



PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING : Tuesday, 7th December 2021

PRESENT : Cllrs. Morgan (Vice-Chair), Ackroyd, Bhaimia, D. Brown, J. Brown, Conder, Dee, Finnegan, Melvin, Toleman and Tracey

Officers in Attendance

Head of Place

Planning Development Manager

Principal Planning Officer

Highways Officer, Gloucestershire County Council

Highways Officer, Gloucestershire County Council

Senior Lawyer, One Legal

Democratic & Electoral Services Officer

APOLOGIES : Cllrs. Taylor and A.Chambers (Ackroyd attended as a substitute)

45. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR

Councillor Morgan was confirmed as Vice-Chair of the Committee.

46. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

47. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 2nd of November 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Vice-Chair as a correct record.

48. LATE MATERIAL

Late Material had been circulated in respect of agenda item 6 – Kingsway Local Centre (18/00852/FUL).

49. KINGSWAY LOCAL CENTRE, THATCHAM AVENUE, KINGSWAY, QUEDGELEY, GLOUCESTER - 18/00852/FUL

PLANNING COMMITTEE
07.12.21

This application had been deferred at the October 2021 meeting of the Planning Committee.

The Principal Planning Officer provided an overview of the planning issues and an update on the application for the erection of a new building to provide 22 self-contained units of supported living accommodation and associated works, including car and cycle parking and landscaping.

The Principal Planning Officer summarised the contents of the late material which included a representation from a local ward member, a summary of a 55-page statement by a local resident and additional consultee responses from the Noise Advisers (WRS) and the Ecology Adviser.

She noted that there was a slight error in the late material, whereby the updated conditions listed as conditions 18, 19 and 20 respectively should have been listed as numbers 19, 20 and 21. She stated that the officer recommendation was to grant the application with the additional conditions in the late material and the updating of these condition numbers.

She noted that, as discussed at October's Committee meeting, the level of noise in the area was deemed acceptable by the Noise Advisers (WRS) and that background noise levels would have to increase significantly to result in any harm.

The Principal Planning Officer stated that in relation to concerns raised about crime in the area by members at October's Committee, that the most up to date figures that she could find, which contained a ward by ward analysis (paragraph 1.9 of the report), showed that Kingsway had a below City average amount of both anti-social behaviour and total crime rates per 1,000 people in Gloucester.

She confirmed that following the deferral at October's Committee after the discovery of Newts on-site, the applicant had applied to Nature Space who had issued a certificate that confirmed that the development could be considered under the Councils District License, that works were acceptable in principle and set out conditions that must be adhered to. She added that additional conditions in the late material set out that before the commencement of any ground works/vegetation removal, an ecologist should inspect the site for non-protected species, including newts, toads and hedgehogs to ensure that proper provision was made to safeguard species.

Councillor Kubaszczyk, a local ward member for Kingsway, addressed the Planning Committee in opposition to the application.

He objected to the application on the following grounds:

- The Crime Rates provided in the officer report were out of date. He stated that he had contacted Quedgeley's Neighbourhood Policing Team who had provided updated figures that showed a significant increase of anti-social behavioural incidents since 2018;
- There had been almost a 40% increase in recorded cases of crime in the area since 2018;
- The number of recorded anti-social behavioural instances had doubled in Kingsway since 2019;
- Incidents of anti-social behaviour in the surrounding area could have a detrimental impact on the quality of life of the potential residents;
- The Committee should listen to local stakeholders' opposition to the application.

The Head of Development for Advance Housing addressed the Planning Committee in support of the application.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

07.12.21

He stated that the application should be granted for the following reasons:

- Advance Housing had been providing high-quality specialist supported housing since 1974;
- Advance Housing was already well-established in Gloucestershire;
- Granting the application would provide high quality, self-contained accommodation for those with enduring mental health conditions;
- The proposed build was well located and close to nearby amenities;
- The current accommodation that prospective residents currently used was not sufficient and was often shared accommodation;
- The proposed build would be sustainable for the long term;
- Support for the residents would be provided by a well-established provider;
- Each tenant would have a robust support plan;
- A support team would be on-site for 24 hours a day;
- There were currently over 120 persons with mental health difficulties in Gloucestershire who needed to move from unsuitable housing. The granting of the application would help to combat this;
- Advance Housing would ensure that the outdoor space would be maintained to a high standard.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to members' questions concerning the qualifications the staff on-site would have, the number of staff that would be on-site, whether there could be discussions with the developer about introducing storage facilities for mobility scooters, concerns raised about the proposed 1.8 metre fence, the reasonings to why the application was before Committee and whether Gloucestershire Constabulary had been consulted as follows:

- There would be staff on-site 24/7. She could not give an exact number of staff on-site at all times, as it would be dependent on the need of the residents. She was unsure as to what specific qualifications the staff would have.
- The Care Commission had provided a lot of information regarding staffing. The level of care would be determined on a case to case basis, and each individual would have a robust risk management plan. On planning grounds, they could not ask for more information about the exact number of staff on-site.
- Specific storage for Mobility Scooters was not a general requirement for Planning, and there was no policy that required it to be provided. However, the developer could be contacted and asked about whether they could extend the proposed cycle storage area or some alternative to allow for room for mobility scooters to be stored.
- The application was initially considered at the August 2021 meeting of the Planning Committee. There was a request by members for an updated Noise Impact Assessment and an updated Traffic Survey. The application was then brought back in October and was deferred after Newtons were discovered on-site. The Committee had not yet determined the application.
- The proposed 1.8 metre fence would be at the rear garden. It would be built partly to secure the boundary but was also required acoustically as a barrier to noise. The applicant had provided a detailed landscaping scheme, and whilst the fence would be visible from outside the south side of the site, within the boundary of the garden, there would be planting to soften the view. The boundary treatments to the front and side would be similar to existing with the use of low post and rail fence with additional planting.
- Gloucestershire Constabulary had not been consulted.

Members' Debate

PLANNING COMMITTEE
07.12.21

Councillor Conder stated that regarding Newts that were discovered on-site, she believed that no matter what development took place on-site, they would require moving. She said that her research had shown that the areas that should be avoided when it came to building accommodation for people with mental health needs were estates with a young population, sites that were too close to sport and recreational facilities and sites that were too close to main roads. She stated that she believed it was an excellent proposal but was in the wrong location.

Councillor Finnegan noted that she believed that it was a good development but in the wrong location.

Councillor Melvin stated that her main concern was a representation by the School Governors of the local school, which noted that some parents would remove their children from the school, should the application receive consent. She stated that she believed that the application was in the wrong location.

Councillor Toleman stated that he was concerned whether anyone would ever say such developments were in the right place and that he supported the officer's recommendation.

Councillor D.Brown stated that it was a difficult one. He said that he understood concerns raised but that various experts had looked at the application and had made a professional judgement. He stated that he would probably support the application on balance.

Councillor Bhaimia stated that he believed that it was a good application. He stated that he thought that it was well designed and would provide good accommodation to persons which mental health needs. He said that he would support the officer's recommendation.

Councillor Ackroyd raised concerns that the residents would be enclosed with the construction of the 1.8 metre fence and questioned whether the fence would block the visibility of nearby shops who may lose trade because of it.

Councillor Dee raised concerns about the building design and questioned whether it was in keeping with the local area.

Councillor D. Brown proposed, and Councillor Bhaimia seconded the officer's recommendation to grant permission subject to the conditions set out in the update report and additional conditions outlined in the late material with the corrected numerical sequencing.

RESOLVED that: - subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to provide the following:

- The use and continued use of the building as supported housing.
- Nomination rights to the Local Authority (Gloucester City Council and Gloucestershire County Council) in relation to new occupants.
- Management of the use by a registered care provider from the County Councils approved framework.

That planning permission is granted subject to the conditions set out in the update report and the additional conditions outlined in the late material with the corrected condition numbers and the provision of some mobility storage to be discussed with the applicant.

50. DELEGATED DECISIONS

PLANNING COMMITTEE
07.12.21

The schedule of applications determined under delegated powers during the month of October 2021 was noted.

51. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, 4th January 2022.

Time of commencement: 6.00 pm

Time of conclusion: 7.07 pm

Chair