



PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING : Tuesday, 7th June 2022

PRESENT : Cllrs. Taylor (Chair), Morgan (Vice-Chair), Bhaimia, D. Brown, J. Brown, Dee, Sawyer and Toleman

Officers in Attendance

Planning Development Manager
Chief Planning Lawyer, One Legal
Highways Officer, Gloucestershire County Council
Democratic and Electoral Services Officer

Also in Attendance

Councillor Patel
Design & Planning Executive, Taylor Wimpy
Local Resident

APOLOGIES : Cllrs. Conder, Finnegan, Melvin and Tracey

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Councillors Taylor and Morgan were confirmed as Chair and Vice-Chair of the committee respectively.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED that: - the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 1 March 2022 were approved and signed as a correct record by the Chair.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. LATE MATERIAL

Late material had been circulated in respect of Agenda Item 6, Land Adjoining Naas Lane (22/00355/REM).

PLANNING COMMITTEE
07.06.22

5. LAND ADJOINING NAAS LANE, QUEDGELEY, GLOUCESTER - 22/00355/REM

The Planning Development Manager presented the report detailing a reserved matters application for approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 97 dwellings, provision of Green Infrastructure including surface water attenuation and play space and other related infrastructure including foul water pumping station (pursuant to outline planning permission ref.18/01228/OUT).

A Design & Planning Executive representing Taylor Wimpey addressed the committee in support of the application.

She stated that the application should be granted on the following grounds:

- The application was developed in line with the approved site master plan agreed upon at the outline stage;
- The application respected the character of the area;
- Of the 97 proposed dwellings, 24 would be affordable housing. This amounted to 25% of properties, which was in accordance with the S106 agreement. - The application was well designed;
- The application would provide 200 car parking spaces;
- Each 4-bedroom property would have at least three car parking spaces, three bedroomed properties would have at least two parking spaces and so on;
- The application would provide a well-equipped play area;
- Sufficient green infrastructure would be provided;
- Private and secure cycle storage would be provided for the dwellings;
- Each home would have a 7.2 k/w electric vehicle charging point;

The Planning Development Manager responded to Members' questions concerning concerns raised about the lack of bungalows proposed, whether there would be electric vehicle charging points, the distance between the pumping station and the neighbouring properties, the time of the publication of the late material, questions about the public right of way and private drive, whether Brooklyn Villas would be accessed by vehicle, whether there would be a Showman's Guild site within the site, what the main concerns were regarding the representations made in the late material and whether Severn Trent had approved the water pumping station as follows:

- There was no specific policy that stipulated a requirement of a certain number of bungalows. However, there was a policy regarding housing mix, which depended on the application size.
- Regarding wheelchair provision, there was a policy within the City Plan which tied in with the affordable housing policy. Out of the total builds, 25% of dwellings must be a category M4(2) dwelling. These were dwellings which made reasonable provisions for most people to access and included features that made them suitable for adaption for a range of potential occupants, including some wheelchair users. 4% of dwellings needed to be a category M4(3) dwelling which was a wheelchair user dwelling. The provision of one bungalow met this 4% threshold.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
07.06.22

- The Housing Officer was satisfied that the application was compliant with policy and met the local area's needs.
- Electric vehicle charging points were being provided. - Regarding late material, for this particular application, the relevant Planning Officer specifically consulted the residents who had previously made representations to inform them that the application was going before the committee, and that the objectors had requested that their letters were published in full.
- The public right of way fell within and continued beyond the site and had been considered at the outline stage. It was common that public rights of way went across private land. The applicant proposed to make upgrades to the public right of way and a minor diversion in one corner. Condition 8 listed in the late material stipulated that no development would start until specifications of the surface improvements to the public right of way were provided. The improvements to the public right of way were a bonus.
- The reserved matters application was only for the approval of appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale. - Brooklyn Villas would be accessed by vehicle. An additional access point was included in the outline permission to provide residents with alternative access.
- There was not a Showman's Guild site as part of the application. The Planning Brief for Land East of Waterwells Business Park produced in 2009, listed in paragraph 3.7 of the report, included the wider site and generally had been superseded. It was still a planning document, but now had very limited weight.
- The representations circulated in the late material argued against the development on numerous grounds. His view was that the majority went to the principle of development and determinations made at the outline stage.
- He could not say the exact distance of the Pumping Station to the closest property, but it appeared to be more than 20 metres away from any dwelling.
 - The pumping station had been approved by Severn Trent Water. He was unsure exactly where the water would be pumped to, but confirmed that this would have been considered by the relevant professionals.

Members' Debate

The Vice-Chair stated that he believed there were matters raised by residents in the late material that required addressing. He added that he was unsure whether he would vote in line with the officer's recommendation.

The Chair stated that he agreed with concerns raised regarding the publication date of the late material for the committee meeting and that he would follow this matter up for future committee meetings with Gloucester City Council's Democratic Services Team and the Planning Development Manager.

The Chair moved, and Councillor D. Brown seconded the officer's recommendation as amended in the late material:

PLANNING COMMITTEE
07.06.22

RESOLVED that: - approval of the reserved matters of layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the report and amended in the late material.

6. 50 SALISBURY ROAD, GLOUCESTER - 22/00051/FUL

The Planning Development Manager presented the report detailing an application for the erection of a single storey rear extension and rear dormer window to facilitate the use of the dwelling as a 6-bedroom HMO.

A local resident addressed the committee in opposition to the application.

He objected to the application on the following grounds:

- The area already suffered from noise pollution; the granting of the application would add to this;
- Local residents objected to the application;
- The dwelling would be densely populated; - Whilst the application was for six persons, it would not be confined to six people as couples would live there;
- The granting of the application would exacerbate anti-social behaviour that had been combatted recently;
- Parking issues;
- There was continuous traffic on Salisbury Road, the granting of the application would further contribute to this;
- The proposed dwelling was inadequate for six occupants.

Councillor Patel addressed the committee in opposition to the application.

He objected to the application on the following grounds:

- His ward was the most densely populated in the City of Gloucester, the granting of the application would set a dangerous precedent and would add to this issue;
- There were parking issues already. Should the application receive consent, this issue would become worse;
- There was a reference to Conduit Street from the Highways Authority in the report, when the application was for Salisbury Road;
- There was an issue with fly-tipping within the area, and the addition of an extra five persons to the street would contribute to the worsening of this issue;
- Anti-social behavioural issues.

The Planning Development Manager responded to Members' questions concerning what would happen if more than six people moved into the HMO, the percentage of HMOs allowed in an area, how many people could live in the property and why the application was before committee when it benefitted from permitted development rights as follows:

PLANNING COMMITTEE
07.06.22

- The application had not already received permitted development approval. However, it benefitted from permitted development rights.
- If more than six persons lived in the property, it would then require planning permission as it would be regarded as a large HMO, which required permission. - The applicant would require a specific licence, separate from planning permission, that deals with aspects such as cooking and beds. Six couples could not fit into the property owing to its size.
- There was to be a maximum of 10% of intensified properties (large HMOs or buildings converted into flats) in an area according to policy. However, this was not a relevant policy for the application before the committee, as the application was for a small HMO.
- It was possible that eight persons could fit within the property based on the size of the bedrooms, but there would be licensing issues that arose from that. Further, that was not a planning consideration as the application before the committee was for six persons.
- He was unsure why the applicant applied for planning permission as it benefitted from permitted development rights.
- The agent was advised that the conversion could be completed under permitted development. However, the applicant chose not to follow that advice. - It was before the committee and not a delegated decision because two local Ward Councillors called it in.

The Highways Officer responded to a question from a Member concerning the reference to Conduit Street in the report as follows:

- The reference to Conduit Street was a clerical error.

Members' Debate

The Vice-Chair stated that he sympathised with the concerns the local resident raised in his speech. However, he added that he believed there were no planning reasons for refusal and that there were licensing means that could control activity to ensure that more than six persons did not occupy the dwelling.

Councillor Bhaimia stated that his main worry was that anti-social behaviour and flytipping was already common in the area and that granting an application to make the area more densely populated would contribute further to this. He said that there was already no capacity for vehicles to park in the area and that the area was not as pleasant now as it used to be.

Councillor D.Brown stated that he was perplexed that the application had made it to the Committee stage. He said that he also had sympathy with the concerns raised by the local resident but that he saw no reason for refusal, particularly as the proposed conversion benefitted from permitted development rights.

The Chair moved, and the Vice-Chair seconded the officer's recommendation:

RESOLVED that: - planning permission is granted subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE
07.06.22**

7. DELEGATED DECISIONS

The schedule of applications determined under delegated powers during the month of February, March and April 2022 was noted.

RESOLVED that: - the schedule be noted.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday 5 July 2022.

Time of commencement: 6.00 pm

Time of conclusion: 7.06 pm

Chair