

GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Committee:	Planning
Date:	1 st December 2020
Address/Location:	Land east of Hempsted Lane, Gloucester
Application No:	20/00600/REM
Ward:	Westgate
Expiry Date:	09.10.2020
Applicant:	Bellway Homes Limited
Proposal:	Reserved Matters application (for details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for a 50 unit residential development with open space including orchard, cycleways, footpaths, and associated works (pursuant to outline planning permission ref. 13/01032/OUT)
Report by:	Adam Smith
Appendices:	Site location plan Site layout plan

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application site is an existing field on the east side of Hempsted Lane. To the immediate north there is a public path and a children's play area, north of this a private sports pitch. To the east there is an area of public open space, and further south on the east side a housing development. To the south is a public path and housing beyond. To the west side is Hempsted Lane and some residential properties on the far side. There is a residential property on the east side of Hempsted Lane (Manor Farm House) which immediately borders the application site. The Hempsted Conservation Area boundary runs along the lane, then extends eastwards to include the south western part of the site and Manor Farm House.
- 1.2 The site benefits from outline planning permission, including the means of access, for residential development. The current application is made pursuant to the outline planning permission, to seek approval of the reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development.
- 1.3 As required by the legal agreement and conditions, the scheme includes the southern part of the site as public open space, which is proposed to be adopted by the City Council. This includes the remnants of an orchard on the east side. The orchard is bounded by a hedge line and much of the site perimeter is bounded by a mix of hedges and trees.
- 1.4 The northern part of the site is proposed for the full 50 units permitted, served off the approved access point from Hempsted Lane to the west. The layout includes green links to the east and west sides with the buildings set in from the site boundary. A further footpath link is also proposed to the east onto the Council's adjacent public open space. This is where a separate planning permission has been granted for drainage ponds that would serve the site. This land is outside the current application site but the proposals include surface water connections into this land. The site is sloped and the proposals also include changes in ground levels.
- 1.5 The application is referred to the Planning Committee because it comprises of 50 residential units.

2.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Application Number	Proposal	Decision	Decision Date
13/01032/OUT	Outline planning application for residential development of site, open space including orchard, cycleways, footpaths, and associated works. Means of access offered for approval (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved for future consideration)	GOP	18.12.2018
16/01055/FUL	Adjacent land to north east: Engineering operation to construct balancing pond(s) and associated landscaping	G3Y	07.04.2017

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

3.1 The following planning guidance and policies are relevant to the consideration of this application:

3.2 National guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance

3.3 Development Plan

Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (Adopted 11 December 2017)

Relevant policies from the JCS include:

SD3 – Sustainable design and construction

SD4 – Design requirements

SD6 – Landscape

SD8 – Historic Environment

SD9 – Biodiversity and geodiversity

SD10 – Residential development

SD11 – Housing mix and standards

SD12 – Affordable housing

SD14 – Health and environmental quality

INF1 – Transport network

INF2 – Flood risk management

INF3 – Green Infrastructure

INF4 – Social and community Infrastructure

3.4 City of Gloucester Local Plan (Adopted 14 September 1983)

The statutory Development Plan for Gloucester includes the partially saved 1983 City of Gloucester Local Plan. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that '*... due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given.*' The majority of the policies in the 1983 Local Plan are out-of-date and superseded by later planning policy including the NPPF and the Joint Core Strategy. None of the saved policies are relevant to the consideration of this application.

3.5 Emerging Development Plan

Gloucester City Plan

The Gloucester City Plan (“City Plan”) will deliver the JCS at the local level and provide policies addressing local issues and opportunities in the City. The Pre-Submission version of the Gloucester City Plan (City Plan) was approved for publication and submission at the Council meeting held on 26 September 2019. On the basis of the stage of preparation that the plan has reached, and the consistency of its policies with the NPPF, the emerging policies of the plan can be afforded limited to moderate weight in accordance with paragraph 48 of the NPPF, subject to the extent to which there are unresolved objections to each individual policy (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given).

Relevant policies from the emerging Gloucester City Plan include:

- A1 – Effective and efficient use of land and buildings
- A2 – Affordable housing
- A6 – Accessible and adaptable homes
- C1 – Active design and accessibility
- D1 – Historic environment
- D2 – Non designated heritage assets
- D3 – Recording and advancing understanding of heritage assets
- E1 – Landscape character and sensitivity
- E2 – Biodiversity and geodiversity
- E4 – Trees, woodlands and hedgerows
- E5 – Green infrastructure: Building with nature
- E6 – Flooding, sustainable drainage, and wastewater
- F1 – Materials and finishes
- F2 – Landscape and planting
- F3 – Community safety
- F6 – Nationally described space standards
- G1 – Sustainable transport
- G2 – Charging infrastructure for electric vehicles
- G4 - Walking

3.6 Other Planning Policy Documents

Gloucester Local Plan, Second Stage Deposit 2002

Regard is also had to the 2002 Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan. This has been subjected to two comprehensive periods of public and stakeholder consultation and adopted by the Council for development control purposes. The following “day-to-day” development management policies, which are not of a strategic nature and broadly accord with the policies contained in the NPPF, should be given some weight:

BE.2 – Views and skyline

3.7 Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

- Heights of Buildings guidelines (November 2008)
- Hempsted Conservation Area Appraisal
- SPG1 – Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (2004)
- SPG6 – New housing and open space (2001)

3.8 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 provides that where an area is designated as a conservation area *'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area'*.

3.9 All policies can be viewed at the relevant website address:- national policies:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Gloucester City policies:

<http://www.gloucester.gov.uk/resident/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/Pages/current-planning-policy.aspx>

4.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

4.1 The **Highway Authority** raises no objection.

4.2 The **Conservation Officer** raises no objection in principle but notes that the proposed materials are poor quality and need to be resolved under condition.

4.3 The **Landscaping consultant** raised several concerns and recommendations on the original submission; provision of a five-year maintenance schedule and planting specification; proposed amendments to the varieties, specification and locations of trees; provision of planting screening to Plots 22 and 23 and the substation; additional planting to enhance the existing hedge; the size of the proposed green link, and landscape maintenance along the path; and that carefully considered tree and shrub planting would help to integrate the attenuation ponds further (note – these are outside the application site and subject to a separate permission). Following the amended submission the consultant confirmed that the planting plan has been amended in accordance with their recommendations.

4.4 **The Civic Trust** has not commented.

4.5 **Severn Trent Water** has not commented.

4.6 The **Drainage Consultant** raises no objections.

4.7 The **Tree Officer** raised several requests initially;
An up to date tree survey, a 5 year maintenance plan to ensure the trees planted successfully establish, and tree pit planting specifications, all of which has now been submitted and accepted.
Requests to amend the proposed tree planting varieties, which has been done and the Officer supports the new proposals.
The amendments to the scheme have addressed the Officer's commented and he has no further comments to make.

4.8 The **Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer** raised the following;

The proposal of 20 affordable dwellings, delivering 40% affordable housing as stated in the s106 agreement is welcomed.

The breakdown of affordable units proposed is not consistent with that set out in the s106 agreement (some of the changes could be accepted, others not). Amendments are suggested that would make the proposal acceptable in this respect.

The development is expected to have clusters of no more than 6 to 8 Affordable Units in a cluster. Two clusters of affordable housing are proposed. While the cluster towards the north of the site is rather large it is well dispersed through the use of open space. The affordable family sized housing should be integrated throughout the development. The two 4-bedroom affordable rent properties should not be directly opposite each other.

The Building Regulations M4(2) proposals are compliant with the S106. Gloucester's policy has changed since the s106 and an increase in the number would be welcomed.

The applicant proposes 2 units in line with Building Regulation M4(3) which meets City Plan

and Section 106 requirements.

Given the range of needs for M4(3) homes we would expect one category M4(3) dwelling to be a 3- or 4-bed house, to accommodate larger families who have wheelchair users.

4.9 The **Urban Design Adviser** raised the following:

Close board fence should not be used where it is visible from the public realm, and should be a screen wall.

There needs to be gaps in the timber knee rail to allow access into the open space.

The layout around plots 47/48 and 50 is poor and unresolved. Plots 47/48 present a rear wall to the street and overlooks a substation

The location of the garage and parking for plot 50 somewhat undoes the usefulness of having a corner turning unit.

The garage for plot 38 and 11 is directly in front of the unit and also at the end of the vista.

This will look poor in the street scene and for the amenity of that property.

The mix of dwelling types is poor, not in line with the SHMA and does not provide for a mixed and balanced community in line with requirements in the national design guide.

A duo-plain tile would be preferable as the SL8 is very large and of low quality given the location of the site next to the conservation area.

Plots 10 and 34 do not turn the corner with active frontage. Plot 10 in particular is in a prominent position.

The appearance of the affordable dwellings is very poor in comparison with the open market units, the 6b4p unit has a very unbalanced front elevation.

4.10 The **Open Space consultant** raised issues in the original consultation regarding provision of links to the north to the play area, provision of suitable street furniture and pathways in the POS to south, amendments to the landscaping proposals, railing protection to vulnerable orchard trees, details of and amendments to boundary treatments, size of the open strip to east side, provision of a tree survey, and screening of the substation. Following the amended submission the consultant has confirmed that the original queries have largely been addressed or reasons given why they could not be accommodated and has no further comments.

5.0 **PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS**

5.1 Neighbouring properties were notified (and a second set of notifications given for the revised submission) and press and site notices were published.

5.2 12 representations have been received raising the following issues:

Developments destroying village and community spirit.

Traffic, noise and odour increases.

Anti social behaviour issues.

Loss of green environment. Green spaces should be protected.

Harm to rural feel of village.

Brownfield sites should be built on first.

Existing sewerage system problems. Drainage should not use the main sewer in the lane which is overloaded.

Surface water runoff into The Gallops.

Use of the adjacent Council land for drainage ponds is acceptable on the basis that the village will gain the open space at the south.

The drainage ponds should be on the building site not land owned by the Council or Hempsted Village.

The City Council should confirm how the proposed green space would be maintained in a manner to be useable by villagers.

The City Council needs to confirm that their maintenance of the onward drainage ditch will be appropriate.

The pedestrian pathway needs to connect with the gate and hard surface at the south east corner which is a future desire line.

Too many dwellings at too high a density, out of character.

Access should be via The Gallops.

Poor condition of road surface.

Where would visitors park.

The local school is full and expansion is not possible.

No health provisions being made for this area.

Incorrect and misleading annotations on Cathedral view plan.

Application site plan implies a brick screen wall to the whole perimeter. Impact of such a perimeter wall.

Impact on house prices.

Loss of areas for children to play and enjoy.

Loss of the cows and horses grazing in the field.

The 3 representations relating to Manor Farm House raise the following issues:

Proposals do not comply with Condition 5 of the outline permission in respect of the maximum extent of development on the site. This requirement should not be set aside. The size of the buffer gap is reduced.

Pedestrians would be funnelled through the gap between the proposed units and Manor Farm House and brought closer to the house than envisaged in the outline stage plans. Impact on the conditions of the ground here in wet conditions. Drainage from the Farm House garage roof runs into the field here and requires a solution to prevent this exacerbating the problem.

Absence of landscape and security proposals on the northern and eastern boundaries of the Farm House. There has been no previous public access to the fields, there is now potential for trespassing if not made more secure. They want a new hedgerow and fence to be implemented. (The second representation notes an agreement that has now been reached between the applicant and the resident to accommodate their requests. The third representation updates further and notes that until a fence and a hedgerow are shown at the shared boundary on plans the objection still stands (it appears a fence has so far been agreed).

No proposals to replace the septic tank / overflow pipe serving the Farm House and is within the application site. They require a connection to the mains system at the developer's expense. The second representation notes the updated proposals to remove it and provide a connection and considers this should be secured by condition.

5.3 The full content of all correspondence on this application can be viewed on:
<http://www.gloucester.gov.uk/resident/planning-and-building-control/Pages/public-access.aspx>

6.0 OFFICER OPINION

6.1 *Legislative background*

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Local Planning Authority to determine planning applications in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.2 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) states that in dealing with a planning application, the Local Planning Authority should have regard to the following:

- a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application;
- b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application; and

c) any other material considerations.

6.3 The development plan consists of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the partially saved 1983 City of Gloucester Local Plan. However, as outlined earlier, the 1983 Local Plan is considered to be out-of-date.

6.4 It is considered that the main issues with regard to this application are as follows:

- Principle and compliance with the outline permission
- Design, layout and landscaping, and heritage
- Housing provision
- Traffic and transport
- Residential amenity
- Drainage and flood risk
- Open space

6.5 ***Principle and compliance with the outline permission***

Outline planning permission has been granted and the principle of residential development of this site for up to 50 residential units has been accepted. The in-principle considerations, including traffic impact, noise, loss of the field and provision of infrastructure have already been made at the outline stage. This application is to consider the layout, landscaping, appearance and scale of the development.

6.6 The outline permission sets out a series of particular requirements for the development, and for reserved matters submissions. Compliance with these is noted as follows:

Condition 5 - Heights of buildings to conform to a specified plan. This plan shows a maximum height of 2 storeys (10m to ridgeline), with 3 areas of feature buildings, allowed to 2.5 storeys, 11.5m to ridgeline. The submitted buildings conform to this.

Condition 5 - Extent of residential buildings and roads to conform to a specified plan – this is broadly complied with but is subject to an objection from a neighbouring resident. The applicant however considers that the proposals are in compliance with this and has submitted an overlay plan. The area of the site which the objection focuses on is at the south western part of the developable area near to Manor Farm House.

The front garden of plot 1 has been cut in to allow a straighter route in front of it. On a point of detail the corner of the building at plot 1 encroaches outside the developable area shown on the specified outline stage plan. The applicant is aware of this but considers the proposals to be compliant. While there is a conflict between the two plans, it is not considered to have a material detrimental effect when considering the purpose of condition 5, which was to secure a broadly acceptable position for the buildings and the open space, achieve the open space links around the site edge, and set buildings back from the Conservation Area edge and road frontage. All of those planning objectives are still achieved in the proposed layout. The objection does not raise planning issues that I consider would be materially harmed by encroachment beyond that set out in the condition other than the point of principle (which is understood), and it undermining the integrity of the decision making progress and trust in it. While the frustration of the objector is understood it is not considered that the divergence in the plans actually causes any significant planning harm on the ground.

Condition 6 – Limit development to 50 units. This is complied with.

Condition 7- Cross sections required to show ground levels and finished floor levels. These are provided and they are discussed in the design and the amenity sections below.

Condition 10 – Reserved matters to show waste/recycling provision. Shared waste storage is

shown on the plans and the cover letter states that for individual dwellings storage would be on hardstandings in rear gardens with all properties noted to have side gates for access.

Condition 14 – Reserved matters to include a study to demonstrate preservation of views of the Cathedral from the footpath to the south of the site. A range of information has been submitted to address this. This is assessed in the design section below.

Condition 15 – Requirement for a green link between the southern open space and that to the north east of at least 10m wide. In the revised submissions buildings have been set back and the link widened; the plan shows 10m is achieved.

Condition 27 – Vehicle parking and turning facilities to be provided on site. This is provided and commented on in the highways section below.

The s106 agreement associated with the outline permission sets out requirements for 40% affordable housing, and a breakdown of the types required. It also sets out requirements for the provision of public open space and drainage works. These issues are commented on by topic below in as much as they affect the assessment of the reserved matters.

6.7 ***Design, layout and landscaping, and heritage***

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and sets out criteria for decision making including ensuring that developments are visually attractive, sympathetic to local character and history while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change, establish/maintain a strong sense of place, optimise the potential of the site to accommodate an appropriate amount and mix of development, and create safe, inclusive accessible places.

6.8 JCS Policy SD4 sets out requirements for high quality design, including responding positively to and respecting the character of the site and surroundings, and being of a scale and materials appropriate to the site and setting. Design should establish a strong sense of place and have appropriate regard to the historic environment. Policy SD10 seeks housing of the maximum appropriate density compatible with good design, the protection of heritage assets, local character and the road network.

6.9 Policy A1 of the Pre-Submission City Plan requires overall improvements to the built and natural environment, preservation of the character of the area and appearance of the streetscene, and appropriate bin storage. Policy C1 requires development to meet the highest possible standards of accessible and inclusive design. Policy E1 requires a balanced approach, providing for housing, and other needs whilst seeking to protect and enhance local landscape features that contribute to environmental quality and local distinctiveness. Trees, hedgerows and areas of green that contribute to local landscape character should wherever possible be retained and utilised to enhance development. Policy E4 seeks to ensure no significant adverse impacts on existing trees or hedgerows and that opportunities are taken for appropriate new planting on site.

6.10 Policy F1 requires high quality architectural detailing, external materials and finishes that are locally distinctive, and developments to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the locality. Innovative modern materials will be encouraged where they strongly compliment local distinctiveness. Policy F2 requires hard surfacing, boundary treatments and planting to be appropriate to the location, and incorporate existing natural features where possible, and ensure adequate space for trees to mature. Policy F3 requires development to be designed to ensure that community safety is a fundamental principle.

6.11 In relation to heritage the NPPF requires Authorities to take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses

consistent with their conservation, the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality, and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Great weight should be given to the conservation of the designated heritage asset; the more important the asset the greater the weight should be. Any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification; substantial harm to or loss of assets of the highest significance such as scheduled monuments should be wholly exceptional. Tests are set out if 'substantial harm' or 'less than substantial harm' to a designated heritage asset are identified.

- 6.12 Policy SD8 of the JCS sets out that heritage assets and their settings will be considered and enhanced as appropriate to their significance. Development should aim to sustain and enhance their significance and put them to viable uses consistent with their conservation whilst improving accessibility. Policies D1 and D2 of the emerging City Plan reflect the guidance in the NPPF and JCS in respect of designated and non-designated heritage assets respectively. Policy D1 includes the requirement for protecting and enhancing heritage assets and their settings, conserving and enhancing the character, appearance and architectural quality of the area, and retaining important views into or out of the Conservation Area.
- 6.13 The surrounding area includes houses of varying styles along either side of Hempsted Lane to the north, with more dense 20th century and more modern housing development on the west side of the lane further south, and beyond the site to the south and south east. The properties along the lane tend to be larger detached properties, with the more modern development including more semi detached and terraced properties. Between the developments the context is more open, with a paddock on the opposite side of Hempsted Lane, and public open space to the north east and a rugby pitch to north, with a variety of hedge rows and trees.
- 6.14 The layout is largely dictated by the approved access point and the restricted developable area set by the outline permission. The proposals have been improved through pre-application discussions, and then during the application process including reorientation of units, relocation of garages, changes to materials/walls, all of which have improved the scheme in terms of design. It broadly provides for back to back blocks enabling street frontage and avoiding exposed gardens.
- 6.15 The house type designs are considered acceptable. The fenestration of the 6b4p house type has been amended to respond to the Urban Design Officer's comment. They appear to be standard house types but exhibit a degree of variation in form and articulation and include detailing that should sit comfortably within the site context and add visual interest. Facing materials are subject to a condition requiring their approval, however the applicant has, as part of the reserved matters submissions, amended the proposed roof tiles in response to concerns, now proposing a smaller format thinner tile.
- 6.16 Great weight has been given to the preservation of the character and appearance of the Hempsted Lane Conservation Area. The Conservation Area has a distinctive rural character with domestic buildings set back from the road, also post war housing estates, with mature trees and historic walls contributing to the character, and has views to its surroundings given the elevated position above meadows and intervening spaces. The Conservation Area is situated on the opposite side of the road from the northern part of the site and the proposed buildings would be sited back into the site away from this road frontage in the manner required by the outline permission. Part of the site at the south western corner is within the Conservation Area and would be provided as public open space again as required by the outline permission. The Conservation Area impact was addressed at the outline stage with some adverse impacts identified but were concluded to be outweighed by the benefits of the

scheme. The reserved matters follow the principles established at the outline stage to aid preservation of its character and appearance, and the Conservation Officer raises no in principle objection to the reserved matters proposals. As such the reserved matters would cause no other harm additional to what was previously assessed at the outline stage, and would comply with the above policy context, and the requirements of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are satisfied.

6.17 Pedestrian links

The site is surrounded by a range of existing roads and paths, and connections to them would be beneficial in the interests of good sustainable design. The applicant has now provided a path link out of the site to the north to the east-west track by the play area. The existing track links Hempsted Lane at the west with the playing fields and the link out to Secunda Way to the east, and the new path link would provide for easy access to local facilities and within the wider area. A formalised path is provided down the east side of the site which would link to the existing path through the public open space adjacent to the north east. Another path link onto the open space is proposed to link with the middle of the development although this one would rely on provision of the missing section on the Council land to join up the paths. The pathways through the open space at the south now provide links out to logical points at the edge of the site and would enhance pedestrian linkages along these desire lines. Access points have also now been provided within the development to aid pedestrian movement along desire lines. As required by JCS Policy SD4 the integration of development with its surroundings and the provision of safe and legible connections are required to achieve good design. With the provision now made it is considered that the proposals meet the policy requirement.

6.18 Security

Concerns have been raised in representations about the security of the edge of the site to Manor Farm House. The applicant's response to this notes that new tree planting is proposed between Plots 1-3, Plot 8 and Manor Farm House which would provide additional screening to the existing, also additional boundary hedge planting has been added to plot 8 to assist visual integration with the adjacent open space buffer, and a maintenance plan has been submitted to cover maintenance for 5 years. The two parties have also evidently now agreed to the provision of a fence and additional hedge planting along the common boundary. Overall I consider that while the proposal would facilitate public access to this side of the existing property where it has not been allowed before, the development would actually lead to more natural surveillance of the surroundings of Manor Farm House. I do not think it could reasonably be assumed that someone presenting a security concern would be more likely to act in front of a housing development than from a private field as is currently the case, and as such there is not detriment to security caused by the proposals, and a condition to provide additional measures is not necessary to make the development acceptable. The principle of residential development of the nearby parts of the field is established, and in light of this analysis I conclude that the security concerns do not amount to a harmful design impact arising from the reserved matters details.

6.19 Heights of building/views

The outline planning permission provides for building heights of up to 2 storeys, with some potential for 2.5 storey feature buildings. The Council's Heights of Buildings SPD defines a series of views to the Cathedral including strategic view corridor 6 'Hempsted Village', which is from a point immediately south of the site roughly mid way along the footpath and the view corridor is across the site. Policy BE.2 of the 2002 Second Deposit Local Plan requires development to protect the city skyline and important views, noting the particular importance of protecting views of the Cathedral. Policy D5 of the City Plan requires that development does not harm any key views of the Cathedral and other historic places of worship. As required by the outline permission a study has been submitted of the views to the Cathedral tower, which now includes digitally modelled views. The large trees at the edge of the rugby

ground to the north currently provide a partial screen of this view (as does the vegetation immediately alongside the footpath itself) however one is still able to obtain a view of the Cathedral tower through the gaps in the trees and above them. As such there are currently partially-restricted sporadic views of the Cathedral from along the footpath.

6.20 The submitted visualisations show that while the ridge height of some of the southernmost units would be above the tower, views of the Cathedral tower would still be achieved from along the footpath and the development is sited down the slope as far out of the view as is possible. The view identified when the SPD was produced is now affected by the vegetation in the foreground of the Cathedral view. It is therefore considered that the proposals would satisfy the condition and allow for the key views, in this case partial views of the Cathedral, and do not involve unacceptably tall buildings in line with the SPD.

6.21 Levels changes

The streetscenes and cross sections show that the site levels would be built up and the impact of this should be carefully considered given the change in visual appearance that is likely to take place as a result of this approach. The reason for the scale of levels changes appears to be to facilitate foul sewer connections and avoid needing a pumping station. There has been a longstanding concern regarding the possible visual impact of this approach. The exact levels changes vary across the site but are likely to have most visual impact at the site edges.

6.22 At the northern edge the site would rise up in one part by about 2m within about a 10m span from the boundary (at the road turning head). Smaller levels changes of up to around 1m higher would also be implemented elsewhere along the northern edge. At the east side by the existing open space the site would rise up about 1.3m between the site boundary and the adjacent road (across a c.4-5m span). At the southern edge of the proposed developable area the ground levels would actually be reduced – by up to approx. 1.5m in places.

6.23 The proposed houses are set back slightly from the site edges but it seems clear that the presence of new buildings would be very apparent in views of the existing site from the nearby surroundings and the mitigating effects of the retained hedge/tree line would be somewhat less than envisaged at the outline stage with the land level and buildings in a more pronounced position. There would be some rather steep drops in levels e.g. next to plots 45/46 at the northern edge.

6.24 The applicant considers the levels changes to be acceptable and are needed to avoid having a foul water pumping station installed with its associated visual, amenity, and servicing impacts. They have noted that Severn Trent Water will not allow a pumping station if a gravity led solution is achievable). They also consider it would provide increased natural surveillance of the play area, and that plots in the north west corner cannot be dropped further to ensure Building Regulations accessibility M4(3) compliance.

6.25 The proposed houses at the levels shown would result in a prominent appearance of the buildings including from publicly-accessed pedestrian links, albeit less so from the existing highways around the development. I am not convinced that the presence of a pumping station would necessarily be worse in terms of appearance of the development but the reasons for the approach are noted. The applicant believes the impact would be acceptable and wishes for the current proposals to be determined, and has submitted an analysis setting out that the maximum increase in levels for buildings is 1.4m, with an average of 0.7m increase. This presents a difficult judgement because the visual effect of introducing houses at these levels is likely to be quite striking, particularly in the context of the existing environment of the hedge/tree line screening a grassed field. However, I conclude that, on balance, in the context of the extent of visual impact to the surroundings that would be caused, the proposed siting of buildings within the site, and the vegetation screening (which

is proposed to be added to), the proposals would not amount to significant harm to the character of the area and landscape setting, nor create a scheme that could be said to be highly unattractive visually. As such it is recommended that no objection be raised in relation to the impact of the levels changes.

6.26 Landscaping

Planting is proposed along street frontages, as a screen to some of the proposed properties, and additional planting is proposed to the orchard area and the rest of the public open space offered at the south of the site. The hedge to the north east and west (other than around the access/visibility splay), and around the orchard (other than at access points) is shown to be retained, and enhanced in several areas with additional planting. These should all help to soften the impact of the buildings, help it blend into the existing landscape and enhance the appearance of the development.

6.27 The setting back of buildings from the west side of the site (required at outline stage for design, landscaping and heritage reasons), is retained. This would serve to enable a large part of the roadside hedge to be retained (other than at the vehicular access). At the position of this site entrance the visibility splay required for nearby residents to see cars entering the site would necessitate the cutting back of the adjacent hedge line somewhat.

6.28 The outline permission requires details of the restoration of the historic orchard at the south of the site. Further details could be dealt with later under the condition however the current submitted plans show the retention of this area and additional planting at the orchard area and as such the layout and landscaping details provided for determination here are considered acceptable in this respect.

6.29 The comments and recommendations of the landscaping and open space consultants and the Tree Officer have been addressed to a satisfactory degree in the revised submissions.

6.30 The landscaping proposals are now considered broadly acceptable, would enhance the appearance of the development and certain further details can be dealt with under condition 16 of the outline permission if needed. The layout and landscaping would comply with the above policy context.

6.31 ***Housing provision***

Policy SD11 of the JCS seeks an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures to contribute to mixed and balanced communities, and requires development to address the needs of the local area. It also requires housing to meet and where possible exceed appropriate minimum space standards, and be accessible and adaptable as far as compatible with local context and other policies.

6.32 Affordable housing:

The s106 agreement associated with the outline permission sets the requirements for affordable housing from this site and requires:

Submission of an Affordable Housing Scheme – this has been provided and is under consideration.

40% affordable housing. This is provided in the submission.

Housing mix:

80% affordable rent, of which;

21% 1 bed

35% 2 bed

29% 3 bed

20% shared ownership, of which;
25% 1 bed
50% 2 bed
25% 3 bed

The s106 agreement includes a mechanism to allow the mix to be amended with the approval of the Council. At the time of writing this is under discussion given the applicant has offered a different mix to that included in the agreement.

Minimum internal floor areas for types of the affordable housing, 15% of the whole development to be in accordance with Building Regs Cat 2 (wheelchair adaptable), and 2 dwellings to meet the Building Regs Cat 3 wheelchair housing standard. The applicant has confirmed that these requirements are met by the proposal.

6.33 As noted above the submitted Affordable Housing Scheme and layout differ from that in the legal agreement and this needs to be resolved. As above, the Housing Strategy Officers considered some of the original changes to be acceptable and others not. The legal agreement provides an ability to agree a different arrangement however the key issue for approving this reserved matters layout is whether the house types required by the legal agreement (or a different mix as agreed with the Housing Officers) can be accommodated as proposed in the layout. Until that is established, it is not clear whether the proposed layout can accord with the requirements of the legal agreement or any amended mix/tenure agreed pursuant to it.

6.34 In this light at the time of writing the applicant has just submitted a response to the Housing Officer's concerns. This changes two plots from a 4bed 6 person to a 4bed 7person house type. They have also confirmed that all of the 3bed units accommodate 5 persons. I am now awaiting the response of the Housing Officer to this proposed change. Their response will clarify whether an amended affordable housing mix can be accepted under the legal agreement and therefore whether the proposed layout can be considered compliant.

6.35 Housing mix:
The 20 affordable units comprise of 4 1-bed flats, 6 2-bed flats, 4 3-bed houses, and 2 4-bed houses as affordable rent, and 2 2-bed houses and 2 3-bed houses as shared ownership. The 30 market houses comprise of 24 4-bed houses and 6 5-bed houses. In terms of the housing mix the market housing is heavily slanted towards large detached properties and would not of itself be considered acceptable, however overall with the substantial provision of affordable housing, across the whole site there is a variety of property types, and the scheme responds to the context of the surrounding built form. In this context it is considered that the development would deliver an appropriate mix of housing and positively contribute to a mixed and balanced community. No objection is raised against Policy SD11. The critical issue in this balance is the level of affordable housing achieved, and it is unlikely the such a mix of market housing would be acceptable without such a level of provision.

6.36 **Traffic and transport**
The NPPF requires that development proposals provide for safe and suitable access for all and that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Policy INF1 of the JCS requires safe and accessible connections to the transport network

6.37 Policy G1 of the Pre-Submission City Plan sets the context for working with organisations on local transport matters. Policy G2 sets requirements for provision of an electric vehicle charging point/socket at every new residential property which has a garage or dedicated space within its curtilage and otherwise will be strongly encouraged where feasible. Policy G4 supports proposals that protect and enhance convenient, safe and pleasant walking

environments, refers to pedestrians being at the top of the road user's hierarchy and seeks to avoid proposals that disrupt desire lines or reduce pedestrian legibility or connectivity.

- 6.38 The Highway Authority raises no objection to the proposed layout. The means of access is fixed from the outline stage. Tracking plans have been provided to demonstrate the accessibility of the layout to private, refuse, delivery and emergency vehicles and some minor concerns about obstructions to the tracking have now been resolved in the amended scheme. The main roads within the development would be offered for adoption, private drives would be conveyed to the properties who have rights over it.
- 6.39 The entrance visibility splays extend into the site and would need to be included within adoption plans for the Highway Authority to ensure it is not obstructed by fencing or hedging. The applicant has confirmed that this area would be included within the relevant highway agreement and the planting proposals have been amended to cut back the hedge line to suit the visibility splay.
- 6.40 The Highway Authority accepts the level of car parking proposed. Each unit has at least one space and most have considerably more. 40 garage spaces are proposed and in most instances there is room for at least 2 cars on the driveway in front of the garage. In addition 10 visitor spaces are proposed around the site.
- 6.41 In terms of cycle parking provision, space is shown in the garages for 2 cycles. For properties without garages cycle parking would be in sheds in rear gardens with steel fixings for storage.
- 6.42 Provision for pedestrian connectivity has already been discussed above and is considered acceptable.
- 6.43 Refuse collection points are located at the end of private drives other than by the main access where a collection point has been removed from the original position following concerns about its appearance at this prominent position. The applicant advises for these units that the highway is wide enough for bins to be on the private drive on collection day.
- 6.44 Overall in terms of highways impact the proposed layout complies with the above policy context.
- 6.45 ***Residential amenity***
Paragraph 127 of the NPPF provides that decisions should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. This is reflected in Policy SD14 of the JCS which requires that new development must cause no harm to local amenity including the amenity of neighbouring occupants. Policy F6 of the Pre-Submission City Plan requires residential development to meet Nationally Described Space Standards.
- 6.46 *Neighbouring occupants*
No. 67 Hempsted Lane
No. 67 Hempsted Lane is situated to the north of the site across the track. The property is around 10m from the edge of the application site and would be broadly parallel with two proposed maisonette buildings – plots 24/25 and 45/46. An overshadowing study has also now been received for this property.
- 6.47 The building at Plot 24/25 would be approximately 19m from the boundary of no. 67 and would face towards its rear garden, slightly angled away towards the end of no. 67's garden. There is a hedge and tree line at the site boundary that would be retained, which is of varying heights, and additional planting is proposed here. The ground floor flat windows are not likely to overlook the neighbouring property given the height, separation and the hedge and garden

fence between. The first floor flat includes lounge and bedroom windows facing north in the direction of no. 67. A section has been provided through the site to the neighbouring property. This shows that with the proposed levels change Plot 24/25 would be sited at a higher level than no. 67 (approximately 1.2m higher).

- 6.48 As a comparison, the usual separation distance required for a new development would be a back to back distance of 21m, which would commonly equate to around 10.5m between houses and the neighbouring garden. In this case the separation is of 19m to the garden and is clearly in excess of that 'normal' standard in relation to new build properties. However the impact in the current proposals also needs to factor in the higher position of the proposed house given the existing and proposed levels changes. The applicants have declined to reduce the proposed levels change and so the proposals need to be determined based on the proposed arrangement.
- 6.49 The applicant has responded on this issue and considers (their measurements) a 19.6m distance to plot boundary, 23.1m distance to garden to be substantially over generally accepted levels, that the intervening existing and proposed landscaping between protects views and amenity, that window to window contact would be too oblique to be material, and that the option of replacing block 24/25 with a single storey unit would result in a poor streetscene. They have also confirmed that there is no intention to reduce the existing perimeter vegetation.
- 6.50 Given the finished floor levels confirmed in the submitted sections, the first floor flat windows would allow (using a 1.7m height eyeline) a view out at a position approximately 19m from the boundary of no. 67 at approximately 5.6m above the ground level of no. 67. There is an outbuilding at the rear of no. 67's garden at the nearside corner. The existing hedge/tree line is lower in the section parallel with plot 24/25 such that a view through would be possible currently. The new planting in this location referred to by the applicant shows a native hedge being planted along the southern edge of the existing hedge/tree line. If this successfully grows it would help reinforce the existing vegetation screen. The species planted where the existing vegetation is lower should grow faster and could be allowed to grow to full height. The mix includes hawthorne and field maple which would grow tall enough to intervene in the potential view across to the garden of no. 67. They are not evergreen but do have quite dense canopies. This effect does rely on proper maintenance and the planting maintenance schedule has been revised to cover this element of the planting to the satisfaction of the Council's Landscaping Consultant.
- 6.51 In conclusion I estimate that new residents in this property would currently be afforded a view across towards no. 67's garden however the separation distance of 19m is significant and in due course, the additional planting could provide an additional screening effect. Even accounting for the higher levels, the separation distance, in the context of the rear garden of no. 67, and the likelihood of, in due course, additional planting further ameliorating any potential overlooking, is such that on balance, the level of intrusion and impact on amenity arising from overlooking would not be significant.
- 6.52 The overshadowing study demonstrates the effect through various points in the year and shows that block 24/25 would not cause any significant overshadowing of no. 67. Some overshadowing of the garden is likely during the winter but this is also likely to be caused by the existing hedge/tree line and boundary fence. Coupled with the time of year it is not considered that this would amount to significant harm. Given the separation distance the proposals would not be overbearing or cause a significant loss of light to no. 67.
- 6.53 The building at plot 45/46 would be around 20m from the boundary of no. 67. The ground floor flat windows are not likely to overlook the neighbouring property given the height, separation and the hedge/tree line and garden fence between. Plot 44/45 is also more in line

with the house rather than the garden of no. 67. The first floor flat includes living room, bedroom and bathroom windows facing towards no. 67. The section drawing shows that plot 45/46 would be at a ground level approximately 2m higher than no. 67.

6.54 The finished floor levels indicate that the first floor windows would allow (again with a 1.7m eyeline) a view out at 20m from the boundary at around 6.4m above the ground level of no. 67. The dense hedge/tree line here provides screening up to approximately 6m height at least. The applicants have provided written confirmation that there is no intention to reduce the perimeter vegetation and a maintenance plan has been submitted. Given the relationship between the properties, the separation between them and the presence of the retained (and enhanced) boundary tree/hedge line, the proposed property would not cause significant harm by overlooking this neighbouring property and there would also be no significant harm to privacy from window to window contact.

6.55 The overshadowing study indicates that block 45/46 could cause some overshadowing of the end part of the rear garden of no. 67 in the late afternoon in Spring and Autumn but no impact in summer, and cause greater overshadowing impacts in mid afternoon in the winter, although again this is at a time where the existing hedge/tree line and boundary fence are likely to have a similar effect and use of the garden is less likely. Given the modest extent of impacts and times of year this is not considered to amount to significant harm. Given the separation distance this new building would not be overbearing or cause significant loss of light.

6.56 Manor Farm House

Manor Farm House is situated to the west side of the site and representations have been received in relation to the impact of the development on this property and its residents. This property includes the main house sited to the middle of the plot and, in closest proximity to the proposed built development at its northern end, a pitched roof garage and an area used for car parking. At the north eastern edge behind the garage is a 1-2m high hedge. There is a garden area that borders the application site with a low level fence at the boundary, to the south of the garage/parking area. Beyond this at the southern part of the property there is a 1.8m close boarded fence. There are also some trees at the edge of the plot affording some screening and again it is noted that the applicant does not intend to reduce this existing vegetation. As noted the proposed development includes an open corridor of grassed space down the western edge such that the proposed houses are set in from the boundary. The farmhouse includes side windows facing towards the application site but the separation distance of over 26m at an angle is such that no harm would be caused from window to window contact.

6.57 The two nearest properties would be:

Plot 1, with the proposed house being northwest facing and sited around 9m from the boundary at the nearest point. It is a two storey dwelling proposed (5m high to eaves, 8.5m to the roof ridge), sited diagonally to the farmhouse plot. The proposed property has habitable room windows in the front elevation but given the orientation and resultant view that could be afforded, the separation distance, position of the farmhouse's garage at the near boundary and use of the near part of the farmhouse plot, and the vegetation screening, it is not considered that significant harm from overlooking would arise. Given the orientation no harm to light, or overshadowing would arise, and no significant overbearing effect would arise given the relationship.

Plot 8 would be sited side-on to the farmhouse plot at a distance of around 10m between the proposed house and the boundary of the farm house. It would be broadly parallel with the farmhouse's garage. This would be the same two storey dwelling type as plot 1 and has no first floor habitable room windows in the side elevation that would overlook the property.

There is a possible view from the front windows of the proposed property diagonally down to the farm house's garden but given the angled view it is not considered that this would lead to a significant impact on privacy. No overshadowing study has been provided in respect of these units, however given the separation distance, the orientation of the properties, the scale of the proposed dwelling and the use of the nearest parts of the farmhouse plot, it is unlikely that any significant harm would arise from overshadowing or loss of light. Given the separation distance and the use of the farmhouse plot at the near edge, the proposed building would not be overbearing either.

6.58 The 5m lampposts previously situated close to the east side boundary adjacent to the existing residential properties, have now been removed.

6.59 Given the proposed siting of properties it is not considered that the proposals would cause any significant harm to residents of any other properties in the locality.

6.60 **Proposed occupants' living conditions**

All units benefit from a rear to rear separation of at least 20.3m. In this instance it is considered that reasonable living conditions would be provided.

6.61 Where there is a side elevation of a property behind a garden, all units benefit from a back to side distance of at least 10.3m, and in those instances the gardens are not entirely enclosed to the rear by the neighbouring property's flank wall. Again it is considered that reasonable living conditions would be provided in this respect.

6.62 In terms of the provision of private amenity space several of the smallest gardens shown in the original plans have now been increased in size and all properties are now considered to have adequate amenity space for future occupants.

6.63 In terms of space standards I am satisfied that the various house and flat types provide an acceptable level of internal space.

6.64 ***Drainage and flood risk***

The NPPF requires that development is directed to the areas at lowest risk of flooding, that new development should take the opportunities to reduce the causes or impacts of flooding, should not increase flood risk elsewhere and take account of climate change. Policy INF2 of the JCS reflects the NPPF, applying a risk based sequential approach, requiring new development to contribute to a reduction in flood risk and requiring the use of sustainable drainage systems. Policy E6 of the emerging City Plan sets out a similar approach to making development safe, avoiding an increase in flood risk, the sequential and exception tests, requiring Sustainable Drainage Systems, incorporating climate change considerations, facilitating benefits to watercourses and floodplains, maintaining a buffer strip for maintenance and ecology.

6.65 The scheme proposes to utilise the permission for the ponds on the adjacent land to the north east of the field for surface water drainage (not to the Hempsted Lane sewer which is raised in representations). As such surface water would outfall from the north east of the site to these ponds. A knee rail has been included to the edge of the road by the ponds given the proximity of the pond and the gradient. Swales are proposed as a sustainable conveyance method for surface water across parts of the site. The Drainage Consultant raises no objection to the arrangements proposed for drainage within the site. Condition 11 of the outline permission 13/01032/OUT requires full details of the surface water system. In terms of the representation about causing runoff towards the properties in The Gallops; consideration of the drainage proposals under Condition 11 will ensure an appropriate drainage system is proposed, nevertheless, the details of the surface water drainage submitted with this reserved matters application indicate a surface water system to capture

runoff from the new buildings and should not worsen any runoff to these properties from the site.

6.66 The s106 agreement associated with the outline permission obliges the developer to construct the drainage infrastructure works prior to first occupation of any unit.

6.67 A foul connection would be made to the east of the site across the open space to the existing system in the adjacent development to the east.

6.68 Drainage arrangements can be fully considered pursuant to the condition, however no concerns are raised in relation to the proposed layout to indicate that the drainage proposals would not be compliant with the above policy context.

6.69 ***Open Space***

The NPPF provides that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities Policies INF3, INF4 and INF6 of the JCS require new residential developments to provide for any additional infrastructure and community facilities required to serve the proposed development. Policies OS.2, OS.3, and OS.7 of the 2002 Plan set out the Council's requirements for open space.

6.70 The s106 agreement sets out the requirements for public open space (POS) and requires an area of at least 1.56ha. The proposed POS area is the southern part of the site as per the area indicated at outline stage. The s106 agreement sets out a range of requirements on the developer in respect of providing the open space, making it available for public use, and transferring it to the Council.

Other issues raised in representations

6.71 There is a septic tank or cess pit within the site serving Manor Farm House. A solution for this piece of infrastructure has not yet been implemented on site and it is currently an open hole in the ground and would be at the edge of the public open space close to Plot 8. Clearly it needs addressing if development of the site is to proceed. The applicants have confirmed that they are in discussion with the owners of Manor Farm House regarding taking the foul flows into the new sewer system for the development. Their proposal is that the neighbouring property would be connected into the site's foul drainage and onwards to the Severn Trent adopted system. The applicants have confirmed that the septic tank/cess pit would be removed in its entirety and the surrounding area checked for residual contamination which would be removed and inert soil put in place, if encountered. As such the potential environmental and public safety issue should be removed, and the Council would be adopting open space with a foul sewer run beneath as opposed to the open pit.

6.72 It appears that this matter simply needs to be resolved between the developer and neighbour. However given the current lack of certainty over its resolution and the public safety and possibly environmental issue that would be apparent, it is considered that a condition is required preventing occupation until the existing arrangement is removed and land remediated if required. Because in practice this involves making a connection to a functioning drainage system on the development site, which is already required to be in place prior to any occupations (by Condition 11 of the outline permission), this new proposed condition would bring clarity to the public safety/environmental issue concurrently with the existing requirements for drainage implementation and should not be any more onerous on the developer in terms of timings of occupations.

6.73 ***Conclusion***

This application for approval of reserved matters has been considered in the context of the policies and guidance referred to above. The proposal is consistent with those policies and guidance in terms of principle, design, layout and landscaping, heritage, traffic and transport,

residential amenity, drainage and flood risk, open space, and specific environmental concerns; the proposal is broadly acceptable and accordingly it is recommended that reserved matters approval be granted if the outstanding matter of the affordable housing mix can be resolved in terms of the layout and house types.

7.0 **RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY GROWTH AND DELIVERY MANAGER**

7.1 That delegated powers be given to the City Growth and Delivery Manager to GRANT reserved matters approval (subject to the following conditions), subject to;

Receipt of information that demonstrates that the proposed layout and house types are able to satisfy the requirements of the s106 agreement for the site (or any amended requirements agreed pursuant to the provisions of the s106 agreement) in respect of the mix and tenure of the affordable housing, also to delegate the imposition of any further conditions necessary to secure the satisfactory arrangement.

7.2 **Condition**

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:

Site location plan ref. 1889 SLP-01

Application site layout plan ref. 1889 ASL-01 Rev. H

External works layout plan ref. 1889 EWL-01 Rev. F (* to be updated)

Site entrance layout plan ref. 3852-101 Rev. B

Detailed planting plan 1 of 2 plan ref. 2078701 SBC00 XX DR L 401 Rev. PL09

Detailed planting plan 2 of 2 plan ref. 2078701 SBC00 XX DR L 401 Rev. PL09

Landscape structure plan ref. 2078701 SBC 00 XX DR L 402 Rev. PL09

Landscape specification (received by the Local Planning Authority on 13th October 2020)
5 year landscape maintenance/Management Plan September 2020 Rev. PL03 (dated 9.11.20)

Tree pit & hedge details plan ref. 2078701 SBC 00XX DR L 201 Rev. 01

The Silversmith floor plans ref. SI-4B-2S-P1

The Silversmith elevations plan ref. A/1234/00/CB/02 Rev. B

The Silversmith elevations plan ref. A/1234/00/CT/02 Rev. B

The Luthier floor plans ref. A/1392/00/AT/S01 Rev. C, A/1392/05/AT/S01 Rev. C,
A/1392/05/AT/S02 Rev. C

The Luthier elevations plan ref. A/1392/00/CB/02 Rev. B

The Luthier elevations plan ref. A/1392/00/CT/02 Rev. B

The Luthier elevations (plots 5 & 18) plan ref. A/1392/00/TB/S02 Rev. C

The Philosopher floor plans ref. PH-4B-2S-P1

The Philosopher elevations plan ref. A/1507/00/CB/02 Rev. D

The Philosopher elevations plan ref. A/1507/00/CT/02 Rev. D

The Goldsmith floor plans ref. GO-4B-2S-P1

The Goldsmith elevations plan ref. GO-4B-2S-CB-E

The Goldsmith elevations plan ref. GO-4B-2S-CT-E

The Weaver floor plans ref. WE-4B-2S-P1

The Weaver elevations plan ref. A/1688/00/CB/02 Rev. F

The Watchmaker floor plans ref. WA-5B-2S-P1 Rev. A

The Watchmaker elevations plan ref. A/1901/00/CB/02 Rev. E

The Watchmaker elevations plan ref. A/1901/00/CT/02 Rev. E

The Baker floor plans ref. BA-2B-2S-P1

The Baker elevations plan ref. BA-2B-2S-CB-E

The Ploughwright floor plans ref. PW-3B-2S-P1

The Ploughwright elevations plan ref. A/1026PW/00/CT/02 Rev. A
The Tillman floor plans ref. TI-3B-2S-P1
The Tillman elevations plan ref. A/1026TI/00/CB/02 Rev. C
2P-1B Apartment – Design sheet plan ref. 1889 2P1B/F/01 Rev. A
2P-1B Apartment – floor areas plan ref. 2P1B-FA-01
3P-2B Flat – Design sheet plan ref. 1889 3P2B/F/01 Rev. B
3P-2B Flat – floor areas plan ref. 3P2B-FA-01
Apartments – Sections plan ref. 1889 SEC/01
6P-4B House – Design sheet plan ref. 1889 6P4B/H/01 Rev. A
6P-4B House - floor areas plan 6P4B-FA-01

Single garage plan ref. A/218/00/CB/R2/01
Double garage plan ref. A/436/00/CB/R1/01
Double garage plan ref. A/436/25/CBH/R1/00
Sales garage plan ref. SG-TF/01 1903
Proposed sub station elevations Plan ref. 1889 PE/SS01

Enclosures details 1.2m estate railings plan ref. 1889 ED-12
Enclosures details 1.8m screen wall plan ref. 1889 ED-01
Enclosures details 1.8m close board fence plan ref. 1889 ED-02
Enclosures details 1.8m timber personnel gate plan ref. 1889 ED-03
Enclosures details 0.45m timber knee rail plan ref. 1889 ED-05

Development cross sections plan ref. 3852-123 Rev. D

Reason

To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Condition

Prior to occupation of any unit, a scheme to remove the septic tank/cess pit within the site serving the adjacent Manor Farm House property and remediate the land of any residual contamination shall be implemented in full on site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in advance.

Reason

In the interests of public safety and environmental health to ensure the septic tank/cess pit is removed alongside the implementation of the drainage scheme to ensure the open space is safe to use.

Condition

The estate railings shown on the External works layout plan ref. 1889 EWL-01 Rev. F parallel with units 29 to 33 shall be installed prior to making the surface water drainage system of the proposed development operational, and shall thereafter retained for the duration of the development.

Reason

To ensure the safety of the public in relation to the adjacent drainage pond proposals.

Person to Contact: Adam Smith (396702)

Planning Application: | 20/00600/REM

Address: | Land East Of Hempsted Lane
Hempsted Lane Gloucester

Committee Date: |

