



PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING : Tuesday, 5th December 2023

PRESENT : Cllrs. Taylor (Chair), Morgan (Vice-Chair), D. Brown, J. Brown, Campbell, Conder, Dee, Gravells MBE, Sawyer, Toleman and Tracey

Officers in Attendance

Planning Development Manager

Principal Planning Officer

Senior Planning Officer

Highways Officer, Gloucestershire County Council

Chief Planning Lawyer, One Legal

Democratic and Electoral Services Officer

APOLOGIES : Cllr. A. Chambers

45. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

46. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on Tuesday 7th November 2023 were confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

47. LATE MATERIAL

Late Material had been circulated in respect of Agenda Item 5 – (RAOB Club - 23/00696/OUT) and 6 (Great Western Road - 22/00770/FUL).

48. RAOB CLUB, 87 - 91 SOUTHGATE STREET, GLOUCESTER - 23/00696/OUT

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report detailing an outline application for the demolition of former RAOB Social Club and redevelopment of the site to provide 17 residential flats and associated landscaping and external works. (landscaping

PLANNING COMMITTEE
05.12.23

reserved) Revision to extant consented scheme comprising 14 units (17/00658/OUT).

Members' Questions

The Principal Planning Officer responded to Members' questions concerning the length of time before the previous application was consented, the difference between the application before the Committee and the one that had previously received planning consent, concerns about three of the flats and whether they would be used for their purported affordable housing purpose, why the dwellings did not meet national design space standards (NDSS), whether the applicant would still have the 2019 permission to build properties in the event of a refusal, whether local history was taken into account by officers and whether the street numbering team could be contacted to reflect that, whether the applicant proposed to include glazing, if the Whitesmiths Arms required repairs and concerns about bin storage as follows:

- The legal agreement in respect of the provision application required a considerable duration to finalise.
- Landscaping was the sole reserved matter not encompassed within the application.
- The application under the Committee's consideration proposed only three alterations: the addition of three units on the second floor, the inclusion of affordable housing units on site and M4(2) units on the site.
- The applicant was in talks with a Registered Social Landlord (RSL). If, after a year they could not sell the 3 affordable dwellings, then an offsite contribution would be required.
- Most of the dwellings did not meet NDSS standards. None of the dwellings in the previous application met NDSS standards and had received consent as this policy had not been implemented by the Council until 2020 and was not in the adopted plan until January 2023. The additional three flats met NDSS standards.
- The original permission to build 14 dwellings would still be in effect, in the event of a refusal.
- Local history was taken into accounts by relevant officers.
- The officer could email the street numbering team. However, it would not form part of the planning resolution.
- The applicant had not offered to provide solar panels. However, there was a condition that stipulated that details of the proposed glazing and ventilation products must be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before construction commences and these windows would have to be well-glazed, owing to the noise in the area. This would ensure that the properties were well insulated.
- The Whitesmiths Arms did require repairs. The Conservation Officer had worked closely with the relevant staff from Whitesmiths on this.
- The Waste Management Team were content with the bin storage provision.

Members' Debate

PLANNING COMMITTEE
05.12.23

The Chair noted that he was happy to see the affordable housing put on site.

Councillor J. Brown observed that concerning the size of the units, a comparable development at the Post House in Barnwood had been successful despite the compact nature of its dwellings. She expressed confidence that the current application would achieve similar success.

The Chair moved and the Vice-Chair seconded the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED that: outline planning permission is granted for outline consent subject to a S106 with the following Heads of Terms and the conditions outlined in the officer report.

- Cotswold Beechwoods SAC contribution
- Contribution of £2,000 for Alney Island SAC and householder information pack.
- 3 Affordable housing units (onsite – if they cannot be sold to a RSL after a specific period of time then an offsite contribution will be required).
- Contribution of £10,000 to amend Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to exclude residents of the proposed development from obtaining permits in the residents parking scheme of zone GC.

49. GREAT WESTERN ROAD YARD/SIDINGS - 22/00770/FUL

The Principal Planning Officer presented the update report detailing an application for residential development of 315 dwellings (comprised of apartment blocks and houses) and formation of new accesses, with associated landscaping, parking, open space and ancillary works including demolition of existing buildings.

A local resident spoke in opposition to the application.

He said that he had concerns in respect of the application on the following grounds:

- About thermal design and whether the site could reach net zero.
- Heat pumps could interfere with each other.
- The current design meant that there would be additional cost and complexity for air source heat pumps.
- The design had not been completely thought through.

A director of Eutopia Homes spoke in favour of the application.

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

- Officers had recommended approval.
- The proposal only sought to make minor amendments.
- The application would provide 315 new homes on an allocated, centrally located brownfield site.
- The applicant had had advanced discussions with a housing association which has got grant funding.
- An energy strategy had been submitted with the application.
- The site would provide 35% affordable housing, this was above the policy requirement of 20%.

PLANNING COMMITTEE
05.12.23

Members' Questions

The Principal Planning Officer responded to Members' questions concerning whether there would be traffic lights installed on Great Western Road, whether there would be a pedestrian crossing on Great Western Road, whether there would be batteries attached to the solar panels, further details about the updated energy strategy, questions about relocating modular housing in future to areas of need, and questions about traffic congestion on Great Western Road and London Road, construction traffic and parking provision as follows:

- Traffic lights were not proposed on Great Western Road.
- The energy strategy provided by the applicant suggested that they would provide houses with batteries with solar panels .
- Questions about whether to provide a pedestrian crossing on Great Western Road had been discussed in depth when the application had previously gone before committee, it had been resolved then to approve the application without it.
- The energy report provided by the applicant evidenced that they were aspirational in relation to their energy efficiency targets.
- There was some complexity regarding the affordable housing situation. The developer contribution was secured (26 units in block D) in the heads of terms for the legal agreement. However, as this was lower than the City Council's policy (20%), the legal agreement would oblige the applicant to look for public subsidies. This was why a housing association had been sourced by the applicant. Therefore, with the combined developer contribution and housing association, the total percentage of affordable units would be 35%.
- In theory, modular units could potentially be relocated, however, this would require a separate planning application, and may not be straightforward due to ownership issues, etc.
- The applicant had submitted a travel plan. The heads of terms for the legal agreement would secure payment to amend the traffic regulation order in relation to the controlled parking zone to address resident permit parking concerns.
- The adopted City Plan allocated the site for 300 units. Whilst this was not planning permission, it indicated that 300 units was acceptable on that land. The low number of parking spaces was lower than what might have been submitted alongside an application for 315 dwellings.
- There would be a construction management plan that would be subject to Highway Authority input and might specify a number of construction traffic entrances, given the existing accesses, if they were considered suitable for such traffic. Further, because the builds would be modular, there would be fewer construction movements overall to and from the site than a regular development.

The Highways Officer responded to Members' questions concerning the volume of traffic the application would create and whether cars would park on the road as follows:

PLANNING COMMITTEE
05.12.23

- The traffic generation from the site would be between 40-50 two-way movements at peak time per day, this was not substantial.
- The application site was in a highly sustainable location. The bus station was about 500 metres away, there were numerous bus stops in the area, and the train station was a close walk away. Further, a high amount of bike storage would be provided. It was not uncommon for some city centre developments in the country to have no parking spaces provided.

The Chief Planning Lawyer responded to a Member's question concerning whether modular properties could be moved as follows:

- There was a full planning application for permanent development and for the modular constructed properties to be moved a new planning application would have to be sought.

Members' Debate

The Chair stated that he believed the application was positive and was content with the addition of affordable units.

Councillor Conder stated that she believed it was positive that modular construction would be used. She stated her belief that if the properties were properly insulated, this would perform well even without the proposed heat pumps.

Councillor Gravells stated that he had some reservations about the application, specifically in relation to where residents would park. He noted that he would contact the Hospital and ask why they did not raise an objection or support the application. He added that he hoped that the application would not block ambulances getting to and from the hospital.

The Chair moved and the Vice-Chair seconded the recommendation laid out in the report as amended in the late material.

RESOLVED that: planning permission is granted subject to the completion of a legal agreement/s to secure the terms set out at Paragraph 6.158 of the February 2023 Committee Report and delegated Authority being given to the Planning Development Manager to negotiate the s106 terms to suit; and; the conditions outlined in the February 2023 Committee Report as amended in the February 2023 late material and as further amended in the current December 2023 late material.

50. DELEGATED DECISIONS

RESOLVED that the delegated decisions for October 2023 were noted.

51. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday 9th January 2024.

Time of commencement: 6.00 pm

PLANNING COMMITTEE
05.12.23

Time of conclusion: 7.15 pm

Chair