



PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING : Tuesday, 4th February 2020

PRESENT : Cllrs. Taylor (Chair), Lewis (Vice-Chair), D. Brown, J. Brown, Dee, Hansdot, Hyman, Lugg, Toleman and Walford

Officers in Attendance

Technical Planning Manager

Principal Planning Officer

Solicitor, One Legal

Highways Development Manager, Gloucestershire County Council

Democratic and Electoral Services Officer

APOLOGIES : Cllrs. Derbyshire and Finnegan

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Derbyshire and Councillor Finnegan.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 5, Manor Gardens, Barnwood Road Gloucester - 19/00672/FUL and Agenda Item 6, 32 Hayward Close, Gloucester - 19/01127/FUL. He left the meeting and did not participate in any aspect of these applications.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 3rd December 2019 were confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4. LATE MATERIAL

Late material had been circulated in respect of item 5 (19/00672/FUL).

5. MANOR GARDENS, BARNWOOD ROAD GLOUCESTER - 19/00672/FUL

PLANNING COMMITTEE
04.02.20

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report detailing an application for the Demolition of existing housing (23 units) and redevelopment of site to provide 46 new build dwellings (16 no. 1 bedroom apartments, 24 no. 2 bedroom apartments, 4 no. 3 bedroom houses and 2 no. 3 bedroom bungalows), formation of new access to North Upton Lane and provision of parking, landscaping, external works and stores for bikes, refuse, plant etc.

Gordon Etherington, a local resident, addressed the Committee in opposition to the application.

Mr Etherington stated that the application was 'totally unsympathetic to the environmental and historical aspects of the site and surrounding areas' and therefore, the application should be rejected or deferred.

He stated that the area currently has low-level bungalows and the proposed builds would be of a high level and density with several 2 storey and apartment blocks. He added that the 'design and construction' would not blend in with the surroundings.

Mr Etherington said that Gloucester City Council's Principal Environmental Officer opposed the application as it conflicted with Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework and its granting would be contrary to the requirements of section 16 and the Statutory Duty of section 66(1) of the 1990 act.

He said that the design approach was also contrary to policies SD4 and SD10 of the JCS and section 12 of the NPPF as the size and scale of the builds would be unreflective of the surrounding properties.

Mr Etherington noted that the site was mainly for those with a disability. He said that considering that this was the case, he did not understand why most of the car parking spaces were on the 'extremities of the site' and not where they were needed.

He concluded by stating that he 'respectfully requested' that the proposal in its current form was rejected or deferred as certain aspects were contrary to several national policy issues, concerning the environmental, social and historical nature of the site.

Lawrence Miller, the Programmes Director for Barnwood Trust, addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Mr Miller stated that Barnwood Trust assisted people with physical and mental disabilities. He added that Barnwood Trust wanted to create the best 'possible vision'.

He said that it was difficult for disabled people to find suitable housing. He stated that in Gloucester, there were currently 150 families with a disabled person waiting for a Wheelchair ramp to their home. He added that only 142 homes in Gloucester were properly wheelchair accessible.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
04.02.20

Mr Miller stated that the accommodation proposed was 'care ready' and prioritised the needs of residents. He said that 50% of the schemes would have subsidised rent. He said that the proposal maximised the use of light and green space which would be conducive to good 'health and wellbeing'. He added that the landscape increased permeability and would help to create a sense of belonging for the community.

Mr Miller said that he had listened to local concerns and decreased density as a response to these concerns. He stated that the flats that would be demolished if the application was granted did not meet the requisite standard.

Mr Miller stated that 75% of the proposed new housing would cater to those with physical or mental disabilities. He added that 12 of the properties would be available for non-disabled residents.

Mr Miller concluded by saying that the proposal would meet the needs of the most vulnerable and that it was an exemplar scheme.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to Members' questions as follows:

- In respect of the reference to 3-storey buildings, the landscape advisor was looking at the wider locality beyond the application site.
- The boundary wall on Upton Lane would be at a similar height as the highest point of the ground floor of the proposed new buildings.

Members Debate:

Councillor Lugg expressed her surprise at the mix of tenants that would move into the property. She believed that the buildings were too tall and that it had too many walkways, especially considering the reduced mobility of many of the residents that would move into the site. She said that the area also had a 'historical significance', particularly from a psychiatric perspective, and that the important poet Ivor Gurney had been treated there. She stated that the area to the east of Barnwood Road was impossible to turn down during rush hour and that the proposed build would contribute further to this problem.

The Highways Development Manager responded that Barnwood Road has 'some issues' but that broadly speaking, the proposal would not add much to the traffic during rush hour.

Councillor Joanne Brown stated that she knew the area well. She noted that there had been one submission in favour of the application and plenty against it. She expressed her disappointment that the site visit had not taken place prior to the meeting.

Councillor David Brown said that he also knew the area well. He stated that he recognised that Barnwood Trust did excellent work. He said that he had seen the

PLANNING COMMITTEE
04.02.20

site plan develop, had gone to public consultations and listened to the concerns of local residents. He stated that there had been a long list of objections raised by residents, many that he agreed with, though they were not all necessarily planning issues. He said that he wanted to focus on the highways issues concerning the proposed application. Councillor David Brown said that there was an Aldi supermarket on the opposite side of the staggered crossroad, which was a problematic area for pedestrians, mainly because there was not a push-button for crossing there.

Councillor David Brown stated that North Upton Lane was already busy without extra additions. He noted that the report had a condition to remove bollards to allow for full access for mobility scooters. Councillor David Brown said that the bollards were there initially to stop vehicles turning left onto Barnwood Road and the pavement. He stated that he was also 'disappointed' that there had not been a site visit arranged. He concluded by saying that he was 'torn' on the issue as he was aware of the excellent work Barnwood Trust do but was particularly concerned about potential problems regarding the crossing at North Upton Lane going into Barnwood Road.

Councillor Lewis responded that the issues regarding crossing did not necessarily come under the planning application. He added that he agreed that there should be a site visit and suggested that the application could be deferred until there was a site visit.

Councillor Dee stated that the amenities of the area could be improved.

In response to Members' concerns, the Highways Development Manager advised that there was an individual perception of what was safe and what was not safe. He said that there was not enough car, pedestrian or scooter trips based on the application that would warrant looking at the issues of signalling. He added that Gloucestershire Highways had ensured that the proposed application was DDA compliant.

Councillor Toleman stated that he was surprised that the highways authority raised no objections.

Councillor Lugg stated that councillors needed to see the bungalows at the site to fully understand the effect that a two-storey development would have on the look of the area.

Councillor Lugg proposed to defer the application until a site visit was arranged, Councillor Joanne Brown seconded her proposal.

RESOLVED THAT: - Planning permission be deferred, so a site visit could be arranged to allow for full consideration of the application.

6. 32 HAYWARD CLOSE, GLOUCESTER - 19/01127/FUL

The Technical Planning Manager presented the report detailing an application for a Single and two storey rear extension.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
04.02.20

Members Debate:

Councillor Hyman stated that the report noted that neighbours were notified about the extension and that no one raised any concerns. He stated that this suggested that there were no objections to the application.

The Vice Chair moved, and Councillor Lugg seconded the Officer's recommendation.

RESOLVED that: - Planning permission be granted.

7. DELEGATED DECISIONS

The schedule of applications determined under delegated powers during the month of December 2019 was noted.

RESOLVED that: - The schedule be noted.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 3rd of March 2020 at 6pm.

Time of commencement: 18:00pm

Time of conclusion: 18:57pm

Chair