



## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MEETING** : Tuesday, 7th September 2021

**PRESENT** : Cllrs. Taylor (Chair), Lewis (Vice-Chair), Ackroyd, Bhaimia, D. Brown, J. Brown, A. Chambers, Conder, Finnegan, Melvin, Toleman and Tracey

### **Officers in Attendance**

Head of Place

Planning Development Manager

Principal Planning Officer (Housing Delivery)

Principal Planning Officer

Planning Assistant

Senior Lawyer, One Legal

Democratic & Electoral Services Officer

**APOLOGIES** : Cllrs. Dee (Tracey attended as a substitute), Walford (Ackroyd attended as a substitute)

### **25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **26. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 3rd August 2021 were confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### **27. LATE MATERIAL**

Late Material had been circulated in respect of agenda item 5 – Robinswood Inn, Matson Avenue (20/00847/OUT) and item 6 – White City Adventure Playground (21/00298/FUL).

### **28. ROBINSWOOD INN, MATSON AVENUE, GLOUCESTER - 20/00847/OUT**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**07.09.21**

*Councillor Toleman was not present at the start of the discussion of the item, and therefore, took no part in the discussion or voting on the item.*

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing Delivery) presented the report detailing an application for the Construction of four dwellings and six apartments.

The Principal Planning Officer (Housing Delivery) responded to members' questions concerning whether or not the properties would be wheelchair accessible, the type of bins that would be used, landscaping, whether a condition could be imposed to require two houses and one dwelling be built as opposed to the proposed one apartment and two dwellings, whether there was a condition imposed relating to charging points, the type of trees that would be planted, whether there would be a parking permit scheme and whether the contribution of £32,830.40 proposed for secondary school provision could be ringfenced for the local ward as follows:

- Matters regarding landscaping would be considered at the reserved matters stage and looked at thoroughly by the Landscape Officer.
- If the trees planted were too close to any property, this would be looked at in-depth by the Tree Officer during the reserved matters stage.
- The application was not at the stage where there would be considerations about whether the dwellings would be wheelchair accessible. The application before Committee was considering the principle of development on the site.
- The proposed apartments would have larger bins and houses would have standard sized bins.
- The contribution of £32,830.40 would be ringfenced for the Gloucester Secondary Planning Area.
- The drawings at this point were purely indicative.
- Financial viability needed to be considered regarding whether to introduce a condition to build two houses and one apartment. The scheme overall proposed 30% affordable housing, which was above policy.
- There would be an expectation that properties would have their own allocated parking.

**Members' Debate**

Councillor A.Chambers stated that he believed it would have been beneficial to have a condition imposed that would require the building of two houses and one apartment. He added, that overall, he believed that it was a good scheme that would maintain green space, would retain trees and that the scheme overall would have 30% affordable housing, which was above policy.

The Chair moved, and the Vice-Chair seconded the officer's recommendation, as amended in the late material.

**RESOLVED that:** - subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to provide the following:

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**07.09.21**

- 1) 3 affordable dwelling units (one house and two apartments); and
- 2) £32,830.40 for secondary school provision in the Gloucester Secondary Planning Area.

Planning permission is granted subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

**29. WHITE CITY ADVENTURE PLAYGROUND, NORTHFIELD ROAD, GLOUCESTER - 21/00298/FUL**

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report detailing an application for the Construction of a Community and Recreation Centre, Adventure Playground building with associated external works, new play area, car park and associated vehicular access, and formation of vehicular access at Dickens Close.

*Councillor Melvin briefly left the meeting during the Officer's presentation, and therefore abstained from voting or discussing the item.*

**A local resident addressed the Committee in opposition to the application.**

He objected to the application on the following grounds:

- The existing play area already attracted a large amount of anti-social behaviour, which the application would add to;
- The current site attracts a lot of criminal activity;
- The Police had to deal with large amounts of anti-social behaviour, which was caused by the current use of the site, the granting of the application would add to this;
- Littering concerns;
- Vandalism of neighbouring properties;
- Residents were not aware of the scale of the proposal until he told them;
- Users of the site currently park on the driveways of the residents in the area;
- There was loud music played from the site, which created noise pollution for residents.

**The Chair of the White City Community Centre addressed the Committee in favour of the application.**

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

- The application from the start considered the health and wellbeing of the local residents and those who would be using the site;
- There was a significant demand for indoor sports facilities in the area, that the application would help to provide;
- It was a replacement for the St Aldates facility;
- Sport England supported the application;
- The proposal adopted would put the site far away from local houses, therefore mitigating potential noise pollution;
- The creation of 40 parking spaces would help to alleviate parking issues in the area;

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**07.09.21**

- Gloucestershire Highways had no issues with the application;
- The building proposed would be highly sustainable;
- There has been a robust consultation with the Community, which had begun in 2015;
- To prevent anti-social behaviour, security shutters would be installed;
- The lighting would only operate in the dark when the building was in use.
- CCTV would be used;
- The building would be acoustically sealed all year round;
- It would be complimentary to the Blackbridge scheme.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to members' questions concerning whether the Police had been consulted as part of the application, whether there was neighbourhood representation on the Committee of the Community Centre, the number and location of properties that had been consulted on the application, the nature of the consultation, whether there were any objections by Gloucestershire Highways, the number of parking spaces, the surfacing materials which would be used in the car park, the type of trees which would be planted, the size of the building, whether there would be a lift on site, whether floodlights would be introduced and whether staff would stay overnight at the proposed build as follows:

- The Police had not been contacted as part of the application.
- The officer was unaware whether there was a neighbourhood representative on the Committee of the Community Centre.
- 99 Properties were notified, and press and site notices were published.
- Gloucestershire Highways did not have any issues with the application, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.
- There was not a condition to provide green surfacing for the car park currently. However, if the Committee requested it, the requirement for the applicant to obtain approval to surfacing materials for the car park could be introduced as an amendment on an existing condition.
- The trees that would be planted were ones requested by the Tree Officer who had looked at the application in depth.
- The building would be two-storeys high.
- There was a railing proposed to be installed. A larger fence to combat anti-social behaviour would likely not be in keeping with the character of the area.
- The only column lights would be in the car park and road to the rear of the site. Should the applicant wish to introduce any additional floodlights, this would have to be a standalone application.
- The installation of CCTV prior to first use of the building could be introduced as an additional condition if the Committee requested it.
- There would be a lift.
- The 'staff accommodation in the upper floor' referred to in paragraph 1.4 of the report meant was a catch all phrase for staff facilities, staff room etc. and staff would not sleep on the site.

**Members' Debate**

Councillor Conder stated that she believed that the site could be used as a site for vandalism. She questioned whether grasscrete could be used in the car parking area.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**07.09.21**

Councillor Toleman stated that he agreed with the points raised during members questions by Councillor A.Chambers regarding the fact that there had only been a couple of objections during the consultation process.

Councillor Ackroyd noted that it may have been beneficial for the police to have been consulted with during the application process.

Councillor Tracey stated that she believed that a site visit may have been beneficial for this application.

Councillor A.Chambers stated that it was important to note that the application could only be judged on planning grounds. He stated that there were no issues regarding the street scene nor lighting in the area. He said that he would happily second Councillor Conders suggestion for grasscrete in the Car Park.

He added that three out of the five representations in response to the consultation process received had come from the same property and one of the five representations was a positive one. He stated that in relation to parking, 40 parking spaces were proposed, despite the car parking accumulation assessment that was undertaken using TRICS, showed that there was a requirement for 23. Therefore, it would potentially help with parking in the locality. He stated that he believed that it would not increase anti-social behaviour, and that it would potentially decrease it, as the increase of facilities would give children in the locality amenities to use, particularly during the school holidays. He stated that he believed that the application would be of great credit to the area.

The Vice-Chair stated that it was his belief that the introduction of CCTV would help to combat anti-social behaviour. He said that he believed that it was an excellent scheme.

Councillor D. Brown stated that he agreed with the Vice-Chair that the installation of CCTV would be beneficial, and he questioned whether it could be introduced before the site was used.

Councillor Conder stated that it may be a good idea if there was a graffiti wall on the site, so that local children could express themselves.

Councillor A.Chambers stated that the current site had previously operated a graffiti wall during the school holidays, which was highly successful.

The Chair moved, and the Vice-Chair seconded the Officer's recommendation as set out in report, subject to an amendment to Condition 3 of it to require approval of surfacing materials for the car park, and the addition of a new condition requiring CCTV at the site prior to first use.

**RESOLVED that:** - planning permission is granted subject to the conditions in the report, including an amendment to Condition 3 of it to require approval of surfacing materials for the car park, and the addition of a new condition requiring CCTV at the site prior to first use.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**07.09.21**

**30. LONGLEVENS RUGBY FOOTBALL CLUB, LONGFORD LANE, GLOUCESTER - 20/01143/FUL**

The Planning Assistant presented the report detailing an application for the addition of fencing around a rugby pitch.

**The Ex-Chairman and current committee member for Longlevens Rugby Football Club addressed the Committee in favour of the application.**

He stated that the application should be granted on the following grounds.

- The building of the fence would allow for Longlevens Rugby Club to be more inclusive, as it would allow children with additional needs from the local school to play on it;
- Currently, there is frequently dog foul on the pitch, the granting of the application would help to combat this;
- The Dog Faeces on the pitch could lead to sickness;
- The provision of play facilities, which the building of the fence would contribute to, would help the physical and mental health of the children who would play on it;
- The fence proposed was typical for the area;
- The application was supported by Sport England.

The Planning Assistant responded to members' questions concerning why the application was before the Committee, the use of the land and the number and usage of the gates proposed.

- The application was before the Committee as the Council owned the land.
- The fence would go around the pitch.
- There would be four gates. One was for access for ball retrieval, one would be accessed by the local school, one would be for the players and there would be a dual gate for emergency vehicles.
- The Council owned the land. However, the land was leased by Longlevens Rugby Club.
- The gates would be closed but not locked.
- Paragraph 6.5 of the report should have been amended to state that the gates would not be locked when the site was not in use but would be closed to prevent dog walkers using it.

**Members' Debate**

The Chair stated that he believed that it was a good scheme and would help the students of the local school.

Councillor D.Brown noted that he was in full support of everything the local school did.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**07.09.21**

The Chair moved, and the Vice-Chair seconded the officer's recommendation as laid out in the report.

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

**31. DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The schedule of applications determined under delegated powers during the month of July 2021 was noted.

**RESOLVED that:-** the schedule be noted.

**32. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday, 5<sup>th</sup> October 2021.

**Time of commencement: 6.00 pm**

**Time of conclusion: 7.28 pm**

**Chair**