

**LATE MATERIAL (APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION)**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE: 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2019**

**ITEM 5 – LAND SOUTH OF GRANGE ROAD 18/00511/REM**

**Additional Consultation Response**

Severn Trent

Since completion of the officer's report the following confirmation has been received:

I can advise we have no objections to the discharge of the drainage related condition. To confirm; all foul sewage is to discharge to the public foul sewer. Surface water from detention basin B is to discharge to the public 300mm surface water sewer at a proposed discharge rate of 5.8 litres/second. I can advise we have no objections to these connections, subject to a formal application to connect (please see further down email for details).

Surface water from detention basin A is to discharge to the highway drain and then to the nearby brook at a proposed discharge rate of 5.8 litres/second; this would need to be agreed with the Highways Agency and the LLFA, we would have no comment to make.

Please note for the use or reuse of sewer connections either direct or indirect to the public sewerage system the applicant will be required to make a formal application to the Company under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. They may obtain copies of our current guidance notes and application form from either our website ([www.stwater.co.uk](http://www.stwater.co.uk)) or by contact our Development Services Team (Tel: 0800 707 6600). Please provide a copy of this email when making your application.

It is considered that these comments respond fully to the questions raised and forms the update referred to in paragraph 6.26 of the officer's report. With the comments already received from the LLFA and Drainage Officer, the latest comments from Severn Trent do not alter the officer's conclusion or recommendation.

**ITEM 6 – LAND AT WINNYCROFT LANE/CORNCROFT LANE 18/01141/REM**

**Additional Consultation Responses**

County Highway Authority

No further comments have been received.

Open Space Adviser

Comments upon amended plans received on 25<sup>th</sup> March

I am concerned at

- The proposed repositioning of the NEAP area.
- Some areas have been provided with 0.3 metre high knee rails. However other areas are still vulnerable to unauthorised access from vehicles
- Updated planting plans still need to be considered.

#### Drainage Adviser

Whilst further plans and information have been submitted, there are still some issues of concern and further changes and clarification would be required before the drainage proposals can be considered to be acceptable and resolved.

#### Report section 6.33 Drainage Issues

As per the comments of the Drainage Adviser above.

#### Report section 6.33 Drainage Issues

Some indicative designs of the pumping station have been submitted however the full extent of above ground works have not yet been finalised. This could be dealt with by condition and depending upon the proposals, further planting to its boundaries required.

#### Report section 6.37 Boundary treatments

Some areas have been provided with 0.3 metre high knee rails. However other areas are still vulnerable to unauthorised access from vehicles and further fencing and some bollards will be required.

#### Report section 6.52 Ecology

The ecological details are still being considered by the Councils Ecology Adviser.

#### Report section 6.53 Materials for the community building

These are now detailed as one of the red bricks but with the slate style roof tile that Officers have said is unacceptable. A condition would be required for alternative materials to be submitted.

#### Report section 6.50 Amended details to the play area, hedge removal and MUGA spec

Some changes have been made however the latest proposals now seek to relocate the play area. This is not what was requested and there is concern that this location is less well related to the pitches, is more isolated and may result in anti social activities. However the applicant has now stated that they would be prepared to move the play area back to its original position.

## **Additional Representations**

Generally we are supportive of the proposal, but note that the footpath adjacent to plot 409 has not been added.

## **Recommendation**

There is no change proposed to the recommendation.

**That, Approval be delegated to the Technical Planning Manager subject to the satisfactory resolution of the outstanding matters relating to the principal issues of highways, drainage and ecology, the minor issues referred to in the report and the addition of conditions as appropriate:**

## **ITEM 7 – COLWELL AVENUE 19/0091/FUL**

### **Additional Consultation Response**

#### Highway Authority

Further to the original consultee response the following clarification has been received from the Local Highways Authority in response to the queries raised:

1. How will traffic flows be affected by this application?

The LHA do not consider that the proposed use will be more intensive in regards to vehicle movements, than the existing use of the garages and detailed within the Transport Statement to which is considered sound.

2. Congestion will arise from the development and use of the scout hut. These issues need to be resolved.

See Transport Statement section 4 and 5.

3. The development will affect our ability to reverse vehicles safely out of our driveway.

As stated in the Highway Code It's an offence to reverse onto a highway, vehicles should reverse into parking bays as to leave in a forward gear.

4. There are a lot of cars that currently use the site for the scouts hut and church. Where will these vehicles now park?

The displaced vehicles from the 10 garages worst case could park within a 200m radius of the site on street as no parking restrictions are present and this is an existing situation.

5. The vehicle survey is not an accurate portrayal. It is unrepresentative of the movements in and out of the site at busy times.

Is there any evidence to support this?

6. On Sundays the Church park vehicles on their car park, the scout hut car park and the area between the garages. The proposal will remove most of the parking and therefore cause congestion. If these plans were passed there would likely be indiscriminate parking on the surrounding roadways posing a highways safety issue.

Obstruction is a police matter and not a planning consideration, as previously stated space is available on street as this is an already occurring situation.

7. I have concerns about the safety of dropping off and collecting my children from the scout hut.

The LHA have no safety concerns in regards to the proposed layout as displayed on plan ref: 5962-P-11C.

8. The amount of parking for the bungalows is excessive.

Gloucestershire does not currently have parking provision standards, parking provision would therefore be assessed against Paragraphs 105 and 106 of the NPPF2018 with consideration given to the accessibility of the development, the type use and nature of development, the availability of, and opportunity for sustainable transport, local car ownership levels and the need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. Further consideration should be given to the DCLG Residential Car Parking Research Document. The spaces should comply with the minimum dimensions of 2.4m x 4.8m for a standard space with 6.0m of drivable space in front of them for ease of access.

It is considered that these detailed comments provide further clarification and do not alter the officer's conclusion or recommendation.