

LATE MATERIAL (APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION)

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 5TH DECEMBER 2017

ITEM 1 LAND AT CLEARWATER DRIVE, QUEDGELEY – 17/00729FUL

Information from County Council (Education and Capital) regarding demand for school places

Confirmed that the information provided to the City Council by the Diocese does reflect the current position as follows:

- 2019 Reception intake - forecast demand 481 for 420 places – 61 short
- 2020 reception intake – forecast demand 544 for 420 places – 124 short

The data is forecast annually in March. This data does not include any additional demand from local housing developments.

The data applies to the two DfE Primary Planning Area's – 9161960 Quedgeley and 9161961 Quedgeley South East, the areas include the following schools:

Quedgeley

Beech Green Primary School

Clearwater Drive

Field Court CofE infant School

Field Court CofE Junior School

Hardwicke Parochial School

Longney C of E Primary School

Meadowside Primary School

Quedgeley South East

Haresfield C of E Primary School

Hunts Grove

Kingsway Primary School

Waterwells Primary Academy

Email from Gloucestershire County Council Asset Management

As regards the land adjoining site with the ownership of the County Council, there are no plans other than for it to remain open space should application 17/00729/FUL for the erection of a Primary School and associated infrastructure be granted.

If the City Council require the County Council is prepared to transfer the land to the City Council for use as public open space.

Additional Letters of Representation

Comments of support

It is very clear that a school is needed as there are up to 30 children attending who otherwise would have no school as all other Quedgeley/Kingsway schools are oversubscribed.

I cannot see where else the school would be sited in the area. If this land was for education historically then surely residents would have been aware of that when choosing to buy housing there.

DGAT to keep up the excellent job they are doing with the children already attending.

I have a family member who started at Clearwater in September and I am appalled to hear that there is talk of the school closing. I don't understand how a school can be opened and filled with staff and pupils and then be told it might not survive.

I would urge Gloucester Council to consider the stability and wellbeing of the pupils who already attend Clearwater before making such a significant decision.

This school was not one of my options at the time of choosing a school for him i had made 5 choices to the other local schools.

If you were not going to give planning permission to the school why accept children to attend! No one is thinking of our poor children who have been attending Clearwater since Sept 2017.

The school has been nothing but amazing since we found out we were attending. Great communication and great staff! This school would be a great credit to the community its warm, friendly and most importantly the children are happy and getting an education.

I think if Clearwater is not given the go ahead it will be a huge mistake for the local community. Where will their children go to school? If there are not enough school places now for the residents how will you cope when more families move to the area!

The community needs more facilities such as schools, doctors and shops for everyone not houses! We need these facilities to keep families in Quedgeley.

Without this school, class sizes will increase

Please consider the children who are already at Clearwater before you make a decision, these children did not get a choice in which school they attended! But as someone who is on the school run everyday they have formed beautiful friendships, they are getting a good education and most importantly they are all happy!

Let's do the right thing for the next generation and give them the best start to life so they can make the most of their education.

We should embrace the fact that the Diocese want to invest in a providing a school

We must consider the children.

The small annoyance to residents in one street is regrettable however this is outweighed by the tens of thousands of children who will benefit from an education in a modern and local environments.

Residents would have been advised, when they purchased their houses that this land was reserved for Educational use

Children attend school for approximately 75% of the year the remainder being holidays when there could not possibly be any disruption.

Hardwick School has playing facilities right next to houses

I have lived in Quedgeley for 30years and the plot of land which the school is planning to be built on has been a waste land since i can remember. is used by dog walkers who DO NOT pick up the mess and fly tippers. i have seen teens and youths hanging around drinking alcohol and taking drugs.

Never have children played on this field for recreation use, they could not play here as the land is not flat, grass is long 80% of the time and filled with poo and other nasty items.

I understand the residents issues about the volume of traffic but this is twice a day, before and after school pick up. Living in Court field Road I have seen the traffic first hand and experienced the hustle and bustle and by 9am it is all gone and the road is quiet again until school pick up time. This has never caused any issues to myself or my family.

Comments of Objection

Concreting over the green area will mean that the water must run off into local homes, rather than being absorbed by the soil

Out of keeping with the residential character of the area.

Will bring a lot of noise and chaos.

I suffer from COPD, (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease), like many with chronic asthma or elderly (who are many around here), air quality can dramatically affect my everyday health, the amount of vehicles which are envisaged to ultimately use Clearwater Drive, would, in such a confined area, create air pollution detrimental to the health of local residents.

There is also a case for light pollution, this school, should it be granted, will also need to illuminate a very large area, given the new size of the project, and this will also be detrimental to local residents.

The Causeway link to Clearwater Drive needs to be blocked off and made into a cul-de-sac again as the road is too narrow to deal with two way traffic and there is no room to widen the road. This would also stop this road from being used as a “rat run” for cars trying to cut past the bus stop - at speed.

I object to the Jubb report saying there will be no significant increase in traffic – the traffic and parking will cause chaos. Clearwater Drive was not designed to accommodate the traffic of a school run.

Eldersfield Close is not suitable as a second entrance – the road is narrow with limited parking. As Eldersfield Close is so narrow, on Thursdays, the refuse lorry has to reverse up - which would be a safety issue for school children

Would refer to the parking problems identified at Fieldcourt school detailed in their recent newsletter “Residents report that cars have been parked across driveways , too far onto the verge/pavement blocking access for walkers as well as parking on corners that are opposite to each other, and therefore blocking the roads to larger vehicles.....We appreciate that it can be very difficult to park near the schools, but parking in this manner is putting your children and those of others at risk”. The situation for Clearwater Drive will be worse

Challenges that the drop off area would not operate for long once the Dioceses realise the safety risk this poses to children.

Refers to inaccuracies within the agents planning statement - relating to since when the site was allocated as a school and how children will be travelling to the school.

Site was declared surplus for education proposes and the Council said that a school was not needed.

There are more objections that support for the school.

Local people have not been properly consulted on this school – the plans have also changed considerably.

The immediate local area can not have a demand for over 440 children. The children attending the school will be living in Kingsway and Hardwick and will be arriving in cars.

Refer to the Gloucester City Council Open Space Strategy and that a significant shortfall in the Quedgeley/Severn Vale ward is identified (1.08ha/1000);

Gloucester City Council has stated that it is 'committed to providing an integrated network of good quality safe and accessible open spaces'. (p8) Two key community priorities being identified in the City Vision which was adopted in February 2012 are :

1. A city where people feel safe and happy in their community
2. A healthy city with opportunities for all.

The residents of Clearwater Drive, The Causeway and surrounding cul-de-sacs will not have the opportunity to promote their health and wellness if this development goes ahead.

Clearwater Drive Open Space clearly fits the criteria for public open space but is disadvantaged by not being adopted as such by the City Council. It is an informal green space which allows public accessibility to grassland and wetlands as well as accessibility to the Canalside linear park.

During the Gloucestershire floods of 2007 this field bounded by a stream and drainage ditch flooded and a fountain appeared where an old drain existed. Where would this water have gone if this land had been built on? As it was the open grassland enabled the floodwater to spread without affecting housing

Gloucester City Council state in this the Gloucester City Open Space strategy that 'promoting and encouraging residents to use our open spaces for healthy activities and healthy living is paramount'. As a resident of Quedgeley/Severn Vale ward I would like to be able to continue to do this with the rest of our community on Clearwater Drive Open Space.

I have previously objected to development of this site when this has been proposed in the past and have stipulated the importance of the key site as an amphibian breeding ground.

Suggestions made in the submitted comments

Perhaps a one form entry school would be a good compromise.

I often see children playing in the roads near Clearwater Drive. This is of course dangerous. The council could mow down the grass and turn the Clearwater Drive site into a playground & field. This would provide a safe play area for children and a nice place to walk.

I have lived in the vicinity of Clearwater drive for 27 years and have used this grassland for recreational use for this amount of time and I have not been consulted over the future use of this land or seen any steps to set up a Friends groups which I would be happy to get involved with

A mini round about at the Clearwater drive/Severn vale junction would work well to keep the traffic flowing.

Extract from the National Planning Policy Guidance.

Should children's best interests be taken into account when determining planning applications?

Local authorities need to consider whether children's best interests are relevant to any planning issue under consideration. In doing so, they will want to ensure their approach is proportionate. They need to consider the case before them, and need to be mindful that the best interests of a particular child will not always outweigh other considerations including those that impact negatively on the environment or the wider community. This will include considering the scope to mitigate any potential harm through non-planning measures, for example through intervention or extra support for the family through social, health and education services.

Case Officer Comments on Outstanding Issues.

The committee report refers to a number of outstanding issues including landscaping, external lighting, external materials, noise assessment, levels and surface water drainage. No further information has been submitted by the applicant in relation to these matters. The discrepancies and conflicts with the plans, also referred to in the report, have also not been addressed

It is considered that issues relating to landscaping and external materials could be dealt with through negotiation with the applicant and if all other matters were acceptable, could be dealt with by condition.

However the other matters are of greater significance and therefore three additional reasons for refusal are proposed.

Additionally a slight amendment to the wording of reason for refusal 1 is proposed to include additional policies within the JCS.

For clarity all the reasons for refusal now proposed are set out below.

Amended Recommendation

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

Refusal Reason 1

The development of this site would result in the loss of an important open space highly valued by local residents, in an area where there is already a shortfall of open space. Insufficient mitigation or replacement facility has been proposed to compensate for this loss. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy SD4, SD14 and Policy INF3 of the Joint Core Strategy, Adoption Version 2017, Policy SR2, ST3 and BE21 of the Gloucester City Council Revised Deposit Local Plan 2002 and guidance within the Planning Policy Guidance and the NPPF

Refusal Reason 2

The layout of the proposal constitutes poor design in that it proposes to site the multi-use games area and playing pitches in close proximity to neighbouring dwellings and therefore is likely to result in unacceptable noise and general disturbance for residents of nearby dwellings. Therefore it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policies SD4 and SD14 of the Joint Core Strategy, Adoption Version 2017 and Policies ST7, BE4, BE7, BE21 and FRP10 of Gloucester City Council Revised Deposit Local Plan 2002, and contrary to the Gloucester City Council Supplementary Planning Guidance "New Housing and Open Space and the guidance and principles set down within the Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Refusal Reason 3

The applicant has provided insufficient information relating to the proposed external lighting details and therefore on this basis, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed lighting would not have a harmful effect upon ecology or residential amenity and is therefore contrary to policies SD9, SD4 and SD14, of the Joint Core Strategy, Adoption Version 2017 and policies B2, BE21 and FRP 9 of the City of Gloucester Revised Deposit Local Plan 2002 and the guidance and principles set down within the Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason For Refusal 4

The applicant has provided insufficient information relating to the proposed level changes across the site and there are also discrepancies between plans and therefore on this basis, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed levels would not result in surface water run off to neighbouring properties and is therefore contrary to policies INF2, SD4 and SD14, of the Joint Core Strategy, Adoption Version 2017 and policies FRP6 and BE21 of the City of Gloucester

Revised Deposit Local Plan 2002 and the guidance and principles set down within the Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason For Refusal 5

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the comings and goings associated with vehicles entering, leaving and manoeuvring within the car park would not cause unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to residents of neighbouring dwellings. Therefore the proposal is contrary to policies SD4 and SD14 of the Joint Core Strategy, Adoption Version 2017 and policies ST7, BE4, BE7, BE21 and FRP10 of the City of Gloucester Revised Deposit Local Plan 2002 and the guidance and principles set down within the Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.