



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

**MEETING** : Tuesday, 5th September 2017

**PRESENT** : Cllrs. Taylor (Chair), Lewis (Vice-Chair), Lugg, Hanman, Morgan, D. Brown, Dee, Toleman, J. Brown, Fearn and Walford

**Others in Attendance**

Mella McMahon, Development Control Manager  
Nick Jonathan, Solicitor, One Legal  
Anthony Hodge, Head of Place  
Caroline Townley, Principal Planning Officer  
Tony Wisdom, Democratic Services Officer

**APOLOGIES** : Cllrs. Hansdot and Finnegan

### 23. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made on this occasion.

### 24. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### 25. LATE MATERIAL

Late material in respect of Agenda item 5, application 17/00616/FUL had been circulated.

### 26. TUFFLEY PARK - 17/00616/FUL

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report which detailed an application for the installation of a play park and new footpath on an existing green space area at Tuffley Park.

She advised that the application had been submitted by the Podsmead Big Local group and would be funded from National lottery funding received by the group in 2012.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**05.09.17**

She advised members that there would be no nett loss of sports pitches and the plans indicated buffer distance of 30 metres from the boundaries of the nearest residential properties. This distance exceeded both local and national guidance which suggested a distance of 20 metres.

She noted that the location had been chosen as it would be overlooked by the nearby properties. She referred to the late material which contained two further representations and amended condition 2 and 3.

**Councillor Deborah Smith, Ward Member for Podsmead, was invited to address the Committee.**

Councillor Smith supported the application and advised that the initiative was started by a petition from the residents of Oaklands Park. She stated that Podsmead Big Local recognised that the scheme would make a positive difference to the area. She believed that it promoted the aims of the Gloucestershire Health and well Being Strategy as it would encourage family use and would provide equipment for users with a wide range of abilities.

She noted that there had been no objections from Sport England or the Highways Authority and the buffer distances exceeded local and national guidance.

She was not ignoring the concerns of local residents and would work with them to address any issues should they arise.

**Nicola Tunbridge of 3 Podsmead Place addressed the Committee in opposition to the application.**

Ms Tunbridge stated that a request for a meeting following receipt of the initial letter from Big Local had been refused by Penny Ryder. She had subsequently attended an open meeting where the concerns and fears of local residents had not been addressed and she questioned who were the 85 per cent of residents who had been said to be in favour of the scheme.

She believed that some residents would feel forced to move due to the loss of privacy, particularly for 2,3 and 4 Podsmead Place and the unwelcome proximity of lots of noisy children. She believed that the proposal would affect the character of the area and the proposed equipment, which included a zip wire, would be an eyesore on the green space.

She believed that the proposal would encourage anti-social behaviour and litter and when a proposal had been discussed with Councillor Watkins in the past residents had been assured that the play area would be sited on the raised area to the right of the clubhouse. She considered that properties would be blighted and there would be parking problems in the surrounding streets.

She expressed concerns regarding the safety of children due to the proximity of the football pitch and the potential for them to be struck by footballs.

She stated that the park was currently used for many types of sport and by dog walkers and noted that many of the local residents were older people.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**05.09.17**

Councillor Dee noted that as soon as play areas had been installed they tended to be taken over by older youths and he called for the proposal to be re-examined.

Councillor Morgan noted that when such areas were designed for a wide age range they tended to create their own particular problems. He stated that he would not be comfortable with a similar proposal close to his home and suggested that a separate area be created for older children He believed that an alternative location should be considered.

The Vice-Chair noted that a play area could not be located near a cricket pitch and that proposed seemed to be the most suitable. He believed that the area near the clubhouse was not suitable and separate play areas were not practicable.

Councillor Fearn welcomed the proposal as a positive initiative that would benefit a lot of families. She welcomed the provision of accessible equipment.

Councillor Hanman questioned the 85 per cent said to be in favour and asked if the Committee were to ignore the 32 letters of objection.

The Principal Planning Officer believed that the 85 per cent referred to the community group consultation which was not part of the planning proposal. She advised that the closest neighbours had been notified of the application by the Council.

Councillor Toleman noted that there was great demand for play areas and he had not received a single complaint about the three play areas in Hempsted.

Councillor Morgan moved deferral but the motion was not seconded.

The Chair proposed that the application be approved subject to the amendments in the late material. The motion was seconded by the Vic-Chair.

**RESOLVED that consent be granted subject to the conditions in the report with the following amendments:-**

**Condition 2**

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Site Location Plan and Fence Detail Plan received by the Local Planning Authority on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2017 and Layout Plan drawing no. V3 received on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2017 except where otherwise required by conditions of this permission.

**Reason**

To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in accordance with policies contained within Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan (2002).

**Condition 3**

The Play Area shall not be open to the public until the litter bins and facilities for cycle parking have been provided in accordance with details submitted and shown

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**05.09.17**

on the approved Layout Plan V3 received by the Local Planning Authority on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2017.

**Reason**

In the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy BE.4 of the Second Deposit City of Gloucester Local Plan and to ensure that adequate cycle parking is provided, to promote cycle use and to ensure that the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up in accordance with paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework

**27. LAND AT GLOUCESTER BUS STATION - 17/00622/FUL**

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report which detailed an application for the variation of condition 3 of planning permission 15/00622/FUL for the demolition of buildings, tree removal and redevelopment of site to provide a new bus station, highways and access works, landscaping and associated infrastructure works including provision of an emergency staircase on existing NCP car park. The variation is for the reduced footprint of the hub element and main building and amendments to the design, height, materials, cycle parking, landscaping and trees at Gloucester Bus Station.

She outlined the proposed amendments detailed in paragraph 1.8 of the report.

**Mr Peter Monk, a retired Chartered Surveyor, addressed the Committee in opposition to the application.**

Mr Monk stated that the proposed amendments would tear the heart out of the approved scheme. He referred to the seriously reduced provision of toilet facilities at a time when Gloucester was showing signs of an upsurge. He also objected to the style of fencing proposed.

He thanked the Principal; Planning Officer for her clear exposition of the application.

He referred to the Planning Advisory Service 2007 publication 'Design and Access Statements' which clearly stated that function should concern Planning and this included toilets. The variation proposed to remove both male and female washrooms which would be an inadequate provision and the small washbasins proposed would inevitably overflow causing cleaning problems.

He noted that buses from the Forest of Dean and other outlying areas were usually full due to the sparsity of the services and did not have on-board toilets.

He did not believe that the 24 hour disabled toilet was necessary and reminded Members that the British Toilet Association recommended that females should have twice the provision for males.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**05.09.17**

**Mr Philip Ardley, Regeneration Consultant for Gloucester City Council, addressed the Committee in support of the application.**

Mr Ardley stated that he was passionate about delivering a modern bus station for the City by August 2018. He believed that the existing facility was a dis-incentive to use public transport at time when visitor numbers were increasing. He advised that there was no reduction in bus facilities with 12 bus bays and over 100 seats in a modern concourse. The passenger information facility would also sell tickets.

He advised that the reduction in the footprint of the hub was due to technical reasons as an unexpected 3.5 deep large metre diameter sewer had been discovered and whilst Severn Trent would divert but it could only be a short distance due to constraints imposed by other utilities. He noted that the number of toilets had been compromised but those proposed would be robust and of high quality. An additional toilet accessible to wheelchairs and families would be provided in the baby changing room.

He noted that the other changes were minor and should be considered in the context of a major transport facility. The anticipated planning application for King's Quarter would provide additional toilet facilities.

He advised Members that any delay could compromise the development.

The Chair reminded Members that the issue before them was the variation of condition.

Councillor Lugg expressed concern regarding the number of toilets proposed and suggested that the proposal would only work if the facilities were to be made unisex.

The Vice-Chair stated that the toilets were his only concern but questioned the external access to the disabled toilet. He was advised that the main facility would be closed between midnight and 5.00 or 6.00 am.

Councillor Hanman was advised that the variation was solely due to the technical constraints described.

Councillor Dee suggested the immediate deployment of temporary toilets.

Councillor Morgan suggested that a condition be imposed to require the provision of an adequate number of temporary toilets.

The Head of Place advised that temporary toilets were in place but were presenting challenges in terms of maintenance and security. He stated that this could be investigated and possibly implemented on an incremental basis. He advised that Phase 2 would take at least another two years.

The Development Control Manager advised that introduction of unisex toilets would not require planning permission.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**05.09.17**

The Vice-Chair was advised that any reduction in the size of the café would adversely affect its viability.

Councillor Brown was advised that the significant reduction of facilities was not a planning reason for refusal in these circumstances.

The Chair noted that Officers had heard Members' concerns regarding toilet provision.

**RESOLVED that consent be granted subject to the conditions in the report.**

**28. PLANNING APPEALS - SUMMARY STATISTICS**

The Development Control Manager presented the report which provided an overview of the Council's performance in relation to appeals against the refusal of planning permission as recorded to the Government as part of its monitoring of the planning process.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**29. DELEGATED DECISIONS**

Consideration was given to a schedule of applications determined under delegated powers during the month of July 2017.

**RESOLVED that the schedule be noted.**

**30. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday, 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2017 at 6.00pm.

**Time of commencement: 6.00 pm**  
**Time of conclusion: 7.40 pm**

**Chair**