



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

**MEETING** : Tuesday, 1st September 2020

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

**Officers in Attendance**

Business Transformation Manager (Planning)

Highway Development Manager, Gloucestershire County Council

Environmental Consultant

Principal Planning Officer

Senior Planning Officer

Solicitor, One Legal

Democratic & Electoral Services Officer

**APOLOGIES** : None.

### 8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

### 9. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 4<sup>th</sup> August 2020 were confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### 10. LATE MATERIAL

Late material had been had been circulated in respect of agenda item 5 – Land off Rea Lane, Gloucester (19/00068/FUL).

### 11. LAND OFF REA LANE, GLOUCESTER, 19/00068/FUL

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report detailing an application for the erection of 33 dwellings, including access, landscaping and associated infrastructure.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**01.09.20**

The Principal Planning Officer noted that there was a requirement for the applicant to provide an education provision contribution of £394,692, which was detailed within the main body of the report but not referred to within the recommendation in the report or late material.

**Councillor Melvin addressed the Committee in opposition to the application.**

**A local resident addressed the Committee on behalf of Hempsted Residents Association in opposition to the application.**

**An agent of Redcliffe Homes addressed the Committee in favour of the application.**

The Solicitor responded to members questions as follows:

- The City Plan was an emerging plan and was not a draft; but in the form the Council considered to be should be adopted and submitted for examination.
- The decision of whether to grant the application should be made in accordance with the adopted Development Plan, subject to material considerations which indicate otherwise, one of which would be the emerging City Plan.
- The extent to which there were unresolved objections to the relevant policies in the plan was one of the factors in considering the weight to be given to those policies in the emerging City Plan
- An argument for refusing the application on the grounds of prematurity would be unlikely to be successful given paragraphs 49 and 50 of the NPPF.

The Highways Development Manager responded to members questions as follows:

- The narrowness of Rea Lane maintains safety as it assists with the preservation of low speeds.
- A priority system was considered but rejected because of the low amount of opposing flow.
- The latest Highways representation stated that they had 'no objection' subject to conditions and planning obligations.
- Highways are currently satisfied that the site should not require a prohibition of waiting order but there is provision for this should it be considered necessary
- There is a high level of visibility of the lane from the driver's position.

The Drainage Consultant responded to a member's question regarding the foul sewage system in Hempsted . He stated that the review of the foul drainage had been conducted by Severn Trent Water, who concluded that their network had capacity.

**Members Debate**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**01.09.20**

- A member noted that a site visit would have been beneficial. She added that she sympathised with the local Hempstead community, but that there was a desperate need for housing, particularly affordable housing.

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

**RESOLVED that:** - That the grant of planning permission is delegated to the Business Transformation Manager (Planning) subject to conditions set out in the report, with any necessary modifications and finalised wording, the addition of condition 20 (as set out in the late material) and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the

- £6,468 financial contribution to library provision
- £133,000 financial contribution for formal sport;
- £47,000 financial contribution for formal play
- £17,000 financial contribution for general POS improvements
- £10,000 financial contribution towards a Traffic Regulation Order
- 25% affordable housing of the mix and house types detailed
- Appropriate S106 monitoring fee; and
- £394,692 financial contribution for education provision.

**12. 82 HENRY ROAD, GLOUCESTER GL1 3DX, 20/00080/FUL**

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report, detailing an application for a change of use to 8 bed House in Multiple Occupation (HMO (sui generis)) including demolition of the existing garage and timber carport, erection of proposed single-storey rear extension and associated car parking, cycle parking and amenity space.

**Councillor Hilton addressed the Committee in opposition to the application.**

**The Democratic Services Officer read out a statement on behalf of a local resident in opposition to the application.**

**The Democratic Services Officer read out a statement on behalf of an agent of Pedersen Smith Architects in favour of the application.**

The Senior Planning Officer responded to members questions as follows:

- If there are up to Six people living together as a family there can be permitted development to go from a C3 to a C4 property, which would be classed as a small HMO. Planning application is required when there would be more than Six people living at a property.
- The agent looked at formal permissions when working out the number of intensified properties in the area. The properties with under six residents that may have changed under permitted development would not have been included in their figure.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**01.09.20**

The Business Transformation Manager responded to members questions as follows:

- A requirement for inspections of the property would not be covered by planning legislation.
- If members wanted more specific detail about the number of HMO's and intensified properties in the area, then it may be appropriate to defer the application.

**Members Debate**

- A member stated that the suggestion by the Chair to defer the application was a sound one.
- The Vice-Chair said that he was in 'two minds' about whether to refuse the application.
- A member noted that he would prefer to defer the application to get more specific information about the number of intensified properties within the area.

The Chair moved, and the Vice-Chair seconded a motion to defer the application.

**RESOLVED that:-** The application be deferred until the next Planning Committee for further information to be provided to ensure that intensified properties represent less than 10% of households within a 100-metre radius of the application property.

**13. DELEGATED DECISIONS**

There were no delegated decisions reported.

**14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> October, 2020.

**Time of commencement: 6.00 pm**

**Time of conclusion: 7.55 pm**

**Chair**