Version, February 2017)

The Council has prepared a Joint Core Strategy with Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Borough Councils (JCS) which was submitted for examination on 20 November 2014. The Inspector published her Interim Findings in May 2016 and the JCS authorities have now approved Main Modifications to the plan for consultation. Consultation took place in February/March 2017 and further examination hearings are expected to take place June/July 2017.

The JCS has therefore reached a further advanced stage, but it is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area and the weight that can be attached to each of its policies will be subject to the criteria set out above, including the extent to which there are unresolved objections.

- 3.4 The following policies in the JCS are of relevance and the plan is subject to representations through the consultation which affects the weight that can be attributed to the policy;

SD1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development

SD5 – Design requirements

SD12 – Housing Mix and Standards

SD13 – Affordable Housing

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

INF5 – Social and Community Infrastructure

INF7 – Infrastructure Delivery; and

INF8 – Developer Contributions

- 3.5 The Draft Gloucester City Plan and 'call for sites' was subject to consultation in January and February 2017. The plan is at a very early stage and therefore carries limited weight.

It does however now show the site allocated for housing in the proposed land allocations.

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/.

- 3.6 Gloucestershire Waste Core Strategy
The Waste Core Strategy was adopted in November 2012 and forms part of the local development plan for Gloucester. It explains how the County Council and its partners will address the issue of planning for waste management in Gloucestershire for the period 2012 to 2027. It provides a policy framework to guide decisions on planning applications for waste management developments. Policy WCS11 is the relevant policy for this application in that it seeks to safeguard sites for waste management to maintain capacity across the County.

4.0 HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

- 4.1 The NPPF states at paragraph 47 that Local Planning Authorities should make

provisions to “boost significantly the supply of housing”. The NPPF further states at paragraph 49 that “housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development”.

- 4.2 The NPPF requires that local authorities should be able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land plus a buffer. For Gloucester, the buffer is 5% because of its past record of housing delivery (local authorities with persistent under delivery are required to provide a 20% buffer).
- 4.3 Gloucester City Council currently do not have a 5 year housing land supply but will do when the JCS is adopted. Gloucester city is actively working on two plans that together will provide the city with a healthy housing land supply. Gloucester city is working on a Joint Core Strategy (JCS) with Cheltenham and Tewkesbury which is at the Main Modifications consultation stage of the Examination. The JCS includes the release of Green Belt land surrounding Gloucester (in Tewkesbury district) which would be for the housing needs of Gloucester, and when the JCS is adopted Gloucester will have an estimated five year housing land supply of 5.8 years. .This five year supply calculation involves an assumption about land that is expected to come forward for development within the Gloucester urban area, and in this regard Gloucester city is also progressing the new city plan which is currently at draft plan stage, and was the subject of a public consultation which ended on 27 February 2017. The examination for the city plan and its eventual adoption will follow on from the adoption of the JCS, which provides the strategic policy and spatial context for the city plan.
- 4.4 In practice then, the City has a route to ensuring its 5 year supply but it is not formally in place yet. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF sets out that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Highway Authority Original comments

The Highway Authority states the following:-

a) Access

It is recognised that access is no longer a matter for consideration and forms a reserved matter. However the main access point is shown from Myers Road and will be taken from this point. There is restricted visibility for pedestrians looking to cross the rugby club access road here and they would have difficulty seeing traffic emerging from the rugby club.

The pedestrian/cycle access points proposed in principle in to Armscroft Park and Blinkhorns Bridge Lane need to have regard to the significant level changes. It is possible to achieve in engineering terms, but may need significant space.

b) Accessibility

There are a number of bus routes within close proximity. Horton road is served by bus services 6 and 33, while a 1km walk on to London Road would allow access to routes 94 and 10. Travel by public transport is a realistic option for future residents.

c) Development Traffic Impact

While the Transport Assessment has used the standard Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) to estimate likely vehicle movement, the assessment does not fully take account of the student parking, nor the traffic from existing uses on the site. Neither has it demonstrated clearly how the new vehicle movements have been distributed and assigned to the local highway network.

d) Parking

The impact of the student parking on the surrounding area has not been clearly shown, while no information has been provided as to the impact on the loss of the car park currently used by the Irish club.

In conclusion it is considered that insufficient information has been provided and that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal is currently acceptable in highway terms.

Revised Comments awaited

5.2 Drainage Engineer

Original Comments

The site is located in flood zone 1, so there is no concern about fluvial flood risk, while the surface water flood maps do not show any concerns.

The Wootton Brook however is already at a high risk of flooding and has no spare capacity. Any increase in flows to the brook would result in an increase in flood risk to nearby properties, which have flooded in the past. Any increase in flood risk would not be acceptable.

The application needs to show the existence of an existing connection to Wotton Brook, and if there is a connection, a plan showing the drained area.

There should be above ground Suds attenuation features on a proposal of this scale.

In terms of mitigating flood risk from Wotton Brook, one improvement the proposal could achieve would be to remove the large masonry structures, which encourage debris to block the brook.

Overall concern that development would increase flood risk to neighbouring properties.

Revised Comments

The applicant has confirmed the following :-

All the existing drainage would be removed and a new system put in place.

The piped concrete bridge over the brook could be removed from the site

Unfortunately over ground Suds drainage features are best positioned in low lying areas of a site as they rely on gravity. The low lying areas of this

site are sterilised by strict Network Rail conditions, therefore scheme would propose underground storage rather than over ground.

The re-development of the site from waste transfer to residential scheme designed in line with the latest industry standards would automatically provide a betterment to the existing conditions.

In light of the above and submission of a revised drainage strategy, the Drainage Engineer confirms they have no objections, subject to conditions requiring the full detailed design of the sustainable water drainage strategy, the removal of the pipe bridge and buttresses and a scheme for maintenance of all SUDS attenuation features.

5.3 Local Lead Flood Authority

Original Comments

The proposed development site is situated within flood zone 1 and there are no known reports of surface water flooding on the site.

The applicants Flood Risk Assessment assumes that at present the majority of the existing site drains in to Wotton Brook and the applicant proposes to maintain this existing drainage regime.

The LLFA object to the proposal as there is insufficient information in the FRA to show that the drainage assumptions are correct. There is a recent history of property flooding associated with the Wotton Brook and the LLFA was concerned that the current proposals for drainage water would increase the flood risk.

Revised comments

The revised Flood Risk Assessment provides sufficient information for the LLFA to rescind its previous objection to the application and to agree the proposed discharge rate of 7.3l/s to the Wotton Brook for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year storm (including 40% climate change).

Therefore there is no objection subject to conditions requiring a fully detailed drainage strategy and Suds maintenance plan.

5.4 Environmental Protection

Noise

It is clear that noise from both Metz Way and the railway line bounding the site would have a significant impact on the proposed development. Any property near the southern boundary would be particularly affected.

Vibration

The current vibration exposure within the southern part of the site exceeds guidance levels, however it is accepted that appropriately designed mitigation measures would enable vibration exposure to be controlled across the site.

Development is acceptable in principle, but considerable more work needs to be undertaken in the form of detailed survey work to get to the point where there could be said to be a satisfactory environment for the future residential occupiers.

The proposal is considered acceptable subject to the following conditions:-

- a) The submission of an additional noise report to show how an actual proposed layout would be protected from high levels of external noise.

- b) No construction traffic parking on Myers road
 - c) An Environmental Management system
 - d) Air quality control - no creation of a street canyon, designing the dwellings for minimum exposure to pollution , provision of an electric vehicle charging point and NOx emission levels for gas fired boilers.
 - e) External lighting
 - f) Refuse storage and recycling
 - g) Operational management plan for student accommodation
 - h) An additional vibration survey
- Also to add an informative on any approval that crushers and screens to be used on the site should be accompanied by a permit to operate.

5.5 Worcestershire Regulatory Services

The submitted Desk study report states the contamination risk for a residential development as medium to high risk and recommends that a Phase 2 site wide intrusive ground investigation is carried out given the sites current and previous uses. The report states that the investigation should include reviewing the underlying ground and ground water conditions, the depth and extent of made ground and superficial deposits, the presence or absence of contamination within shallow subsoils and groundwater, and to monitor gas and groundwater to confirm the current ground gas regime.

Worcestershire Regulatory Services recommend that the standard suite of contaminated land investigation and mitigation conditions be attached to any approval.

5.6 Environment Agency

The application site is located in Flood Zone 1 and the EA refer the local authority to their Flood Risk standing advice.

They also require a condition on any approval stating that there should be no new structures (including gates, walls and fences) or raising ground levels within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the Wotton Brook inside or along the boundary of the site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

It is further stated that the previous use of the site may give rise to land contamination and comments from Environmental Protection should be sought.

5.7 Archaeology

It is accepted that it is not possible for the applicant to undertake an archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) in advance of determination. The site however has the potential to contain significant heritage assets of archaeological interest, most especially human burials of Roman date. Any ground works associated with this proposed development have the potential to damage or destroy any archaeological remains that might be present.

A condition requiring a programme for archaeological mitigation is recommended on any approval.

5.8 Gloucestershire County Council

The above scheme is likely to give rise to community infrastructure requirements including library contributions and contributions towards pre-school, primary and secondary schools. It is not possible to give absolute figures here as the application is only in outline, however if the reserved matters come in as the indicative layout of 120 houses and 80 apartments then the following amounts would be required.

Pre- school places - £152,349 – 11.53 places

Primary school places - £472,833 – 35.79 places

Secondary school places - £417,920 – 20.74 places

Libraries - £39,200

The number of places required is net of the total yield – not all children moving into the development will require a school place at the local or nearby school. Especially at secondary level, where children are more likely to remain at the secondary school if possible. These figures could change depending on the resulting mix: fewer flats will increase the yields and vice versa.

The pre-school/nursery requirement is based on existing assumptions, but from 2018 the yields will be re-assessed as part of the introduction of 30 hours funded term time places for 3 year olds (and some 2 year olds), which result in the need for a greater number of nursery and pre-school places. There are a number of nearby nursery providers through which s106 contributions could be spent to increase provision. Existing provision within 1 mile of central Gloucester City is generally good, but these are all sustainable businesses and nurseries, and they are operating at their capacity.

At Primary level, the additional expected 36 places required equates to an additional 5 children per year group, although with new developments the additional pressure arising tends to be at the lower-age end, in reception year particularly. Each school has a known physical capacity, and we know the numbers on roll and forecast. For operational purposes GCC will consider a school to be at capacity when it has fewer than 5% surplus places – i.e. when it reaches 95% capacity. This allows fluctuations and in-year changes. The nearby primary schools are St Peter's Catholic Primary School a 2 FE school which is currently at, and forecast to remain at capacity. Widden Primary School is a 2FE school with nursery has some surplus presently, but is forecast to increase based on known demographic trends. Elmbridge Primary School is near capacity and forecast to be within 5% of its capacity. Other primary schools within 2 miles of the site are Hatherley Infants, Tredworth Infant, Barnwood C of E and Coney Hill Community Primary School. All of these are forecast to be at or near capacity, with the exception of Tredworth which will have some capacity.

At Secondary level, across the Gloucester school planning area there is 13,124 spaces. From 2019 there will be less than a 5% surplus across the 12

secondary schools in the school planning area. This buffer is an advisable level of surplus places which allows for in-year changes and changes over years. Forecasts show that the numbers on roll will exceed the number of places available by 2021. There is therefore a need to secure contributions towards secondary school provision from development proposals to mitigate the harm.

5.9 Severn Trent

No objection to the proposal subject to a condition to provide details of foul and surface water drainage

5.10 Housing Strategy and Enabling

The current application is proposing no affordable housing. If the site proceeds with the 200 dwellings and 200 student bed spaces, then if there were no viability issues, the scheme would deliver 80 affordable homes at the 40% current policy position or 40 affordable homes at the 20% JSC CIL policy on position.

While no affordable housing is proposed, any mix needs to consider the Strategic Market Assessment profiles, and in particular the need for smaller units. Special needs housing and Lifetimes homes should also be considered. The viability should be robustly assessed and if there is seen to be low viability, then a review mechanism should be built in to any decision.

5.11 Council Ecologist

The site has nothing of great concern. There is low level badger activity and a possibility of reptiles. The brook will likely be a bat commuting corridor, so there needs to be caution with light spillage.

There should be conditions on any approval, requiring protection of badger setts, site clearance method statement to avoid reptiles, lighting scheme preventing light spillage, and bird and bat boxes.

There should also be conditions requesting energy and waste management strategy statements.

5.12 Network Rail

This application would not appear to cause Network Rail any problems, over and above the existing peak time traffic flows over Horton Road level crossing. The application site does include a very small element of Network Rail land and this area needs to be removed from it.

Officer Note : This element of land has been removed

5.13 Urban Design

The Illustrative Masterplan shows a sensible arrangement of blocks in most areas, but more work may be needed along the southern boundary of the site, specifically relating to the impacts from railway noise. There may be more of a continuous form of development needed along the boundary with garden areas in particular needing screening to meet guidelines. A mix of residential uses on the site would help to provide a wider range of residents in the area and possibly extend activity levels during the day.

5.14 Gloucestershire County Council

The application site, at present, contains a well established and operational concrete batching plant, which plays an important role in contributing to much needed supplies of local construction materials. The application site also contains a number of active and operational waste management facilities that form part of an important network of local waste facilities. National planning policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) refers to the importance of safeguarding such facilities as part of a wider package of measures to secure sufficient mineral supplies. It does, however, recognise the prospect of changing commercial / land use circumstances and makes specific provision for applicants to demonstrate either a lack of need or future suitability for an existing safeguarding facilities and/or the realistic prospect of achieving the appropriate re-location of safeguarded infrastructure. Assurance should be sought from the applicant regarding the alternate provision/ relocation of the waste management facilities.

6.0 PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATION

6.1 Press and site notices were published. Notifications were sent to 28 neighbouring occupiers. Three responses were received stating the following:-

- a) Would support scheme however there is no firm proposal for drainage of the development site and Wotton Brook has high risk of flooding , having done so twice in 2007.
- b) Following on from above the Flood Risk Assessment lacks clarity and makes assumptions as to the current draining situation rather than providing certainty.
- c) The trees at the eastern end of the site should be retained and supplemented, with exception of leylandii that should be removed.
- d) The Irish club raises concern at loss of their car park. At present there are 80 car parking spaces and this will be reduced to 26 spaces as part of the proposal. The size of the car park is said to be a big incentive to those who use the club for events.
- e) Not an ideal site for student accommodation as not that close to facilities.
- f) A bridge over or subway under the railway would help improve connection

6.2 Civic Trust

The industrial development once connected with the railway has become “non-conforming” with the growth of neighbouring residential uses at the old football stadium and former psychiatric hospital, and the increased use for a large primary school and a private school. The current recycling operation at Allstone attracts heavy vehicles to Horton Road and other streets not built for such traffic. The panel has no objection to the principle of residential development, but reserves judgement on the details. The site may have underlying Roman and mediaeval levels together with the industrial archaeology of the former Midland Railway steam engine sheds and sidings which need to be investigated and recorded.

- 6.3 The full content of all correspondence on this application can be inspected at Herbert Warehouse, The Docks, Gloucester, prior to the Committee meeting or via the following link:-

<http://planningdocs.gloucester.gov.uk/default.aspx?custref=16/00945/REM>

7.0 OFFICER OPINION

- 7.1 It is considered that the main issues with regard to this application are as follows:-

- a) Principle of the Development, including loss of the Waste Transfer station
- b) Design of the Proposal
- c) Flooding and Drainage
- d) Land Contamination
- e) Ecology and Landscaping
- f) Viability
- g) Impact on Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers /Satisfactory Living Environment for Occupiers
- h) Affordable Housing
- i) Public Open Space
- j) Library/Education provision
- k) Archaeology
- l) Traffic and Transport

- 7.2 a) Principle of the Development, including the loss of the Waste Transfer Station

The adopted 1983 Local Plan shows this site as non- designated, however in the Local Plan Second Stage Deposit 2002 the site is identified on the proposals map as Old Employment Sites for employment use (Policy E3), with the caveat that an alternative use, or mix of uses may be permitted if the developer is able to demonstrate that the proposal would offer greater potential benefit to the community It is also subject to Policy E4 –Protecting Employment Land that states planning permission will not be granted for new development that involves the loss of employment land unless the following criteria are met:

- 1) The land has limited potential for employment , and
- 2) The developer is able to demonstrate that an alternative use, or mix of uses, offers greater potential benefit to the community

The accompanying text to these policies does recognise the limited potential of the older employment sites to cater for modern employment, while the removal of this bad neighbour development and provision of more compatible much needed housing could to a certain extent be considered a benefit to the community.

Policy H11 in the Local Plan Second Stage Deposit Draft 2002 specifically states that:-

Within established residential areas and throughout the Central Area the City Council will:

- 3) support the relocation of non –conforming bad neighbour uses and the redevelopment of their sites for housing, open space or car parking/ garages where appropriate.

The current use of the site does not sit well with the residential areas to the north and east, in particular the residential areas off Myers road, which share the same access road as the trucks that regularly go in and out of the application site. The noise and dust from the waste recycling, concrete batching and moving aggregate around, is also harmful to residential amenity.

The Local Plan Second Stage Deposit Draft 2002 is somewhat dated now, and the direction of policy travel at both central and local levels is putting far greater emphasis on housing delivery, particularly on brown field sites in sustainable locations, such as this one.

As indicated in section 3.3 above the Joint Core Strategy carries limited weight as it is not yet adopted, however the rational informing the policies is obviously more up to date.

Policy SD11 – Residential Development states:-

Housing Development will be permitted at sites allocated for housing through the development plan, including Strategic Allocations and allocations in district and neighbourhood plans.

On sites that are not allocated, housing development and conversions to dwellings will be permitted on previously – developed land in the existing built up areas of Gloucester City, the Principal Urban Area of Cheltenham and Tewkesbury towns, rural service centres and service villages except where otherwise restricted by policies within district plans.....

The Draft Gloucester City Plan is then also a document with limited weight, but again is informed by a more up to date evidence base. Under the proposed land allocations section, this site is shown now allocated for housing, with a likely allocation of up to 250 dwellings.

As stated in section 4 of this report, the Council does not currently have a 5 year housing land supply, but through the JCS has a process in place through which to achieve it. The development of this site for housing is not an absolute requirement for meeting the 5 year housing land supply, however should it come forward the site will still help towards meeting the target. Furthermore it will bring a likely variety of dwelling types (with both flats and houses shown on the illustrative plan) to allow a mixed and balanced community in a relatively sustainable location within the city and not far from the centre.

It is recognised that the proposal would be counter to Policy WCS11 of the Waste Core Strategy that seeks to safeguard existing and allocated sites for waste management use. Gloucestershire County Council states that the application site contains a well established and operational concrete batching plant, along with a number of active and operational waste management facilities that play an important local role., while the NPPF also indicates that

concrete batching plants should be safeguarded where possible. The Lead Commissioner does ask that reassurance is given by the applicant that the use would be relocated. The applicant has indicated that he would move the operation to another site before releasing this site for housing, however it is accepted that the Local Planning Authority could not control this happening.

Officers are also of the opinion that this current operation is constituting a bad neighbour development with its regular lorry movements sharing a residential road (Myers Road) and with the noise and dust from operations being harmful to the residential amenities of the dwellings to the north and east. It is also somewhat of a visual eyesore with the large piles of aggregate that are in easy view from the trains running to and from Gloucester to Birmingham. Furthermore the current activities and noise and emissions from the site could hamper the key redevelopment of the neighbouring triangle site to the south. The current proposal would be providing much needed housing on a sustainable brownfield site within the city, thereby making more effective use of the land and helping to regenerate the area. This in turn would ensure that the proposal accords with the policies of the NPPF and meets the requirements of the emerging policies of the Draft JCS and Draft City Plan.

Overall the principle of development is considered acceptable.

7.3 b)The Design of the Proposal

It should be noted that this application is an outline planning application with all matters of access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale reserved for future determination. The design of the development is therefore not for determination at this stage, however an illustrative masterplan and Design and Access statement have been submitted to demonstrate how the proposal might be laid out.

The illustrative masterplan shows the proposed student accommodation at the western end of the site and is proposing buildings up to 5 storeys in height. Proposed apartments are then shown in the western half of the site and to the south, potentially up to three storeys, while to the north and east would be dwellings, generally two storeys in height. A linear strip of landscaping would run along the southern boundary next to the railway line, and directly north of it a pedestrian/cycleway would also run the full width east to west. Access would be taken from Myers road as the site does currently and 0.76 ha of public open space is shown to the east of the site.

The application has indicated the number of dwellings at 200 and the number of student accommodation beds at 200, it is therefore important that officers can be satisfied that this quantum of development can be developed on this site within a high quality design. The urban designer has viewed the scheme and is satisfied that this level of development can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site, though this is not to say that the illustrative layout and indicative building heights are acceptable. It should also be noted that as all matters are reserved, then there is opportunity for an entirely different layout to be put forward.

7.4 c)Flooding and Drainage

The application site is in Flood Zone 1, the EA flood category of lowest risk, so there is no concern about fluvial flood risk. However the eastern end of the site borders Wotton Brook. Wotton Brook is at high risk of flooding and has no spare capacity. Any increase in flows to the brook would result in an increase in flood risk to nearby properties. There has been a previous history of causing flooding to properties, particularly in the mid 1990's. Two comments were received from neighbouring residential occupiers flagging up this flooding issue and seeking assurance that the assessment gave flooding full consideration. Originally there were concerns from the LLFA and the Drainage Engineer that the application needed to demonstrate how the site currently drained in to the brook, however it was then realised that as a whole new drainage system would be put in for the residential development, it would be better to simply model and assess the new system. The Drainage engineer and the LLFA confirm they are happy with the re modelled work.

Another suggestion was that the potential for removing a pipe and masonry structures from the brook should be considered as debris during flooding got blocked on it. This could form a condition on any approval.

There is preference for over ground SUDS drainage, however an issue here is that it needs to be in the lower part of the site to work with gravity. Due to Network Rail restrictions near the railway line, the drainage will have to be further up the site. It has been accepted by the drainage engineer that underground storage tanks would be acceptable in this situation.

Overall the LLFA and drainage engineer consider the proposal acceptable, subject to conditions requiring the full detailed design of the surface water drainage strategy, the removal of the pipe bridge and buttresses and a scheme for maintenance of all SUDS attenuation features.

Severn Trent have also confirmed they have no objection subject to a condition for foul and clean water drainage, while the EA simply require 8 metre clear access to the brook, which could form a condition on any approval.

7.5 d)Land Contamination

The site has a long history of potentially contaminating uses from the earlier use as locomotive sheds in the days of steam trains through to use as a fertiliser depot, coal yard and the modern day uses of concrete batching, waste transfer and processing, and aggregate works. Worcestershire Regulatory Services note the contamination risk for a residential development is medium to high risk and recommend that any approval is subject to the standard suite of investigation and mitigation contaminated land conditions.

7.6 e)Ecology and Landscaping

The Councils ecologist states that the site has relatively low ecological value, with low level badger activity, some possibility of reptiles and bats likely to be using the brook as a commuting corridor. He suggests that any approval should be subject to conditions on badger sett protection, a method statement

for site clearance to avoid harm to reptiles and details of a lighting scheme, keeping lighting to a minimum near the brook.

In terms of landscaping, the site does not have a lot of tree coverage. The trees are predominantly located along the northern edge of the site, then with a larger group to the eastern end next to the brook. The illustrative masterplan shows this group of trees retained, while introducing a long landscape strip next to the southern boundary. As part of any approval there would be conditions for a landscape plan to include retained and proposed new trees. The general intention would be to retain trees, where possible, except for the *Leylandii* adjacent to Armscroft Park, which the tree officer considers best removed.

7.7 f) Viability

Paragraph 173 of the NPPF states:-

‘Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan making and decision making. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of the development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to the willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. ‘

The emerging JCS in paragraph 5.8.5 then states:-

The JCS authorities recognise that economic viability of development can be finely balanced, particularly where significant infrastructure requirements are identified as being needed to make the proposal acceptable to the local planning authority. The balance may be particularly sensitive in respect of redevelopment of brownfield land and, where evidence is available, the local planning authority will be mindful of that in those cases.

The applicants submitted a viability assessment with their proposal and it has been independently assessed by a viability consultant on behalf of the City Council. The City Council’s viability consultant has viewed various scenarios from full policy compliance of 40% affordable housing contribution and full s106 contributions right down to zero affordable housing and limited section 106 contributions. Unfortunately the conclusion is that there is no money in the scheme and that its deliverability even with zero contributions is relatively marginal. The major abnormal site costs for the development are unsurprisingly in relation to remediating a very contaminated site to allow it to be used for residential purposes.

As the scheme was assessed for viability on the number of units being 200 dwellings and 200 units of student accommodation, then officers would ensure that any approval is restricted to this number and should any scheme

come forward with greater numbers, then there would be the need for a new planning application to be submitted and tested again for viability.

7.8 g) Impact on Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers /Satisfactory Living Environment for Occupiers

The application is an outline application with all matters reserved, however as stated earlier officers seek to ensure that a scheme with this quantum of development can be delivered at the reserved matter stage with a satisfactory living environment for the occupiers and with no material harm to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Of particular concern with regard to this site is the location of the railway along the southern boundary and the potential impact of vibration and noise on the living environment of the proposed residential occupiers. The Pollution control officer flags up that the current vibration exposure within the southern part of the site exceeds guidance levels, however he confirms that appropriately designed mitigation measures would enable vibration exposure to be controlled across the site. This could be controlled via a condition on any approval.

With regard to noise, the application was accompanied by a noise assessment that recognised the potential for noise from both the railway line and Metz Way. This assessment indicated that the site would be acceptable for residential development, subject to mitigation measures. However it did flag up that the properties facing the southern boundary would need a higher level of performance for noise mitigation. This would potentially involve looking at the orientation of dwellings/positioning of windows in the southern elevations, and /or providing a noise bund/attenuation fence along the southern boundary with the railway line. The illustrative layout shows a landscaping strip along the boundary here, which could easily be banded or could have a fence erected upon it. The pollution control officer is satisfied that adequate mitigation measures could be provided, but would ask that a more detailed noise assessment is submitted to inform the reserved matters applications. This could form a condition on any approval.

The pollution control officer also originally had some concerns on controlling air quality. Generally speaking the removal of the current use that emits dust and has frequent heavy lorry movements obviously running diesel engines can be seen to have a positive effect on air quality in the area. He has confirmed he is now content however subject to conditions controlling NOx levels for gas fired boilers and for the design of the development to ensure no street 'canyoning' that would trap polluted air and locating habitable rooms in the dwellings away from busy roads. The NOx levels could be controlled via condition, while officers would take account of the design points made when assessing the layout.

Overall the pollution control officer is satisfied that a satisfactory residential environment could be achieved for the potential occupiers, subject to conditions on any approval.

On the matter of impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, this would predominantly be undertaken at the reserved matters stage when assessing layout. Officers are satisfied however that a layout similar to the illustrative layout could be seen to work. There is some potential concern over heights of the student accommodation as shown up to 5 storeys, particularly next to the two semi detached dwellings set back off Horton road. It will however be for the applicant to demonstrate at reserved matters stage that heights here can work, but officers are still satisfied that the indicated quantum could be achieved even with lower heights in this position. The pollution control officer has also requested the submission of a student hall operational management plan as a condition attached to any permission to help protect the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers. To protect amenity during demolition/construction an environmental management system condition is also suggested for any approval. Officers are satisfied that a scheme can be put forward here that protects the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

7.9 h) Affordable Housing

Paragraph 50 of the NPPF states that:-

‘To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should;

.. where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.

Policy H15 of the Local Plan Deposit Draft 2002 states:-

‘The City Council will seek the provision of an element of affordable housing on new housing sites of 15 or more dwellings or 0.5 ha or larger, irrespective of the number of dwellings and will seek an overall target of 40% of the net site area. The amount of affordable housing will be negotiated on the basis of site and market conditions at the time of the application and may exceed 40% in some cases. In some cases abnormal costs of development will need to be taken in to account which may reduce the affordable housing requirement’

Emerging policy 13 of the JCS then states:-

The JCS authorities will seek, through negotiation, for new development to deliver new affordable housing on a sliding scale approach as set out below:

1....

ii) Outside of the Strategic Allocation sites, on sites of 11 dwellings or more, or sites with a maximum combined gross floor space of greater than 1000sqm; a minimum of 20% affordable housing will be sought on developments within the Gloucester City administrative area.....

...

9 If a development cannot deliver the full affordable housing requirement, a viability assessment, conforming to an agreed methodology, in accordance with Policy INF7 will be required.

The current council policy position would be the requirement of a minimum of 80 affordable homes, whereas under the emerging policy there would be a minimum requirement of 40 dwellings.

The applicant submitted a viability assessment to demonstrate that there was not sufficient profit in the scheme to allow the provision of any affordable housing. As stated earlier, the City Council's viability consultant has viewed the viability appraisal and tested affordable housing provision through various scenarios from the full policy compliant 40% provision to zero. His conclusion was that due to the very high abnormal costs needed to remediate the contaminated land to make the site suitable for residential use, there was no possibility of providing any affordable housing. Even at zero provision the Council's viability consultant advises that the profit margins are very tight. In conclusion it is confirmed that the scheme is not able to provide any affordable housing.

7.10 i)Public Open Space

The proposal involves the inclusion of 0.76ha public open space, shown on the Illustrative masterplan at the eastern end of the site.

The Landscape Officer has viewed the scheme and states that the development needs to provide Public Open Space (POS) at 2.8ha /1000 population in line with policy OS.2 of the Local Plan Second Stage Deposit 2002 and also allotments at 0.2ha/1000 population to accord with policy A1 of this plan. She has calculated that the scheme should provide 3ha of POS or an equivalent off site contribution of £1.37m (£1.02m for formal sport, £217k for formal play and £152k for general POS improvements.). Her suggestion would be that as Armscroft Park borders the site directly to the north, then it might be prudent to provide off site contributions to improve the parks facilities and infrastructure.

Unfortunately as stated above there is no additional finance in the scheme and therefore the development would only be able to provide the 0.76ha of on site provision as indicated. There would be a s106 agreement on any approval to ensure this amount is provided and overall the policy deficit has to be seen against the delivery of much needed housing on a brown field site. Furthermore Armscroft Park would in itself provide very close amenity space for the new residents.

7.11 Library/Education Provision

There would also be a requirement to provide community infrastructure in the form of education and library contributions .Based on the figure of 200 dwellings there would be the need for the following financial contributions:
Pre- school places - £152,349 based on 11.53 places
Primary School places - £472,833 based on 35.79 places

Secondary School places - £417, 920 based on 20.74 places
Libraries - £39,200.

The County Council s106 officer states that not all children moving in the development would require a school place at the local or nearby school, especially with regard to secondary level, where children would more likely remain at their current school, and obviously should the mix involve more flats then the yield would reduce and vice versa, if the number of houses increased.

He states that the current provision of pre – school/ nursery providers in the area is good, but that they are operating near capacity and that from 2018 the yields will be re-assessed as part of the funded term time places , which will likely result in a need for a greater number of spaces.

At Primary level, the nearby schools are St Peter’s Catholic Primary school , which is currently at and forecast to remain at capacity, Widden Primary school , which does currently have some surplus, but is forecast to increase based on current demographic trends and Elmbridge Primary school, which is near capacity. Other primary school within 2 miles are Hatherley Infants, Barnwood C of E, and Coney Hill Community Primary School , which are close to capacity , as well as Tredworth Infant, which has some capacity.

The County Council s106 officer then states that at Secondary level, across the Gloucester school planning area that there are 13,124 spaces. From 2019 there will be less than a 5% surplus across the 12 secondary schools in the school planning area. This buffer is an advisable level of surplus places which allows for in-year changes and changes over years. Forecasts show that the numbers on roll will exceed the number of places available by 2021. He states that there is therefore a need to secure contributions towards secondary school provision from development proposals to mitigate the harm.

Overall there can be seen to be some current limited capacity at pre- school and primary level, however with the forecast that they will be at capacity in the very near future. At secondary level, the s106 officer indicates that the pressure is greater, though he does state that children coming into the development at this level often look to stay at their current school if possible. Unfortunately while the pressure on the current system of education is fully appreciated, as previously stated in this report there is not sufficient viability in the proposed development to make any financial contributions.

As required in paragraph 5.8.5 of the emerging JCS officers recognise that there is a sensitive balance that has to be struck between the need for infrastructure requirements and the redevelopment of brown field land, where financial margins will be very tight. In this case it is felt by officers that the positive benefits of removing a bad neighbour use and providing residential development on previously developed land in a sustainable location outweigh the limited pressure it would put on existing educational and library provision in the area.

7.12 j) Archaeology

The City Archaeologist states that the site has the potential to contain significant heritage assets of archaeological interest, most especially human burials of Roman date. He recommends a condition requiring a programme for archaeological mitigation on any approval.

7.13 k) Traffic and Transportation

The application was originally submitted with access to form a matter to be considered at this stage, however the application was then amended to delete access from the assessment.

Notwithstanding this fact there is still a requirement to ensure that the proposal can be seen to work in transportation terms. The application was accompanied by a transport assessment and it is recognised that as shown on the illustrative drawing, access would be obtained via Myers road as is the case with the current operation. The Highway Authority (HA) have raised concern that there is restricted visibility for pedestrians looking to cross the rugby club access road here and that they would have difficulty seeing traffic emerging from the rugby club. They have no fundamental objection to this access point, but would like to see details as to how it would work. In response officers would state that this would be conditioned and assessed under the reserved matter of access. The HA also have flagged up that the pedestrian/cycle access points into Arsmcroft Park and Blinkhorns Bridge Lane would involve some engineering works due to level changes, but again this is achievable and can be assessed at reserved matters stage.

Generally the site can be seen to be relatively sustainable with a number of bus routes in close proximity Horton road is served by bus services 6 and 33, while a 1km walk on to London Road would allow access to routes 94 and 10. Travel by public transport is therefore a realistic option for future residents. The cycle and pedestrian routes crossing the site would also link in the neighbouring cycle and foot path route to again promote sustainable forms of transport.

With regard to parking, the first matter for consideration is the loss of parking for the Irish club located on Horton Road. The club has written in to object to the proposal stating that its parking would be reduced from the current level of 80 spaces to 26 spaces. They state that one of the reasons people utilise the club for functions is due to the ample parking provided. It should be noted that as Allstone own the car parking area, they can take the area back at any time. The HA have however asked that a parking survey be undertaken to seek to ascertain likely parking dispersal should the development take place and the results of this survey are still awaited. While parking in the development itself would normally be a matter to consider with the layout, the HA have asked that further survey work be undertaken with regard to the student vehicle movements and parking provision, currently indicatively shown as 23 spaces to assess impact on the surrounding area.

While having no in principle objection to the development the HA have also raised some concern with the methodology in the Transport Assessment.

While the Transport Assessment has used the standard industry based Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) to estimate likely vehicle movement, the assessment is not considered to fully take account of the traffic from existing uses on the site nor demonstrate clearly how the new vehicle movements would be distributed and assigned to the local highway network.

Further information has therefore been requested from the applicant to satisfy the concerns above.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 Whilst it is recognised that policies E3 and E4 of the adopted Local Plan Second Stage Deposit Draft 2002 predominantly seek to protect employment Sites, even back at this point it was recognised that the older employment Sites were often not suitable for modern industrial working practices and also there was the caveat in both policies that accepted the loss if could be considered to be of greater potential benefit to the community. The Allstone site would not be considered an ideal site for modern industrial working due to both its high level of contamination and close proximity to neighbouring residential properties. Furthermore its method of operation makes it a bad neighbour development in relation to the residential areas to the north and east. It would not be unreasonable to state that its departure from this site would be a benefit to local residents and therefore the community. The removal of the waste management and concrete batching facility from the site would be contrary to policy WCS11 of the Waste Core Strategy in that there is no clear indication as to where the operation would relocate. The applicant however has indicated that he is in the search for site and does not intend to close the business.
- 8.2 The proposal does however clearly meet the policies of the NPPF and Emerging JCS and City Plan in providing much needed housing on a previously developed site. Furthermore the illustrative masterplan shows this to be a mix of types from houses to flats as well as the student accommodation, which would help achieve the aim of a mixed and balanced community. The removal of the bad neighbour development and replacement with housing is also likely to aid the regeneration of the area, including the railway triangle site as well as simply give a better impression of Gloucester to those passing through on the train i.e with the removal of the very visual aggregate heaps. The site is also in a relatively sustainable location with good access to bus routes to the city centre and access to footpath and cycling networks.
- 8.3 It is recognised that the proposal is unable to provide s106 contributions to mitigate the impact of the proposal on existing education and library facilities in the area or provide affordable housing, which is disappointing, but finely balanced against the positive benefits of bring this site forward, the failure to do so is considered acceptable by your officers. Your officers are then further confident that through the reserved matter submissions a good well designed high quality scheme can be delivered. The HA have no

objection in principle to the proposal, but do seek further clarification on the transport assessment methodology before they are able to remove their concerns.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION

That Members of the Planning Committee Resolve to Delegate Authority to the Head of Planning to Grant Planning Permission subject to:-

- a) the below mentioned conditions;
- b) resolution of the transportation matters requiring more information on impact of loss of Irish club car park spaces, the proposed student car movements and parking and vehicle routing in the traffic assessment; and
- c) the signing of a s106 agreement to secure the delivery of public open space.

10.0 PLANNING CONDITIONS

10.1 The conditions on the planning permission to include details of the following and transportation conditions following the resolution of transport matters.

General Conditions

- 1) Approval of Reserved Matters
- 2) Plans and Particulars of Reserved Matters
- 3) Time Limit for Submission of Reserved Matters
- 4) Time Limit for Commencement
- 5) Definition of Planning Permission at 200 dwellings and 200 units of Student accommodation with 0.76ha of Public Open Space
- 6) Details of Phasing of the Development

Environmental Protection

- 7) An Additional Noise Report
- 8) A vibration survey
- 9) Environmental Construction Management Plan
- 10) External Lighting
- 11) Limit on Hours for Construction and Deliveries
- 12) Operation Management Plan for Student Accommodation
- 13) Provision of electric vehicle rapid charge point
- 14) All gas fired boilers to meet emission standard of less than 40mgNO_x/kwh
- 15) All gas –fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant to meet emission standards for spark ignition engine of 250mgNO_x/Nm³, compression ignition engine of 400mgNO_x/Nm³ and Gas turbine of 50mgNO_x/Nm³.
- 16) Refuse Storage and Recycling
- 17) No materials or substances to be burnt
- 18) Details of Waste Management
- 19) Details of an Energy Strategy

Flood Risk and Drainage Conditions

- 20) Full details of the Sustainable Drainage System

- 21) Provision for Management and Maintenance of the Drainage System
- 22) Details of Proposed Removal of Pipe Bridge and buttresses over Wotton Brook
- 23) Details of Scheme for Foul Drainage
- 24) No new structures or raising ground levels within 8 metres of the top of the bank of Wotton Brook

Archaeology

- 25) Programme of Archaeological Work

Design Conditions

- 26) Detailed Materials Schedule
- 27) Details of Boundary Treatment

Landscaping Conditions

- 28) Hard and Soft Landscaping Scheme, to include new tree planting
- 29) Provision for Management and Maintenance of the Landscaped Areas
- 30) Details of Tree Retention and Protection during Construction

Ground Conditions

- 31) Details of Existing and Proposed Ground levels, including slab levels for buildings
- 32) Compliance with contamination conditions
- 33) Site Characteristics
- 34) Submission of Remediation Strategy
- 35) Implementation of Approved Remediation Strategy
- 36) Reporting of Unexpected contamination
- 37) Long term monitoring and maintenance

Ecology Conditions

- 38) Requirement for a bird survey before works are carried out during the bird nesting season (March to August)
- 39) Lighting Proposal in relation to impact on bats
- 40) Provision of bird and bat boxes
- 41) Method statement for protection of badger setts
- 42) Site clearance method statement with regard to reptiles

16/00948/OUT

**Allstone Sand And Gravel Centre
Myers Road
Gloucester
GL1 3QD**

Planning Committee 04.04.2017

