



STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices • Ebley Mill • Ebley Wharf • Stroud • GL5 4UB

Tel: (01453) 754 351/754 321

www.stroud.gov.uk

Email: democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

4 June 2019

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Development Control Committee will be held on **WEDNESDAY 12 JUNE 2019** in the Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Ebley Wharf, Stroud at **6.00 pm.**

Chief Executive

Please Note:

- i. This meeting will be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site (www.stroud.gov.uk). By entering the Council Chamber you are consenting to being filmed. The whole of the meeting will be filmed except where there are confidential or exempt items, which may need to be considered in the absence of the press and public.
- ii. The procedure for public speaking which applies to Development Control Committee is set out on the page immediately preceding the Planning Schedule.

AGENDA

- 1 **APOLOGIES**
To receive apologies for absence.
- 2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
To receive Declarations of Interest in relation to planning matters.
- 3 **PLANNING SCHEDULE AND PROCEDURE FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING**
(Note: For access to information purposes, the background papers for the applications listed in the above schedule are the application itself and subsequent papers as listed in the relevant file.)
- 3.1 **LAND AT M5 JUNCTION 13 WEST OF STONEHOUSE, EASTINGTON, GLOUCESTERSHIRE (S.16/0043/OUT)**
Outline planning application for a 5,000 capacity football stadium and other ancillary uses (Use Class D2); two full-sized grass pitches and a goal practice area (Use Class D2); car parking for cars and coaches and highways improvements to the A419 including a signalised site junction and combined cycle/footway. All matters are reserved save for access.

Members of Development Control Committee

Councillor Martin Baxendale (Chair)

Councillor Miranda Clifton (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Dorcas Binns

Councillor Nigel Cooper

Councillor Haydn Jones

Councillor Steve Lydon

Councillor John Marjoram

Councillor Jenny Miles

Councillor Sue Reed

Councillor Mark Reeves

Councillor Jessica Tomblin

Councillor Tom Williams



Stroud District Council

Planning Schedule

12th June 2019

In cases where a Site Inspection has taken place, this is because Members felt they would be better informed to make a decision on the application at the next Committee. Accordingly the view expressed by the Site Panel is a factor to be taken into consideration on the application and a final decision is only made after Members have fully debated the issues arising.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Procedure for Public Speaking

The Council have agreed to introduce public speaking at meetings of the Development Control Committee.

Public speaking is only permitted on those items contained within the schedule of applications. It is not permitted on any other items on the Agenda. The purpose of public speaking is to emphasise comments and evidence already submitted through the planning system. Speakers should refrain from bringing photographs or other documents as it is not an opportunity to introduce new evidence.

The Chair will ask for those wishing to speak to identify themselves by name at the beginning of proceedings. There are four available slots for each schedule item:-

Ward Councillor(s)
Town or Parish representative
Spokesperson against the scheme and
Spokesperson for the scheme.

Each slot (with the exception of Ward Councillors who are covered by the Council's Constitution) will not exceed 6 minutes in duration. If there is more than one person who wishes to speak in the same slot, they will need either to appoint a spokesperson to speak for all, or share the slot equally. Speakers should restrict their statement to issues already in the public arena. Please note that statements will be recorded and broadcast over the internet as part of the Councils webcasting of its meetings; they may also be used for subsequent proceedings such as an appeal. Names may be recorded in the Committee Minutes.

The order for each item on the schedule is

1. Introduction of item by the Chair
2. Brief update by the planning officer.
3. Public Speaking
 - a. Ward Member(s)
 - b. Parish Council
 - c. Those who oppose
 - d. Those who support
4. Member questions of officers
5. Motion
6. Debate
7. Vote

A copy of the Scheme for Public Speaking at Development Control Committee meetings is available at the meeting.

Parish	Application	Item
Eastington Parish Council	Land At M5 Junction 13 West Of Stonehouse, Eastington, Gloucestershire. S.16/0043/OUT - 5,000 capacity football stadium and other ancillary uses (Use Class D2); two full-sized grass pitches and a goal practice area (Use Class D2); car parking for cars and coaches and highways improvements to the A419 including a signalised site junction and combined cycle/footway. All matters are reserved save for access.	



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Item No:	
Application No.	S.16/0043/OUT
Site No.	PP-04401581
Site Address	Land At M5 Junction 13 West Of Stonehouse, Eastington, Gloucestershire,
Town/Parish	Eastington Parish Council
Grid Reference	378047,206562
Application Type	Outline Planning Application
Proposal	5,000 capacity football stadium and other ancillary uses (Use Class D2); two full-sized grass pitches and a goal practice area (Use Class D2); car parking for cars and coaches and highways improvements to the A419 including a signalised site junction and combined cycle/footway. All matters are reserved save for access.
Recommendation	Resolve to Grant Permission
Call in Request	Requested by Planning Manager



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019



Applicant's Details	Ecotricity Group Limited
Agent's Details	Ecotricity Lion House, Rowcroft, Stroud, Gloucestershire, GL5 3BY
Case Officer	John Chaplin
Application Validated	21.01.2016
	CONSULTEES
Comments Received	Building Control Manager (E) Contaminated Land Officer (E) Archaeology Dept (E) Forest Of Dean District Council Eastington Parish Council Sport England Flood Resilience Land Drainage Arboricultural Officer (E)



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Natural England (E)
Public Rights Of Way Officer
The Environment Agency (E)
Historic England SW
Cotswolds Conservation Board
Mr Nick Small
Stonehouse Town Council
Wales And West Utilities Limited (E)
Berkeley Vale CPRE
CPRE Gloucestershire
Biodiversity Officer
Development Coordination (E)
Department For Communities And Local Government
Environmental Health (E)
Standish Parish Council
Nailsworth Town Council
Contaminated Land Officer (E)
Quedgeley Parish Council(E)
Stroud Town Council
Strategic Planning
Crime Prevention Design Advisor (E)
Highways England
Canal Team (E)
Conservation North Team
Archaeology Dept (E)
Leonard Stanley Parish Council
Sustrans South West
Mr Andrew Lord
Arlingham Parish Council
Mr Nick Small
Wales And West Utilities Limited (E)
Wychavon District Council
Jane Bullows - Sport And Health Development Manager
Gfirst LEP
Football Association
Frampton On Severn Parish Council
Cainscross Parish Council
Cam Parish Council
Dursley Town Council
South Gloucestershire Council
Cotswold Canal Trust (E)
Planning Strategy Manager (E)
Gloucestershire Playing Fields Association (E)
Crime Prevention Design Advisor (E)
Strategic Planning
Severn Trent Water Ltd (E)
SDC Water Resources Engineer



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

	Archaeology Dept (E) Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust
Constraints	Eastington Parish Council
	OFFICER'S REPORT

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is situated to the west of Stroud and Stonehouse and north of the settlement grouping of Alkerton and Eastington adjacent to the junction 13 of the M5 motorway. The site is bisected by the A419 and the M5 which provide three distinct areas.

The first of the three areas is the Northern Area, consisting of 18.9 ha of land immediately to the north of the A419, the western boundary adjoining the M5 Junction 13, the Northern boundary adjoins existing residential properties accessed from Grove Lane, with the final Eastern boundary adjoining agricultural land which forms a wedge between the Northern part of the application site and the existing petrol filling station, hotel and restaurants sited to the North West of the Chipmans Platt roundabout.

This roundabout as well as providing access from the A419 to Grove Lane also now provides the western access to the developing allocated residential and commercial development Land West of Stonehouse now known as Great Oldbury. In addition via its Southern arm it also provides access to Eastington and the village centre of Alkerton.

The second area of the application site, the Western area comprises approx 4.5ha of land situated to the west and south of junction 13 of the M5. This is made up of two meadows with mature hedging. The Stroudwater Highways depot and the A419 which connects with the A38 at Whitminster are located to the north with the River Frome on the Southern boundary. This area is within Flood Zone 3. There is an underpass and river tunnel under the motorway embankment connecting to land to the east of the M5.

The Southern area, land to the south of the A419 is approximately 13.5ha is the third area. With the boundary with the A419 to the North, M5 to the West there are existing residential and an institutional use (William Morris House) to the East. The industrial development at Eastington Trading Estate is located just beyond the south boundary.

The agricultural land immediately south of the Southern area of the application site is edged in blue as being in the applicants control but is not shown within the application red line. This area is shown for illustrative purposes only as a potential position of future canal works as part of the Missing Mile project.

All the land currently has an agricultural use and is relatively flat and low-lying but gently undulates with a slight slope to the south towards the flood plain and River Frome beyond. The agricultural land has predominantly been used as grazing land by cattle and for cutting of hay. These fields generally have well-defined hedgerow boundaries, however, there are



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

some gaps within them. Some trees are located within these hedge lines along with a slightly more wooded section adjacent to the M5 junction.

The A419 provides one of the main gateways into this part of the Stroud district. It is currently a single carriageway width with no footpath and the majority being unlit until it reaches the Chipmans Platt roundabout. Grove Lane is a rural lane which provides access to Nupend and Westend before continuing over the M5 to Whitminster and the A38.

The northern part of the application site is bisected by two footpaths running broadly north to south, joining up just north of the southern boundary of this section of the site. The conjoined footpath then crosses the A419 and runs south through the southern section of the site adjoining William Morris House to Westfield Bridge, a bridge over the now filled in canal.

National Cycle Route 45 which connects to Stroud, runs along Grove Lane then south at the roundabout before heading east along the canal/A419 corridor.

No Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens or Listed Buildings are present within the red line application site. However, part of the southern part of the site and the western section are located within the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area (IHCA). The IHCA follows and includes the historic industrial development of the canal, mill sites and associated features for example; Meadow Mill, William Morris House, Westfield Bridge and the former route of the canal.

Listed buildings are located adjacent to the site. This includes Mulgrove, Westend Farm and Grove Farm on Grove Lane, Eastington Grange at Chipmans Platt, Eastington Park and the various buildings including the church at Churchend. There are further Listed buildings in the wider area including at Nupend and Nastend.

There are no landscape or wildlife designations within the application site but the adjacent River Frome is a Key Wildlife Site. The site is located within the Severn Vale landscape character area with the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and escarpment located 2km away. Within 5km are located two internationally important ecological sites; Severn Estuary and Rodborough Common. Other nationally and locally important sites are also present.

THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application as originally submitted on 21st January 2016 sought outline planning consent, with all matters reserved, apart from access, for the following development: 'A 5000 capacity football stadium and other ancillary uses (Use Class D2); and up to 41300sq m of B1 floorspace; up to 22,800sq m of B2/B8 floorspace; indoor football playing pitch (use Class D2), other recreational use (use Class D2); Transport Hub (including ancillary parking for cars and coaches, and a drop off point for buses and taxis), with all matters reserved save for access.'

The initial application showed, for illustrative purposes, the northern part of the site as being for what the applicant described as a 'Green Technology Hub' which as that particular Use



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Class is not recognised in Regulation was proposed to consist of some 37,300sq m of B1 (Office Use) and 22,800sq m of B2 (Light industry) and B8 (Warehousing and Storage). A Parameter Plan was submitted showing that the heights of the proposed development on this northern portion of the site would be arranged in three parallel areas to the alignment of the A419, ranging from up to 12m high adjacent to the A419, then a band of development up to 12m high with the final band of development being some 6m high nearest to the dwellings in Westend.

The Western area, was described by the applicant as a 'Nature Conservation Area' and as befits its notation was not proposed for any development, however, the illustrative potential realigned canal route was shown as bisecting the area.

The Southern portion of the application site below the A419 was originally proposed as 'The sports hub' including a football stadium with various open training pitches, additional sporting facilities and parking. A new B1 (Office) block of some 5000sq m was also proposed for use by Ecotricity.

Revisions to the initially submitted application

Following discussions and the results of initial statutory consultations the applicants, in September 2016, the submitted scheme was revised ('Further Environmental Information 1' (FEI1)). The revisions included a ramped access footbridge across the A419 between the 'Green technology hub' and the 'Sports Complex' and signalisation of junction 13 of the M5. In addition the applicants proposed improvements to National Cycle route 45. The submitted revisions also included a consideration of employment land requirements and significantly amended transport information. Further revisions to the overall Master plan included removal of the non-football illustrative outdoor sports facilities and replacement with more football training pitches. Additional illustrative designs for the Stadium were also submitted. The B1 offices proposed on the southern site were to be re-sited away from the historic alignment of the former canal.

Further revisions to the submitted scheme and additional information were submitted in March 2017 (FEI2) following further detailed discussions including concerns regarding the highway impact, parking, landscape and ecology.

Following these revisions further considerable dialogue occurred with the applicants and their agents, in particular concerning the acoustic impact on the residents of William Morris College situated at the south east boundary of the southern site of the application. This together with further information required by Highways England resulted in an updated Transport Assessment and a revised Travel Plan being submitted in August 2017 and constituted a further revision (FEI3). The revision also showed a bus, pedestrian and cycle only access from Grove Lane to supplement the main access onto the A419 which was revised to show realigned access arrangements to the southern and northern parcels. In addition the illustrative layout drawings were revised to accord generally with the winner of the applicants design competition, Zaha Hadid Architects.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

The result of the acoustic study submitted by the applicant's agents was judged, by officers and our specialist consultant, unsatisfactory to mitigate the acoustic effects on William Morris House. Officers informed the applicants late in 2017 that, as submitted, the scheme would likely be recommended for refusal on acoustic grounds irrespective of other issues that had not been fully considered at that date.

THE APPLICATION TO BE DETERMINED.

In December 2017 the applicant radically revised the submitted proposal to the scheme now under consideration. Whilst the built development component altered, the application site in terms of the red line and three distinct parcels remained the same totalling some 39.5ha.

The development is now:

'5,000 capacity football stadium and other ancillary uses (Use Class D2); two full-sized grass pitches and a goal practice area (Use Class D2); car parking for cars and coaches and highways improvements to the A419 including a signalised site junction and combined cycle/footway. All matters are reserved save for access.'

The application remains in outline form with only the details of the access submitted. An indicative Masterplan has been submitted, together with key parameters for the development as now envisaged. The Green Technology Hub/employment land and the office space have been removed from the proposal. No development is proposed within the southern section, to the south of the A419 apart from the highway mitigation, including hedge translocation. This area will remain in agricultural use.

The sports hub on the southern parcel was modified in extent and content and moved to occupy the entire northern parcel. The parking area of some 1700 spaces is proposed to include provision for cars, coaches and cycles. The area will also include facilities for disabled users and a local stage bus pick up and drop off points.

The proposal now comprises the following development:

- * A football stadium with a seating capacity for 5000 spectators
- * Two full size grass practice pitches
- * One goal practice area
- * A car park for 1700 vehicles.

The illustrative material submitted shows the proposed stadium as the primarily new build structure on the application site with the applicants' stated intention that it will become the new home for Forest Green Rovers, who are currently based at The New Lawn in Nailsworth. Therefore, within the proposed stadium ancillary facilities are also proposed, namely;

- * Club shop
- * Health and fitness facilities
- * Conference facilities
- * Training and staff offices
- * Changing facilities
- * Function and bar areas.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

The club is seeking to produce a highly sustainable building with Zaha Hadid Architects having been appointed and has provided the indicative designs and visualisation. The building is proposed to be low carbon and low impact, with measures introduced to minimise energy use, water, waste and pollution. The revised Design and Access statement demonstrates in illustrative figures and text form the evolution of the overall innovative wood design, and the measures that are proposed to be incorporated to ensure a sustainable and 'green' building is produced.

These, together with figures showing the overall master plan, illustrative strategic landscaping details and parameter height and illustrative sections through the site, have been submitted to demonstrate the anticipated design that the applicant envisages and how it reacts and relates to the local context.

The proposed stadium is an indicative oval shape, 159m long and 144m wide with an indicative maximum height of 19.5m. The illustrative landscaping has been specifically designed to form a parkland landscape setting to the stadium. For illustrative purposes the potential degree of changes to existing levels in the car park and landscaped areas have also been indicated and this results in generally only modest changes of levels for these areas.

The illustrative landscaping proposals at the northern boundary of the development site adjoining existing houses on Grove Lane show orchard and hedgerow planting and a landscaped bund which provide separation from the car park and main stadium area. On the southern side of the development site adjoining the motorway junction two ponds are proposed with species-rich areas of grassland and parkland. The large areas of landscaping to provide boundary treatment for the stadium are envisaged within the illustrative material. This is produced in part by the trans-planting of existing hedgerows on the site, thus mitigating the overall loss of hedgerow.

The vehicle parking area is shown as being laid out with a significant level of tree planting on the illustrative layouts/visualisations and with further translocation of existing vegetation.

The sole matter not reserved for future applications is access. The main access is to be gained from the A419 with a new signalised junction, including signal controlled pedestrian and cycle crossing. As part of the highway mitigation package it is also proposed to fully dual the A419 from the M5 Junction 13 to Chipmans Platt with a combined footway cycleway on the south side of the A419 which will link to National Cycle Route 45 (NCN45) at Grove Lane. Improvement to the M5 junction roundabout lining are also outlined. A secondary pedestrian, public service vehicle and cyclist entry point only is shown off Grove Lane. The provision of sustainable transport is also part of the proposal with match day transport proposed and, whilst not now proposed, a possible informal park and ride has also been discussed.

Since the revised proposal was submitted in December 2017 and following discussions several submissions of 'Further Environmental Information' (FEIs) have been received. These have included further information and updates on the landscape impact, justification, noise issues and the highway assessment and mitigation (FEI 4-8).



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Additional ecological information has also been submitted with the western area again being proposed as a Nature Conservation Area (FEI 7). The indicative Green Infrastructure Plan and Indicative Concept Masterplan show the whole of the area west of the M5 with further nature conservation enhancements including orchard planting and appropriate ecological management.

Submitted information

The revised scheme was accompanied with a new Environmental Impact Assessment, though this drew on work done previously relating to the previous iterations of the scheme. The EIA now supporting the application has been undertaken in accordance with the 2011 EIA regulations, however, the 2017 regulations contain additional matters which would, had the original application been submitted at a later date, have been required to be assessed in line with those regulations. The applicants have stated that they have in any event assessed additional matters which would have been required under the 2017 regulations.

The Environmental Statement (ES) assesses the likely environmental impacts from the development during its construction and its operation. It also assesses the cumulative impacts from other developments.

The revised Environmental Statement now comprises the following subject areas:

- * Archaeology and Cultural Heritage
- * Ecology and Nature Conservation
- * Flood Risk, Hydrology and Drainage
- * Landscape and Visual Impact
- * Scio-economics
- * Transport and Access
- * Air Quality and Dust
- * Lighting
- * Noise and Vibration
- * Climate Change
- * Major Accident and Disasters
- * Cumulative Effects

Officers are satisfied that the information submitted within the revised Environmental Statement is sufficient to consider the potential environmental impacts of the development.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

2015/1820/EIAS - Proposed mixed use development for a sports and green technology centre, known as "Eco Park" comprising of a sports complex including transport hub with park and ride, green technology hub and nature conservation area. EIA Required – 30 Sept 2015

SITES INSPECTION PANEL

All members of the Development Control Committee were invited on the Sites Inspection Panel (SIP) visit on Tuesday 28th May 2019 with 7 members in attendance. This was a closed meeting for Members and Officers of Stroud District Council to inspect the site and locally important locations.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Both Ward Councillors were invited with Cllr Stephen Davies attending.

The panel started at Pick Lock and walked along the footpath/former canal towpath and convened on Westfield bridge to identify the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area (IHCA) the former route of the canal, its potential restoration and associated buildings and features. This included views in and out of the Conservation Area.

The position of the site, including the proposed built footprint and other key local identifying features like the A419, M5 and River Frome were noted along with the local landscape character. The local footpath network was also noted.

The position and proximity of the William Morris College was also appreciated.

The panel reconvened at the field entrance adjacent to the layby to the North of the A419 to appreciate the onsite elements, use, levels, vegetation and location etc.

The site was then observed from Grove Lane, noting the Land West of Stonehouse development, the local character of Westend and Nupend and the Listed buildings and their setting and the local views along Grove Lane and the elevated motorway bridge towards Whitminster.

The panel reconvened at Haresfield Beacon to appreciate the wider landscaping setting and the position of the site. This included the view from the Cotswold escapement, the AONB and Cotswold Way and identified the site within the proposed landscape setting including its relationship with nearby landmarks and developments.

REPRESENTATIONS

Statutory Consultees:

January 2016. Original submission

Eastington Parish Council: Object - Conflict with Local Plan, IHCA impact, not sustainable, loss of employment from town centre, landscape impact, benefits over stated. Attached their highways consultant report, questions the data and conclusions.

Stonehouse Town Council: Support but concerns about traffic. Walking and cycling enhancements required.

Moreton Valence Parish Council: Concern about traffic, noise and light pollution.

Arlingham Parish Council: Concern about flooding and traffic concern.

Nailsworth Town Council: No observations.

Standish Parish Council: Object - contrary to Local Plan, traffic, parking, need

Stroud Town Council: Comment - Request a Park and Ride

Cainscross Parish: Object - Contrary to Local Plan, A419 congestion, risk of taking employment out of Stroud.

Leonard Stanley Parish Council: Support but need to get support for the canal restoration, A419 improvements welcome, nature conservation should be enhanced.

Wychavon District Council: No comment

South Glos Council: Concern about strategic highway implications.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Highways England: Holding objection
Sustrans: Transport proposals lack ambition
Stagecoach: Potential for bus improvements, welcome A419 dualling.
Stagecoach: Ongoing discussion with applicants
GCC Public Rights of Way: Implications for existing footpaths.

Environment Agency: No objections but make comments on the supporting information
GCC Lead Flood Authority: No objections subject to conditions
Severn Trent: No objections subject to conditions
SDC Water Services Engineer: Defer to Lead Flood Authority

Historic England: Some concerns, planning balance required.
County Archaeologist: No objection subject to condition
Cotswold Conservation Board: Potential to have a negative impact on AONB, visible from several viewpoints,

Natural England: No comment but defer to Cotswold Conservation Board on landscape.
Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust: Highlight importance of ecological potential of the area.
CPRE: Objection. Relocation benefits not proven, other sites, Environmental Statement does not support.
Need for landscaping, materials important, needs careful consideration.
Cotswold Canals Trust: Willing to discuss Section 106

Sport England: "Unable to support", need further information
F.A.: General support but needs further information.
Glos Playing Field Assoc: No supporting evidence on need, impact on existing facilities, question management of facilities, question financial viability.
Active Gloucestershire: Support. Welcome opportunity.
Gloucestershire Schools F.A. Support. Welcome opportunity.

Contaminated Land Officer: No objection subject to condition
EHO Noise needs further research, but otherwise recommends condition

GCC Planning: Question ecology, need to respect rights of way.
Gloucestershire Constabulary: Offer advice on crime protection

William Morris House: Concern about access arrangements, noise, lighting, privacy.

Further Environmental Information (FEI 1) Revised Information September 2016

Eastington Parish Council (Highway consultants): Question transport study
Eastington Parish Council (Planning consultants): Neighbourhood Plan in place, contrary to settlement pattern, IHCA harm.
Cainscross Parish Council: Objection: increase in parking, design unsympathetic

Historic England: No further comments
Environment Agency: No further comments



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Sport England: Support
Natural England: No further comments
GCC Planning: Lighting implications on ecology

Highways England: Holding objection
Sport England: No further comments
EHO: Satisfied on lighting

Glos Wildlife Trust: Note surveys undertaken. Opportunities for enhancement. Considerable potential
CPRE: Still unacceptable, case not proven, contrary to Local Plan.
Cotswold Canals Trust: Concern about implications for restoration
SVCC: concern about canal restoration opportunities.

FEI 2 - March 2017

Stroud Town Council: Recommend a Park and Ride.
Sport England: No further comments
Natural England: Question landscape impact not any comment on ecology.
Historic England: Concerns - questions future implications for canal, pitches and car parking will be obtrusive.

FEI 3 - August 2017

Quedgeley Town Council: Agree with Highways England.
Cainscross Parish Council: Concern about traffic congestion.

Highways England: Holding objection
Historic England: No further comments
County Archaeologist: No objection
Sport England: No further comments
Environment Agency: No further comments
Contaminated Land Officer: No objection

Revised scheme Dec 2017 and FEI 4 - May 2018 (Movement of stadium as revised December 2017)

Easington Parish Council: Objection – Contrary to Local Plan and NDP, does not reflect existing character and settlement pattern, cumulative impact with Land west of Stonehouse. Sustainable benefits over-stated. No robust sequential test of alternative sites.

Stroud Town Council: Cycling provision disappointing.
Frampton Parish Council: Object. Contrary to Local Plan, impact on William Morris House, highways.
Arlingham Parish Council: Same capacity stadium, highway concerns.

Historic England: No objection
County Archaeologist: No objection, recommend conditions

Lead Flood Authority: No objection, recommend conditions



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Environment Agency: No objection.

Wales and West Utilities: No adverse comment, show maps of pipelines.

Contaminated Land Officer: No objection, subject to condition.

EHO: Noise still under consideration, otherwise conditions recommended including biomass boiler.

Natural England: No further comments.

Cotswold Canals Trust: Towpath will be a benefit

Sport England: No objection.

Highways Agency: Holding objection.

CPRE: Object, stadium is unnecessary, contrary to Local Plan, large scale building, in isolated countryside.

SDC Building Control Officer: No objection, applications for reserved matters will need to address risks of fire but stadium will be subject to safety at sports grounds requirements as well as the FA's licensing requirements.

FEI 5 22 May 2018 (Travel plan, highway information Transport and biodiversity)

Eastington Parish Council: Object: Capacity at Chipmans Platt roundabout, contrary to NDP, erodes green buffer, noise nuisance, and other sites should be considered, contrary to Local Plan.

Stroud Town Council: No objection.

Eastington Parish Council: Objection. Unsightly expanse of car parking, loss of hedges, need to re-route footpaths, site selection needs to be re-done (alternative sites), undermine green buffer for Stonehouse, impact on AONB, impact on listed buildings, impact on IHCA, contrary to Local Plan.

Stroud Town Council: No further comments.

Nailsworth Town Council: Contrary to Local Plan.

Stonehouse Town Council: Impact needs to be quantified and could be mitigated by sustainable transport.

Standish Parish Council: Objection, increase in traffic

Highways England: No objection subject to conditions.

GCC Highways: Acknowledge traffic surveys and revised Traffic Impact Assessment and Travel Plan. No objection subject to condition.

Natural England: No further comments

Historic England: No objection

County Archaeologist: No objection subject to condition

Environment Agency: No objection

Ministry of Defence: No objection.

G First LEP: Support: Landmark design, will promote local economy, training opportunities and links to colleges.

EHO. As previous comments.

Contaminated Land Officer: No objection subject to condition

FEI 6 & 7 August 2018 (Noise, highway impact, ecology)

Eastington Parish Council: objection. Hedgerow retention still not clear, stadium could be re-sited to improve ecology, question acoustic barrier, noise is still an important consideration, loss of biodiversity, contrary to NDP.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Stonehouse Town Council: Traffic concern. Noise management required for William Morris House.

Standish Parish Council: Remain unconvinced about highway impact.

Forest of Dean District Council: No objection.

Sport England: No comment.

Natural England: No further comments

Historic England: No further comments.

GCC Public rights of Way: Some diversion required.

EHO: WYG consultants (on behalf of SDC) are considering noise

CPRE: Objection, works to A419 will be harmful

FE1 8 December 2018 (Noise, landscape, ecology, sustainability, design, materials, travel plan, concept master plan, supporting information).

Eastington Parish Council: Object: Traffic, Junction 13 will be unsafe, accumulative impact on network, loss of hedging will harm ecology, noise impacts will be significant, contrary to Local Plan, biodiversity/geo-diversity/landscape/historic environment/flooding and efficient land use are all critical. Dualling of the A419 will be harmful; the area is a "green bridge". Concept plan does not show sufficient consideration of bio-diversity, stadium could be better sited elsewhere particularly Cam/Dursley, private sporting venue not for public use, outside settlement boundary, contrary to NDP.

Stonehouse Town Council: Need for sustainable transport measures, canal implications need to be considered, noise must be investigated.

Nailsworth Town Council: Support the position of Eastington Parish Council asking to call in the application to the Secretary of State for the Environment.

Sport England: No further comments

Natural England: No further comments

Environment Agency: No further comments

Historic England: No further comments

County Archaeologist: No further comments

Glos CC Public Rights of Way: Need for some diversions.

Lead Flood Authority: No further comments

EHO: Recommends conditions

Public comments

Approximately 500 responses have been received. Most were to the original submission, with less comment on the revised submission whereby the stadium was moved and employment area deleted. There are more responses of objection than support overall. The issues raised include:

Original submission

Support:

Pressing need for the new stadium, close to West of Stonehouse and nearby settlements, could help canal restoration, existing stadium will provide affordable homes, club will be more efficient with the pitches, boost local economy, help progress in football league, improvement to cycle routes, support youth/ladies teams, promote knowledge/education, help club



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

progress, exemplar design, one off opportunity, access to existing stadium is difficult, lack of car parking at existing.

Also received:

470 signed pre-printed cards (some with comments as summarised above) in support.

Neutral:

Opportunity for park and ride, car parking fees important for spill over parking, opportunity to improve Sustrans link, need to improve walking facilities, need links to Stonehouse Station, buffer needed to Grove lane, reed bed would help sewage, low grade agricultural land, disabled spaces needed, commercial space is needed, road signage important.

Objection:

Loss of countryside, loss of agricultural land, M5 junction impact, flooding as site is on lias clay, likely to shift jobs from other areas, traffic lights will impair flows, road network already congested, too much short cutting through Eastington, lack of car parking, AONB impact, sewage problems, should be sited at Javelin Park, poor accident record at M5 and A419, should be used for other sports, "green belt", light pollution, refusal and appeal dismissed for rugby ground elsewhere, will look out of place, archaeology (crossing point in Roman times), archaeology (Roman Villa), impact on business in Stroud and Nailsworth, carbon footprint, section 106 requirements on existing stadium, not necessary, contrary to NDP, existing stadium only 10 years old, set a precedent, contrary to Local Plan, impact on William Morris House, lack of public transport, should be brownfield first, dimensions are questionable, phone coverage inadequate, impact during construction, impact of flashing headlights, danger to horse riders, financial benefits are already in the economy, 3D model is unrepresentational, employment area will be an eyesore, impact of pollution, set a precedent, lead to relocation of Ecotricity Offices, harmful to IHCA, Eastington has its own football club, need to re-open Stonehouse station, cost of parking, litter, loss of dairy land.

Also received:

A petition of 577 signatures in objection.

Revised plans (relocation of stadium north of A419 and deletion of employment area)

Support: Opportunity, green credentials, employment benefit, potential to support canal restoration, benefit to youth teams, social benefit, problems of existing stadium.

Neutral: Consider transport opportunities.

Objection: Traffic, contrary to Local Plan, landscape impact, lack of accessibility, contrary to Eastington NDP, no benefit to economy, set a precedent, pollution, outside settlement limits, noise, accident record, pollution, M5 congestion, litter, nuisance during construction, other sites including Cam/Dursley Station.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Revised Feb 2019.

Available to view at:



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

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

The NPPF sets out Government planning policy for England and how it should be applied. The Framework sets the context for Policy and planning decision making on development proposals. The NPPF reminds the reader that in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Framework sets out that the bedrock of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. To achieve this objective Paragraph 11 of the Framework requires that decisions on planning applications should be applied with a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision making this means accordance with Section 38(6), namely approving development proposals in accordance with up-to-date development plans without delay.

In circumstances where there are no relevant Development Plan policies or the policies which are important for determining the applications are out-of-date granting permission without delay unless:

- i. The application of policies in this framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed, or
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in (the) Framework as a whole”

The policies referred to in i. above are, inter alia of relevance to the application, those within the Framework relating to habitat, sites of special scientific interest, areas of outstanding natural beauty and heritage assets including archaeological interest.

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF sets out the three objective elements to the achievement of sustainable development namely, economic, social and environmental. The application of each of element to the achievement of sustainable development needs to be considered in mutually supportive ways, so that the resulting consideration can secure net gains within each element. Paragraph 9 of the NPPF warns that the three dimensions of sustainable development are not criteria against which every development proposal should be judged but play a role in guiding development to sustainable solutions, within the local context.

The economic dimension requires consideration of how a development proposal would assist in building a strong, responsive and competitive economy.

The social objective seeks to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by encouraging well designed and safe built environment, with accessible services which reflect current and future need for communities health, social and cultural well being.

The environmental objective seeks development to support the achievement of the protection and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment; Ensuring the prudent use of natural resources, minimising waste and pollution and mitigating and adapting to climate change and a low carbon economy.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Each of the three objectives will be considered below in the context of the NPPF:

The Economic Objective

Chapter 6 of the NPPF amplifies and expands on the economic aspects of sustainable development. Paragraph 80 advises that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and the need to create conditions in which business can invest, expand and adapt. Paragraph 84 recognises that development in rural areas seeking leisure land uses may occur outside or adjacent to existing settlements. However such proposals will need to ensure the development is sensitive to its surroundings, produces no unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits opportunities to make the development sustainable by improving access. Sites well related to existing settlements 'should be encouraged'.

Chapter 9 of the NPPF at paragraph 108 and subsequent paragraphs sets out how development proposals in term of sustainable transport should be considered. Sustainable transport mode opportunities should be grasped, coupled with the provision of safe and suitable access to the site for all users. Impacts from development on the transport network in terms of capacity, congestion and highway safety can be mitigated.

Paragraph 109 warns that;

'Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'.

The following paragraph (110) advises that first priority be given in any development proposal is to cycle and pedestrian movements, then secondly to public transport. The needs of persons with disabilities and reduced mobility also must be addressed. Applications for development should create safe secure and attractive places where conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles is avoided; such places should also make provision for access for deliveries and for the emergency services. Development should be designed to enable re-fuelling provision for plug in and other low emission vehicles.

The Social Objective

Chapter 8 of the NPPF focuses on the social aspects of creating places. Paragraph 91 encourages positive decisions which promote social interaction in a safe and accessible location. Decisions on the social objective should enable and support a healthy lifestyle. The following paragraph (92) sets out what relevant planning decisions should seek to achieve including:

- * Plan positively for the provision of inter alia community facilities, including sports venues, and
- * take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well being for all sections of the community.

The Environmental Objective

The environmental objectives of the NPPF encompass both the design and in particular the sustainability of built structures to contribute to mitigating climate change (Paragraph 124 and Chapter 14 refers) and impact on the natural, and historic environment. Chapter 12 at paragraph 131 dealing with the built environment aspect considers that;



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

'In determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area'. However, the same paragraph cautions that designs should fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

Turning to the sustainable transport aspect of the environmental objective, the NPPF policy for this matter is contained in Chapter 9 of the document. The policy requires that the environmental impact of traffic and transport are identified and taken into account and opportunities to mitigate negative impacts and for net gains are made. Constituent matters to be considered with respect to this application are air quality, noise, opportunities to influence modal split and utilisation of public transport and low emission vehicles.

The NPPF deals at Chapter 15 with the natural environment and requires that planning authorities refuse development which results in loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats. The NPPF encourages within development opportunities the incorporation of biodiversity improvements, in particular ones which can secure a measurable gain.

The NPPF notes that development schemes do not enjoy the presumption in favour of sustainable development where the proposals have a significant effect on a habitat. (Paragraph 177 refers). The environmental effect of development on ground conditions and pollution also form part of the environmental sustainable objective and the need to minimise impact.

A further constituent of the environmental objective of sustainable development is the impact of development on heritage assets and the historic environment. Chapter 16 of the NPPF considers these matters. The Policy advises that development proposals should contain a description of the impact on any heritage asset affected with a level of detail proportional to the importance of the asset. The settings of any identified assets are also required to be considered. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF advises planning authorities on how to consider the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset: 'Great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm'. In the case of non-designated heritage assets such as impact on Conservation Areas the policy is clear, Paragraph 197 states; 'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.

Stroud District Local Plan adopted 2015.

The Stroud District Local Plan was adopted in November 2015. This covers the whole District. The Plan is being reviewed and has just completed its consultation on the emerging strategy.

Policies together with the preamble text and associated supplementary planning documents are available to view on the Councils website:
www.stroud.gov.uk/localplan



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Local Plan policies considered for this application include:

CP1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development.

CP2 – Strategic growth and development locations.

CP3 – Settlement Hierarchy.

CP4 – Place Making.

CP5 – Environmental development principles for strategic growth.

CP6 – Infrastructure and developer contributions.

CP7 – Lifetime communities.

CP11 – New employment development.

CP13 – Demand management and sustainable travel measures.

CP14 – High quality sustainable development.

EI11 – Promoting sport, leisure and recreation.

EI12 – Promoting transport choice and accessibility.

EI13 – Protecting and extending our cycle routes.

EI16 – Provision of public transport facilities.

ES1 – Sustainable construction and design.

ES2 – Renewable or low carbon energy generation.

ES3 – Maintaining quality of life within our environmental limits.

ES4 – Water resources, quality and flood risk.

ES5 – Air quality.

ES6 – Providing for biodiversity and geodiversity.

ES7 – Landscape character.

ES8 – Trees, hedgerows and woodlands.

ES10 – Valuing our historic environment and assets.

ES11 – Maintaining, restoring and regenerating the District's Canals.

ES12 – Better design of places.

The most pertinent elements of the principle policies are highlighted below in the descriptive preambles.

CP1 Presumption In Favour Of Sustainable Development

This is an all-encompassing policy which sets out principles and objectives for every development. It echoes paragraph 8 of the Framework (NPPF). Sustainability is also its key intent.

It rightly makes reference to the need to accord with Local Plan Policies. But then continues where there are no relevant policies that any adverse impacts need to be considered against the benefits.

The policy states:

'When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.'



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

1. Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or
2. Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted'.

CP15 A Quality Living Countryside

This applies outside settlements and similarly the adopted Local Plan does not allocate the application site for development. The proposal contravenes this policy. The starting point of the upper case policy emphasises the need to protect the separate character of settlements and the quality of the countryside (including its built and natural heritage). There are a few very stringent exceptions which include enabling development to maintain a heritage asset or involve essential community facilities. The policy continues that development will only be permitted where there is no heritage impact, no excessive encroachment.

The emerging Local Plan strategy does allocate the stadium site for that use but has limited status at this stage.

Policy CP15 states:

'In order to protect the separate identity of settlements and the quality of the countryside (including its built and natural heritage), proposals outside identified settlement development limits will not be permitted except where these principles are complied with:

1. It is essential to the maintenance or enhancement of a sustainable farming or forestry enterprise within the District; and/or
2. It is essential to be located there in order to promote public enjoyment of the countryside and support the rural economy through employment, sport, leisure and tourism; and/or
3. It is a 'rural exception site', where development is appropriate, sustainable, affordable and meets an identified local need; and/or
4. It is demonstrated that the proposal is enabling development, required in order to maintain a heritage asset of acknowledged importance; and/or
5. It is a replacement dwelling; and/or
6. It will involve essential community facilities.

Where development accords with any of the principles listed above, it will only be permitted in the countryside if:

- i) It does not have an adverse impact on heritage assets and their setting;
- ii) It does not lead to excessive encroachment or expansion of development away from the original buildings;
- iii) In the case of proposals to re-use an existing building or buildings, these are appropriately located and capable and worthy of conversion. Any such conversion will involve a building that positively contributes to an established local character and sense of place. In the case of replacement buildings they must bring about environmental improvement; or



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

- iv) In the case of extensions to buildings, it does not result in an inappropriate increase in the scale, form or footprint of the original building; or
- v) In the case of replacement dwellings the proposal must bring about environmental improvements and not result in an inappropriate increase in the bulk, scale, form or footprint of the original building; or
- vi) In the case of new buildings for essential community facilities, they cannot be accommodated within the identified settlement development limits or through the re-use or replacement of an existing building'.

E11 Promoting Sport, Leisure And Recreation

This general policy can be considered as being relevant, since it deals with the generality of sports facilities. It requires them to be located respectfully to settlements or meeting a rural need. It also requires that such developments would not harm the character and appearance of the area.

The Policy states:

'Planning applications for new sports, cultural, leisure and recreational facilities, or improvements and extensions to existing facilities will be permitted provided:

1. The proposals are connected to and associated with existing facilities, they are located at a site that relates well to the settlement hierarchy in the District or they are intended to meet specific rural needs that cannot be appropriately met at settlements within the settlement hierarchy
2. The development would not harm the character, appearance and amenities of the area
3. The development can be made readily accessible to adequate bus, cycling and walking links, for the benefit of non-car users
4. Cycle/vehicle access and on-site cycle/vehicle parking would be provided to the adopted standards
5. Adequate access to and between the facilities would be provided for people with disabilities
6. Any biodiversity interest is enhanced by taking opportunities to create a network of multi-functional green spaces, which support the locality's natural and ecological processes
7. It is not subject to any other overriding environmental or other material planning constraints'.

CP14 High Quality Sustainable Development

This is an all-encompassing policy applicable to all development. It has some specific requirement criteria. Criterion 8 requires the retention and enhancement of important landscape and geological features, biodiversity interests including trees, hedgerows and other natural features.

The Policy states:

'High quality development, which protects conserves and enhances the built and natural environment, will be supported. Development will be supported where it achieves the following:

1. Sustainable construction techniques, including facilities for the recycling of water and waste, measures to minimise energy use and maximise renewable energy production



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

2. No unacceptable levels of air, noise, water, light or soil pollution or exposure to unacceptable risk from existing or potential sources of pollution. Improvements to soil and water quality will be sought through the remediation of land contamination, the provision of SuDS and the inclusion of measures to help waterbodies to meet good ecological status
3. Adequate water supply, foul drainage and sewage capacity to serve the development and satisfactory provision of other utilities, transport and community infrastructure
4. No increased risk of flooding on or off the site, and inclusion of measures to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding as a consequence of that development
5. An appropriate design and appearance, which is respectful of the surroundings, including the local topography, built environment and heritage
6. Re-use of previously developed land and/or the adaptation of existing buildings that make a positive contribution to the character of the site and surroundings, unless demonstrably unviable
7. No unacceptable adverse effect on the amenities of neighbouring occupants
8. Contribute to the retention and enhancement of important landscape & geological features, biodiversity interests (including trees, hedgerows and other natural features)
9. Contribute to a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves and in the way in which they integrate with their surroundings including appropriate landscaping, biodiversity enhancement, open space and amenity space
10. A design and layout that aims to assist crime prevention and community safety, without compromising other design principles
11. Efficiency in terms of land use, achieving higher development densities in locations that are more accessible by public transport and other non-car modes and where higher densities are compatible with the character of the area and the setting of the development
12. It is not prejudicial to the development of a larger area in a comprehensive manner
13. Safe, convenient and attractive accesses on foot and by cycle and suitable connections with existing footways, bridleway, cycleways, local facilities and public transport
14. It is at a location that is near to essential services and good transport links to services by means other than motor car.

Major development should contribute to the provision for allotments and/or community gardens where there is an identified need.

Development proposals will be required to demonstrate how they have responded to the above criteria through the submission of Design and Access Statements and relevant technical reports. It is important that the applicant provides clear and informative plans, elevations and street scenes and, where required, Masterplans, Development Briefs, Concept Statements and Design Codes to show how these criteria have been taken into account where necessary'.

ES7 Landscape Character

In all locations development proposals should conserve and enhance the special features and diversity of different landscape character types. The site is within the Severn Vale, which does not have AONB status but is nonetheless distinct and well regarded. The Council's Stroud Landscape Assessment notes this is a varied landscape ranging from open plain to more undulating landform towards the limestone escarpment. It is identified as "rich rural lowland", with "dispersed pattern of isolated villages", whereby "the churches act as strong



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

foci and landmarks". The document also notes the "need to protect river valley and wetland landscapes" and to control "sporadic development along the major routes".

This policy also mentions the setting of the AONB. "On land that may affect its setting priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the conservation and enhancement of the natural and scenic beauty of the landscape". Having said that, the proposal impacts more on the immediate area, the Severn Vale, particularly as the AONB impacts are more on outward views.

The Policy states:

'Within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), or on land that may affect its setting, priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the natural and scenic beauty of the landscape whilst taking account of the biodiversity interest and the historic and cultural heritage. Major development will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated to be in the national interest and that there is a lack of alternative sustainable development sites.

In all locations development proposals should conserve or enhance the special features and diversity of the different landscape character types found within the District. Priority will be given to the protection of the quality and diversity of the landscape character. Development will only be permitted if all the following criteria are met:

1. The location, materials, scale and use are sympathetic and complement the landscape character; and
2. Natural features including trees, hedgerows and water features that contribute to the landscape character and setting of the development should be both retained and managed appropriately in the future.

Opportunities for appropriate landscaping will be sought alongside all new development, such that landscape type key characteristics are strengthened.

The Stroud District Landscape Assessment will be used when determining applications for development within rural areas'.

ES10 Valuing Our Historic Environment And Assets

This requires the "conservation and enhancement of the setting of heritage assets", particularly "those elements which contribute to the distinct identity of the District".

The Policy states:

'Stroud District's historic environment will be preserved, protected or enhanced, in accordance with the principles set out below:

1. Any proposals involving a historic asset shall require a description of the heritage asset significance including any contribution made by its setting, and an assessment of the potential impact of the proposal on that significance, using appropriate expertise. This can be a desk based assessment and a field evaluation prior to determination where necessary and should include the Gloucestershire Historic Environment Record.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

2. Proposals and initiatives will be supported which conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the heritage significance and setting of the Districts heritage assets, especially those elements which contribute to the distinct identity of the District. These include:

A. The 68 sites of national archaeological importance (which are designated as Ancient Monuments), any undesignated archaeology of national significance, and the many buildings that are Listed as having special architectural or historic interest

B. The stone, bronze, iron age and roman settlements and remains; the medieval settlements including Berkeley Castle; historic houses; historic parks; gardens and villages

C. The townscapes of the larger towns such as Stroud where the industrial heritage influenced its historic grain, including its street layouts and plot sizes

D. The District's historic market towns and villages, many with designated conservation areas, such as Berkeley, Wotton Under Edge, Minchinhampton, Painswick and Dursley.

3. Proposals will be supported which protect and, where appropriate, enhance the heritage significance and setting of locally identified heritage assets, such as buildings of local architectural or historic interest, locally important archaeological sites and parks and gardens of local interest.

4. Proposals will be supported which protect and, where appropriate, enhance key views and vistas, especially of the spires and towers of historic churches and mills.

5. Any harm or loss would require clear and convincing justification to the relevant decision-maker as to why the heritage interest should be overridden. A full programme of work shall be submitted with the application, together with proposals to mitigate any adverse impact of the proposed development, and where appropriate, be implemented through measures secured by planning condition(s) or through a legal agreement.

A full programme of work shall be submitted with the application, together with proposals to mitigate any adverse impact of the proposed development, and where appropriate, be implemented through measures secured by planning condition(s) or through a legal agreement'.

ES11 Maintaining, Restoring And Regenerating The District's Canal

This very specific policy encourages the restoration of the canal.

It has other relevance too, in terms of the impact of the stadium. "All developments must respect their (the canal's) character, setting, biodiversity and historic value as well as improving and enhancing views along and from the canals".

Development on the route of, or adjacent to, the Stroudwater Navigation, the Thames and Severn Canal or the Gloucester & Sharpness Canal must not prevent the improvement, reconstruction, restoration or continued use of the canals or towpaths.

All developments adjacent to the canals must respect their character, setting, biodiversity and historic value as well as have regard to improving and enhancing views along and from the canals. Environmental improvements to any canal's appearance will include enhancement of its historic and biodiversity value.

In assessing any proposals for development along or in the vicinity of any of the Districts three canals, the Council will have regard to any relevant adopted design guidance.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Eastington Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The second component of the Development Plan is the adopted Eastington Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan (October 2016). Policies in an NDP are required to be consistent with the NPPF and the adopted Local Plan.

The Plan covers the whole of Eastington Parish in which the development site wholly lies. The NDP overall seeks within its policies to encourage sustainable development and supports the principle of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Policy EP1). The development site is considered, in line with the Local Plan policies, to be within the open countryside where there is a presumption against development.

Policy EP2 of the Plan requires that development proposals should respect the natural environment and protect and enhance biodiversity.

Policy EP3 mirroring a similar policy in the Local Plan supports the continued restoration of the canal.

Policy EP4 of the Plan sets out further details including design, biodiversity, amenity and heritage that development is required to address.

Policy EP8 requires that development proposals should encourage sustainable means of transport.

The re-routing of existing rights of way caused by development should in terms of Policy EP9 be designed as part of landscaped corridors, but ideally should be protected.

This application should also be considered against:

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66(1) & Section 72(1).

The Stroud District Landscape Assessment S.P.G. (November 2000)

The application site is situated within the Frome River Valley and in part the lowland plain portion of the general area characterised by the document as rolling agricultural plain. This categorisation forms one of the most extensive landscape types within the District.

The Frome valley sub classification is defined by gentle and subtle convex slopes to form a shallow valley that traverses the landscape from east to west and the lowland plain an expansive area of relatively flat land. The built portion of the site is situated on the latter area. The landscape pattern is formed by the river with its damper conditions, and permanent unimproved wet pasture and meadows. The transport routes of the A419 and M5 dissect this lowland landscape.

The document notes that the 'flat and relatively open nature of the rolling agricultural plain and the visibility of this landscape from the AONB make it particularly susceptible to inappropriate development. The document notes that this landscape is under pressure from the expansion of existing settlements.

The document also notes that the distinctive patterns of field enclosure and their geographical distribution are sensitive to changes in land use, reducing the amount of pasture land, hedgerows, and trees. It is particularly noted that 'it is important to retain the pastoral river valley qualities of the River Frome, as there are few landscapes of this nature within the Stroud District'.

A Heritage Strategy for Stroud District (SPA February 2018)



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

This Supplementary Planning Advice (SPA) does not set out detailed policy or guidance to supplement the detailed policy contained within the adopted local plan, but seeks to highlight the value and significance of the Districts heritage and the benefits of positive management but supports the adopted Local Plan. The supporting heritage management plan utilising the SPA's objectives and priorities to assist in achieving targeted action.

The document notes that local distinctiveness including within Conservation Areas has been eroded by inter alia economic pressures and standard design, leading to an acceptance of 'normal' design.

The objectives of the SPA are:

- 1 To maximise the contribution that the historic environment makes to the character of the District, its economic well-being, and the quality of life of its communities;
- 2 To identify ways to positively address the issues and pressures that are facing our heritage assets;
- 3 To maximise opportunities for the historic environment to help deliver the District Council's wider corporate objectives, including those of the Local Plan.

The three objectives are all concerned about properly valuing the Historic environment and assets.

The SPA sets out three priorities to assist the Council to capitalise on the historic environment and assets as follows:

- * Exploiting our rich heritage and our high quality historic environment as part of the District's USP and 'place branding'. (Place branding is about communicating and managing the identity and perception of a place).
- * Encouraging all kinds of new development in all parts of the District to use our historic environment as a stimulus to high quality, imaginative design, which carries our distinctive local identity into the 21st century.
- * Nurturing creative and cultural industries, which are a distinctive feature of Stroud District's economy: encouraging existing cross-fertilisation with our heritage and boosting mutual benefits for our historic environment, with particular focus on the re-use of industrial heritage.

The application site's red line adjoins and includes a small area of the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area (IHCA), though the proposed built development footprint is sited some distance from that boundary. The IHCA stretches some 15 miles across the middle of the District, with an area of some 6.7 square kms, tracing the watercourses of the Stroud Valleys, from Framilode on the Severn estuary to Sapperton in the East.

The IHCA is currently assessed as "at Risk" in Historic England's Heritage at risk register and the Council has committed, within the SPA, to the positive management of the District's heritage deemed at risk. The analysis of the material issues section of this report considers the Heritage impact of the development in the context of this and other relevant policies and documents identified and described in this section.

The Industrial Heritage Conservation Area Statement and Design Guide (Supplementary Planning Advice [SPA] November 2008)

The SPA, responding to the designation of Conservation Area in September 1987, and to subsequent extensions in the period 1989 to 2008 considers the whole of the IHCA.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

The SPA characterises the area in which the proposed development is situated as being; 'A fertile, flood prone land within the lower Frome Corridor distinguished by its open rolling landscape'

The area has scattered rural communities which grew from their medieval cores. The IHCA statement notes that the green spaces along the IHCA are as important to its character as the built environment, being the context for the heritage assets but assisting in and understanding of the co-existence of agriculture and industry. The IHCA's spine is a green corridor.

The SPA sets out some key issues of particular relevance to the determination of the development proposed:

'The loss of legibility of historic settlement patterns; particularly the erosion of visual distinction and physical separation between settlement groups and mill complexes.

Loss of local distinctiveness; ... through the proliferation of new build which fails to observe local characteristics and hence has a watering down effect on the distinctiveness of the IHCA's built environment'.

Industrial Heritage Conservation Area Design Guide (SPA November 2008)

This document provides practical design guidance for use in the IHCA and is based on previously published Management proposals for the IHCA issued in 2008. The design guide is used to interpret and apply Local Plan and National Planning Policy.

The document notes the importance of the IHCA as a precious resource and notes that not just the canal side but the wider Conservation Area must be 'boosted' not degraded by new development; noting that if the quality of design is high and this is matched by quality of execution, construction and sustainability and will stand the test of time it will enrich the area. (paragraph 2.7 refers)

The IHCA design guide, building on the paragraph cited above, notes that the question posed by the challenge set out above is 'do the buildings and spaces show excellence in design, and contribute to local character and distinctiveness with the prospect of becoming part of the architectural heritage?'

At Chapter 6 of the SPA issues of scale and new development are considered. In particular at PDG 2 the guide notes that; 'The full impact of large developments or individual bulky/tall buildings on long range views and the setting of existing historic buildings will be a consideration when assessing proposals for development. Particular attention will be given to the effect that such proposals would have on the transition between built form and rural land, especially on the fringes of historic mill sites and small settlement groups. Development which would cause harm to this aspect of the IHCA will not normally be permitted.'

Paragraph 6.16 notes that the integration of new large buildings into the Conservation Area requires careful consideration. The commentary notes that such buildings cannot be hidden but are likely to become 'The landmarks of the future'.

Notwithstanding the desire to achieve local distinctiveness within the Conservation Area the design guide acknowledges the problems with detailing large modern buildings with details taken from smaller historic structures and that this may not be successful, noting at



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Paragraph 7.32 that; 'New big buildings in the Conservation Area may be particularly suited to modern design.'

Stroud District Local Plan Review Emerging Strategy Paper (November 2018)

Following the publication and consultation on the issues and options document, the Council in late 2018, published for consultation, an emerging strategy paper to take forward the review of the adopted Local Plan. This document has now completed its consultation and a final draft plan is proposed to be published in the autumn of 2019. Whilst this document does comprise a material consideration, given the current stage of consideration the weight to be afforded to it is very limited.

The application site is situated within the area defined as Stonehouse within the Stonehouse cluster. The strategy notes that the principal physical constraint is the floodplain along the Frome valley and notes that the preferred direction of growth from a landscape sensitivity perspective is to the west and/or to the north of the settlement. The document considers that land within the application site either side of the A419 between the Chipmans Platt roundabout and the M5 junction 13 contains potential sites for development. The strategy identifies 10ha for employment, canal and open space (PS20a) and 18ha for sports stadium and community uses (PS20b). Although the employment uses are clearly identified with the canal uses, the map in error shows site PS20a as north of the A419 and consequently the stadium is shown to the south of the A419. The intention of the Emerging Strategy was to show the employment and canal uses to the south of the A419 and the stadium site to the north of the A419.

These are shown as potential sites for inclusion within the draft local plan. As a result of public consultation on the Emerging Strategy during winter 2018, site PS20a received 39 supporting representations and 9 objecting representations. Site PS20b received 39 supporting representations and 10 objecting representations.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

MAIN ISSUES

- * Principle of development
- * Highways
- * Landscape And Visual Impact
- * Ecology
- * Trees
- * Design
- * Heritage
- * Residential Amenity
- * Noise
- * Lighting
- * Air Quality
- * Contaminated Land
- * Drainage
- * Agricultural Land
- * Public Sector Equality Duty
- * Obligations



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

* Planning Balance And Conclusion

THE PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of a planning application should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Local Plan has been adopted and full weight should be given to its contents, in accordance with paragraphs 11 and 12 of the NPPF. There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (Para 10 NPPF) as applied locally through the policies contained within the Local Plan. Consequently, decision makers should approve proposals that accord with the Local Plan without delay, but should refuse proposed development that conflicts with the Local Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Parish of Eastington has an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan dating from October 2016. Policies in an adopted NDP are in accordance with the adopted Local Plan. The NDP mirrors the policies in the Local Plan with a presumption against development outside settlement boundaries or the allocated Land West of Stonehouse site.

The application now before the committee has been agreed by the applicant to be contrary to the policies of an up to date plan (email dated 11/01/19 from D Vince to LPA). The application as originally submitted including the employment site was similarly contrary to Development Plan policy.

The amended scheme now shows development only on the northern side of the A419, to include a repositioned football stadium, additional training pitches, with associated car parking, footway/cycleway and transport improvements.

The site is located in the countryside outside the defined settlement limits. To promote sustainable development and protect the quality of the countryside, the separate identify of settlement and avoid coalescence, development is restricted unless it meets the criteria outlined in Policy CP15.

Policy CP15 does allow for sport, leisure and tourism facilities where this protects the quality of the countryside and promotes public enjoyment of the countryside. In this case, whilst suitably designed and located sports pitches may achieve these objectives, it is clear that the character and nature of the development proposed would not be designed to protect the countryside or to promote public enjoyment of the countryside. It would involve a major sports complex which would be incompatible with protecting the countryside.

Whilst the applicant's planning consultant comments regarding the need are noted, the benefits of the scheme and the lack of alternative sites are material considerations that carry weight, however, these do not mean the proposal is in accordance with the Local Plan.

The Local Plan does provide a policy mechanism to support sports facilities with Policy EI11 supporting planning applications for new sports, cultural, leisure and recreational facilities subject to satisfying specific criteria including regard to the settlement hierarchy. In terms of



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

overall locational criteria, whilst the new facilities would not be geographically connected to or associated with existing facilities, there is intended to be a functional relationship with the existing FGR stadium in that the new facility would replace and improve upon an existing facility, serving and extending the existing catchment. It is also noted that the training pitches will allow the FGR 1st team and possibly the women's, reserves and youth sections to also train within Stroud District rather than their current training facilities at Chippenham, Wiltshire etc. The club's need is addressed below but the provision of a new high quality facility will have a significant and positive social benefit for the club.

Whilst the site is currently separated from Stonehouse and so does not currently relate well to the settlement hierarchy, the site is adjacent to land allocated for mixed use development (Land West of Stonehouse) which is currently under construction and so, once this development has been completed, it will relate reasonably well to this part of Stonehouse which will contain a local centre and local recreational and community facilities. The separate identity of settlement is not significantly affected.

The supporting information also seeks to gain support from the current shortfall of playing pitches. Whilst our latest Playing Pitch Strategy which will be published shortly is likely to continue to highlight this shortage, particularly with population growth and rapidly expansion in women's football, it is not clear how the scheme addresses the wider sporting need with no clear current community use/accessibility. Whilst it is understood that the primary use will be for FGR and an appropriate management of the pitch and facilities is required, a scheme of structured community engagement/use is required and can be agreed via condition or S106.

The development will fundamentally change the character and appearance of the site itself and to this extent at least will affect the existing character and appearance of the site. Whilst it is accepted that there is potential to develop the site in a positive way, through an architecturally landmark building within a parkland setting, these design matters are reserved at this stage for future consideration, however, the parameters are controlled by the conditions or S106. In terms of public amenity, the development will change the current open land crossed by part of the rural footpath network but the intended uses would enhance sport and recreation facilities both within the local area and within the wider District, where there is an identified shortage of playing pitches in Stonehouse cluster and wider district.

New sports, leisure and recreational facilities should be readily accessible to bus, cycling and walking links. Whilst at some distance from the nearest town centre of Stonehouse, the site is located adjacent to the A419, a major movement corridor in the District, which benefits from regular bus services. Walking and cycling routes to Stonehouse and other destinations are proposed to be enhanced by the provision of a combined footway/cycleway along the south side of the A419. Proposals also involve an extension to local bus services to serve the scheme on match days and options for new proposals for public transport on non match days have been discussed. The supporting statement makes clear that the detailed design of the scheme will provide suitable access and facilities for people with disabilities.

The proposals include the retention of the majority of trees and hedgerows within the site and significant indicative planting is proposed both within the site and around the perimeter. Ecological enhancements have also been proposed as part of the scheme.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

The existing FGR Stadium at the New Lawn, Nailsworth is designated as protected outdoor play space. Policy ES13 allows for the replacement of facilities, provided that there is a net benefit to the community in terms of the quality, availability and accessibility of open space or recreational opportunities. Whilst the consideration of the redevelopment of the existing New Lawn is subject to a separate application, the proposal shows an intention for this development to entirely replace these facilities. The proposed larger and purpose built all-seater stadium with training pitches is superior to the existing provision. Clearly there will be a loss to residents of Nailsworth in terms of access to existing local facilities but the new facilities are likely to be more accessible to a wider catchment within Stroud District and beyond.

The redevelopment of the New Lawn site is currently subject of an undetermined outline planning application for residential use (S.18/0815/OUT). The consideration of this is separate from this new replacement stadium and cannot progress until the new stadium issue has been addressed.

The site is also featured in the Stroud District Local Plan Review, Emerging Strategy Paper dated November 2018 (Site ref: PS20 a & b). This has been published and consulted upon with the detailed analysis of all responses being used to inform the preparation of the draft Plan. The site has been identified as a potential site for a sports stadium, employment, open space and employment uses. However, the weight at this stage to be accorded to this document as a material planning consideration is very limited (Paras 48 & 49 of the NPPF refers to the weighting to be afforded to emerging Plans).

The Need

The proposal seeks a replacement sports facility for Forest Green Rovers football club (FGR) who are currently based at the New Lawn in Forest Green, Nailsworth. This was built when the club was playing in Conference. The applicant has outlined the club's progress up the leagues and that the current stadium and site are a restriction on the future, given the club's ambition to grow and progress further.

The crowd size has increased from 800 in 2010 to an average of 1753 in 2016/17 season. Promotion to League 2 also saw a further raise above the 3000. The team have been in the League 2 promotion playoffs for the last 2 years and are seeking to eventually play in the Championship. The playoff semi final this season had a reported attendance of 4,492. The existing facilities whilst they were built to replace the previous ground 'the Lawn' it does not have much potential to be redeveloped. The Nailsworth site has a restricted size and only provides match day pitch. The practise and training facilities all currently have to be off site. The need for seating and shelter as well as improved hospitality space is also noted and would be difficult to achieve at the existing site. This will increase with the growth and progress of all the teams at the club.

The existing onsite parking and access are also greatly restricted. The onsite car park is limited to approx 150 spaces and whilst a Park and Ride from Renishaws is available for some of the matches this is not an ideal situation. The restricted nature of Tinkley Lane directs traffic through Nailsworth. The local streets in the Forest Green area experience



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

significant congestion and parking issues on match days with fans seeking to park close to the stadium. Parking restrictions on the Springhill/Nympsfield Road up to the ground are also sometimes imposed to help manage the situation. The existing location is also not ideal to encourage greater use of cycling or other sustainable forms of public transport due to the gradient and limited space for bus provision.

The applicant has also provided a comparison of the proposed new stadium to the existing stadium at the New Lawn as follows:

	New Lawns	Proposed stadium
Total Fan Capacity	5,011	5,000
Potential expansion#	0	5,000
Seated Fan Capacity	2,020	5,000
Hospitality Space sq m	865	1,785
Spectator Viewing Area sq m	2,500	4,900
Overall interior area sq m	5,000	9,200
On site parking	150 cars + adj school	1700
Sustainable transport	options limited	greater potential in travel plan

(# Any proposal to extend the submitted development to accommodate additional spectators would require a new planning application accompanied by a transport study as well as other relevant studies.)

A new stadium is also an opportunity to embed sustainability into the construction and fabric of the building. This reflects the ethos that is advocated and encouraged at the club and would be easier with a new stadium than a simple upgrading or redevelopment of the existing restricted site.

A cutting edge wooden design would allow sustainable options to be built into the design approach. This includes the provision of a choice of sustainable transport options including cycling and bus and train connections.

The applicant also outlines a social benefit; *'The decision to move rather than simply upgrading or renovating the existing New Lawn stadium is driven by the desire to build a stronger community base. The new ECO Stadium will help to bring together the junior, ladies and men's team strengthening bonds between the different branches of the club'*.

Easington Parish Council has raised concerns about the justification and site selection and suggest a sequential test (NPPF Para 86) should be carried out. As the agent has highlighted, the sequential test required by Para 86 of the revised NPPF relates to town centre uses. Whilst these can have a sport element they refer to more intensive sports activities like bowling and fitness centres. Due to the size of the stadium and/or training pitches this makes it difficult to find a town centre location and none within the nearby towns is evident.

Sport England aim that proposed facilities are fit for purpose and their guidance simply seeks a search with the proposed scale of development and the location of proposed users to



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

insure easy access. However, whilst there is not a policy requirement for a formal sequential test, the applicant has looked at alternatives during the selection process with the starting point being the existing site. As addressed above, the restricted nature of the Nailsworth site means the do nothing or the redevelopment of the New Lawn options are not viable to allow the successful future expansion of the ground given the clubs ambition to progress up the Football League.

The location of current season ticket holders has been mapped and a desire for a location within a 10km search area from the existing site outlined. Sensitive locations like existing built up areas, the AONB, and wildlife sites were annotated to help narrow down the selection process with alternatives including employment land at Oldends Lane, Aston Down and Javelin Park considered. It is not evident that any of the alternative sites would be available or suitable to be able to provide a preferable site. They do not appear to be of an appropriate size, form or character which could mitigate the impacts. The proposed site is also near and connected to Stonehouse and the Stroud Valleys, the largest centres of population within the district.

Alternative positions near to Junction 13 have also been considered, with the previous version of the scheme with the stadium to the south of the A419 discounted due to the proximity and harm to the Conservation Area and adjacent neighbours.

A possible Cam/Dursley option has been highlighted by Eastington Parish. Whilst a railway station on the main Gloucester to Bristol line is available this option does not provide a positive access options for the major population areas of the district where current fans are located and was not within the core search area.

The possibility of a ground share with Gloucester City has been raised but with the location differences and the club's need for its own facilities and room to grow and progress it is accepted that this is not a viable long term alternative.

Eastington Parish Council has questioned the local association with their Parish and CPRE have suggested a site nearer Nailsworth would provide a better local connection. Whilst it is acknowledged that FGR does not have a direct relationship with Eastington, the club has a strong and long history and local connection to the district being the highest position in the league and having a wider influence and catchment area than just the Nailsworth/Forest Green area.

A large number of support and objection comments have been received raising the move away from Nailsworth as an issue. Whilst the name of the club current does reflect the location of the ground and the history of the club, the community interest and fan base does extend beyond this part of Nailsworth. There is also no planning consideration or reason why the name and historical geographical location of the club should affect a decision of the proposed location of a new stadium. This would be a decision for the club and their supporters and it is noted that support for a move has also been received from the Forest Green Supporters Club.



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

Given the above Officers therefore accept the applicant has carried out the necessary site search and looked at possible alternatives.

Conclusion

The Local Plan and NDP has been adopted therefore full weight should be given to them and the policies contained within in accordance with paragraphs 11 and 12 of the NPPF. There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development as applied locally through the policies contained within the Local Plan. Consequently, decision-makers in line with S38(6) should approve proposals that accord with the Local Plan without delay, but should refuse proposed development that conflicts with the Local Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The principle of additional sport and recreation facilities within the District is supported by the Local Plan and a policy mechanism is also explicit within the Plan to allow for the replacement and if necessary relocation of existing sports facilities provided that certain criteria can be met. To that extent the proposals are in general accordance.

However, the site in question is identified as countryside within the Local Plan and whilst sport and recreation uses can be compatible with rural locations, in this case the nature and scale of the development, involving a large built stadium development with associated parking and hard landscaped circulation areas, is not compatible with the objective and detailed principles of Policy CP15 to protect the quality of the countryside. Similarly the site does is not within an allocation or defined boundary of a settlement within the settlement hierarchy detailed in Policy CP15 and NDP Policy EP1.

Whilst the landscape impact and mitigation of the proposals is addressed below, the principle of development has the potential to fundamentally change the character and appearance of the site itself and have adverse effects in landscape terms within the immediate vicinity of the site.

This is not to say that the development has no merit and the detailed proposals have the scope and ambition to create an attractive development. However, if the proposals are taken as a whole they are considered to be contrary to the Local Plan and the NDP for Eastington and the planning application should be refused, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

As discussed above, the need for a modern fit for purpose FGR stadium to meet football league standards, the potential lack of alternative more suitable locations and the nature and scale and sustainability of the proposals themselves are relevant material considerations to consider within the planning balance which is addressed below.

HIGHWAYS

The application has been the subject of considerable pre and post application discussion with both GCC Highways as the County Highway Authority and Highways England. Whilst this included the previous versions, with the application being significantly varied in December 2017 the following comments relate to the current revised proposal with the principle



Development Control Committee Schedule 12/06/2019

development to the north of the A419. Whilst the application is submitted in outline, access has been submitted for consideration.

Overall, GCC Highways and Highways England consider that the proposal will have effects on capacity of the network but they are not so severe as to warrant a recommendation that planning permission should be withheld on highway grounds.

Proposed Site Access

The proposed access to the site is from the A419. This access comprises a new three arm signalised junction onto the A419, which is also proposed to be dualled from the motorway junction to the Chipmans Platt roundabout. The junction provides two full lanes on each arm of the A419 through the junction and a long left turn filter lane from the west and a flared two lane right turn facility from the east. The details of the junction also provide facilities for cyclists and pedestrians to cross over the dualled A419. These are provided over the eastern arm of the junction to meet desire lines. A previous iteration of the scheme showed a footbridge which has now been deleted. The site access provides a full right turn lane and a 2 full left turn lanes from the site. GCC as the Local Highway Authority have concluded from the submitted modelling and safety audit that the detailed design of the site access will operate within absolute capacity, i.e. all arms under 100% saturated, in all scenarios.

The Highway Authority note that the usage of the site access arm on the A419 will be occasional, meaning that for the majority of the time the A419 will be afforded a continuous green signal and comprise two full lanes in each direction. This represents a significant improvement to the current situation on this stretch of road, between Junction 13 and Chipmans Platt to the benefit of capacity during network peak times.

Chipmans Platt Roundabout

Improvements to Chipmans Platt are already underway by virtue of an approved GCC scheme. This is part of the G-First LEP funded A419 improvement scheme. This will provide greater capacity on the network, particularly at key junctions and assist with the delivery of housing growth, including the Land West of Stonehouse development.

The impact of this proposed development on the roundabout will result in the junction exceeding capacity, although limited to one arm, with the increase in queuing ranging from six to ten vehicles on Saturday evening peaks and weekday PM evening peaks. This queue will increase by 15 vehicles in the Saturday afternoon peak in 2021 and 30 vehicles in 2031. The Highway Authority do not consider this to be a "severe" impact requiring mitigation, particularly considering that this will be an infrequent occurrence which will occur outside network peak periods.

A419/A38 Roundabout

Predicted traffic flows have been modelled and this junction will continue to operate within capacity in all of the assessment scenarios for future years with the development in place.

Grove Lane

The proposed scheme shows an indicative design layout proposing a new one way entrance for buses only taken from Grove Lane. This maybe gated when not in use and be controlled

