



# 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

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

16 June 2020

6.00 pm – 8.40 pm

Remote Meeting

Minutes

# 3

### Membership

<b>Councillor Martin Baxendale (Chair)</b>	P	Councillor John Marjoram	P
<b>Councillor Miranda Clifton (Vice-Chair)</b>	P	Councillor Jenny Miles	P
Councillor Dorcas Binns	P	Councillor Sue Reed	A
Councillor Nigel Cooper	P	Councillor Mark Reeves	P
Councillor Haydn Jones	P	Councillor Jessica Tomblin	P
Councillor Steve Lydon	P	Councillor Tom Williams	P

P = Present    A = Absent

### Officers in Attendance

Head of Development Management	Interim Head of Legal Services & Monitoring Officer
Majors and Environment Team Manager	GCC Highways Officer
Principal Planning Officer	Democratic Services & Elections Officers
Senior Planning Officers	
Corporate Policy and Governance Manager	

### Other Members in Attendance

Councillors Braun, Davies, Tucker and Pearson.

The Chair made announcements regarding the procedure to be followed for the Committee's first remote meeting and also welcomed Stephen Hawley the new Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) Highway Team Leader to the meeting.

### DC.001            APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Reed.

### DC.002            DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

### DC.003            MINUTES – 18 February 2020

**RESOLVED** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2020 are approved as a correct record.

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLANNING SCHEDULE**

Representations were received and taken into account by the Committee in respect of Applications:

1	S.19/2399/FUL	2	S.19/2527/FUL	3	S.19/2329/FUL
4	S.19/2165/DISCON	5	S.20/0449/REM		

**DC.004 DUTCHCOMBE FARM, YOKEHOUSE LANE, PAINSWICK (S.19/2399/FUL)**

The Chair outlined the application for a revised replacement dwelling, new access and driveway at Dutchcombe Farm.

The Interim Head of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer drew Members' attention to page 15 of the planning schedule, regarding the observations of the Council's Biodiversity Officer. He confirmed an error on the Council's portal had been replicated onto the planning schedule and in the report. When CB Design Ltd saw the Biodiversity Officer's statement on the portal they provided the Council with satisfactory evidence which demonstrated that they were qualified to provide the survey. CB Design Ltd are competent in this field of work and the Council apologized profusely for these errors. Members were requested to ignore these observations and confirmed that the Biodiversity Officer accepted the applicant's survey.

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the above application for a dwelling on the site of a property that was uninhabited due to fire damage in 2015 and images were displayed. Planning permission was granted for a replacement dwelling in 2017 and this scheme remained extant. The application for the replacement dwelling was now three times larger. Design Policy HC5 of the Council's Local Plan stated that replacement dwellings must be smaller and this application did not comply because of the design, size, massing and was also located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). An artist's impression of the proposal that showed the elevations and floor plan was shown in green, the former historic building shown in red and extant scheme shown in blue for comparisons.

Mr S Faure, the applicant, stated that he had been looking for a suitable property for many years. The current proposal stands on its own merits; the building would be a more sympathetic 5 bed roomed farmhouse. The design was more environmentally sustainable and would enhance and not be detrimental to the environmental. A tree survey had been carried out; the Woodland Trust had confirmed that within 5 years nearly all of the current Ash trees would be dead or dying. These were being replaced with 1500 native trees to restore an ancient orchard. The neighbours and Parish Council were in favour of the application and welcomed the new design which was more sympathetic in design, increased in size and would improve the landscape.

Councillor Pearson, Ward Member for Painswick and Upton stated that he had correspondence dating back to December 2019 and had walked around the site. The 47 acre site had a great deal of trees, including hundreds that had been newly planted. He could not see any reason for this application to be refused stating that the Case Officer had changed and also the original advice that had been given to the applicant. He requested that Committee approve this application.

In reply to Members' questions the following answers were given by Officers:-

- The area of the fire damaged property was approximately 250sqm, the footprint of the extant scheme was approximately 324sqm and the proposed scheme had a footprint of approximately 710sqm.
- The ridge height for the proposed dwelling is 10.6m and 7.9m to eaves compared with the extant scheme of 10.1m to ridge and 5.6m to eaves. The Officer had no details on the historic building.
- A site plan showing the location of the existing track in yellow and the revised element across the field was displayed. The Biodiversity Officer had confirmed that there would be no detrimental impact on the site and Officers had no concerns with this amendment.

Councillor Cooper proposed a Motion to permit the application; this was seconded by Councillor Jones.

Councillor Cooper stated that there was an extant permission for a 5 bedroom, 3-storey house and this application was for something better but slightly bigger. The increase in size was acceptable considering permissions had been given elsewhere within the district and was permissible under Local Plan Policy HC.5. The orientation and citing had been moved and the property would now be less prominent to anybody from Painswick looking at it. The walls are 4 inches thicker than normal for insulation; this house if built as planned would be carbon neutral and environmentally friendly. This was a well planned sustainable application and he hoped the rest of Committee agreed.

Councillor Jones concurred with the above stating that this application was an improvement on the extant scheme and he was pleased to support this application.

Councillor Marjoram lost his internet connection on several occasions and therefore could not hear all of the discussion on this application. Consequently, the Monitoring Officer advised that he should not take part in the vote on the item and he did not do so.

Councillor Clifton stated that this application was much bigger than the extant scheme. There had been several objections regarding massing and the reflection off the glass windows from neighbours. The sustainability and tree planting were commendable and more in keeping with the original farm house.

Councillor Marjoram confirmed he was happy that the biodiversity issues had been resolved.

Councillor Williams reminded Members that there were policies in the Council's Local Plan for a reason and one was to resist overdevelopment of the countryside and particularly within the AONB. The application seemed to be another attempt to push the limits. He agreed that there could be a replacement farmhouse but we have policies in place for good reasons to protect. We ought to hold the line and stick to the footprint for extant permission and keep it at that.

Councillor Miles raised her concerns about the size of the new farmhouse with its environmental improvements. This application went against the Council's policies within the Local Plan because it was not of a similar size; but a larger size.

On being put to the vote there were 5 votes to grant the application, 5 votes against and 0 abstention. The Chair used his casting vote and the Motion to grant permission was lost.

The Chair proposed a Motion to refuse the application; this was seconded by Councillor Binns.

On being put to the vote there were 5 votes to refuse the application 4 votes against and 1 abstention.

**RESOLVED To REFUSE Permission for Application S.19/2399/FUL.**

NB. The Monitoring Officer advised that it was a legal requirement for remote meetings that Members must hear and be heard for the whole of the item under discussion to be able to vote. Unfortunately, Councillor Marjoram had on a number of occasions encountered various technical difficulties during the item where his screen had frozen so did not take part in the vote.

Councillor Marjoram subsequently dialed in to the meeting and could hear and be heard for the remainder of the meeting.

**DC.005 LAND AT GREENAWAYS, EBLEY (S.19/2527/FUL)**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the above application for the erection of 2 flats and 6 terraced houses on the above site. Plans showed that there were protective trees 25m from the site.

Mr D Scott, spoke on behalf of the applicant who had acquired the site in 2015. He outlined a scheme that had been submitted last year that had been refused. The revised planning scheme was for 6 houses and 6 apartments. Objections had been received from nearby occupants because of the access. Access had been granted for an office block and doctor's surgery which would have had more vehicle movements. If the application was approved a condition relating to vehicle movements would be added the Construction Management Plan. Utmost consideration would be given to the public and neighbours to minimize the impact on them.

Officers gave the following replies to Members' questions:-

- County Highways had assessed the scheme and confirmed that 2 vehicles could get round the parking area passing side by side.
- The ridge height to the eaves was 7.4m, similar to the existing development.
- The Parish Council had called the application in on the grounds of highway safety and wanted Committee to determine the application.
- The previous application was refused; the distance from Monkey Puzzle Close had been increased to 25m and the trees were now protected. The site was close to a bus route and 1.5 parking spaces per property was sufficient.
- The materials would be in keeping with the area.
- There were 2 flats because of the lack of amenity space.
- There was a demand for houses and flats in the area.

Councillor Binns proposed a Motion to grant permission; this was seconded by Councillor Clifton.

The proposer confirmed that she knew the site quite well and this had been a vacant plot for some time and was in favour of the application. The seconder concurred with the proposer and stated that people should be encouraged to walk more and then there would be less need for parking spaces.

In debate Councillor Williams was disappointed that there would be no medical centre on this site which was the original intention, stating that this was very disappointing and would be a very dense development.

The Head of Development Management confirmed that Officers were mindful of the Construction Management Plan, and requested that Members give that consideration before they voted for the application.

Councillor Miles echoed Councillor Williams' disappointment about no doctors surgery. When Greenaways were given permission there was 1 parking space allocated per dwelling. Not all people walk and highlighted her concerns for children when they were walking to school. Currently there are cars parked on both sides of the road and there would be site traffic and danger. She referred to page 28 and the comments of the Council's Environmental Health Officer who had recommended that the site hours be from 8:00-18:00, requesting that these were amended to 9:00-18:00, to give children the opportunity to go to school when it was less chaotic.

The Principal Planning Officer stated that this could be an option but was concerned that the developer may have a concern with the time difference. If there was not an early start time there may be a noise issue with Environmental Health.

The Head of Development Management reminded Members that the Government are looking to relax construction hours on sites and they need to look at this proposal in that context as well.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that there had already been a condition attached to the application for a Construction Management Plan and would add a bullet point about children passing the site.

Councillor Lydon was concerned that deliveries could back up awaiting to get on site; this needed to be looked at carefully on this very constrained site.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was unanimously carried.

**RESOLVED To Grant Application S.19/2527/FUL, subject to an amendment to Condition 3, the Construction Method Statement to include the need to address school children mitigation.**

The meeting adjourned at 7.22 pm and reconvened at 7.31 pm.

**DCC.006      GARAGES AT MOUNT PLEASANT, WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE  
(S.19/2329/FUL)**

The Chair stated the application was for the erection of 5 residential dwellings with associated parking and landscaping revisions.

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the above application and displayed a site location plan onto the screen. This showed a former Council garage site with permission for 4 dwellings and the proposed site layout. This application was for 5 dwellings; houses that would front the highway, access and gardens to the rear. There were 2 parking spaces per dwelling and a public right of way would be retained and unaffected by the proposal. This was a larger footprint than the first scheme and concerns had been raised because of the loss of Council garages and the impact of parking on the surrounding streets. The Council had already accepted the principal of housing on this site. Committee were asked to accept amendments to conditions because the Officers had received a revised site layout plan for electric plug in points (reference Conditions 7, 8 and 11 should be version n).

Councillor Braun, the Ward Member for Wotton-under-Edge stated that Wotton-under-Edge Town Council had objected to the application for a number of reasons all relating to parking. She emphasized the impact this application could have on the existing local residents by losing on-street parking and effecting road safety. The Mount Pleasant bus route caused problems for the bus trying to maneuver because of parking and the access is very difficult. She encouraged Members to consider these issues on this application.

Councillor N Pinnegar, the Chair of Planning at Wotton-under-Edge Town Council confirmed that objections had previously been made for 8 properties on this site because of the lack of parking in the surrounding area. The garages had been taken away resulting in increased parking on the street corners and the grassed verges, causing them to be churning up. This is a bus route and they often have to mount kerbs to get through the site because the road is very narrow. The application was for 3 bed houses with 10 parking spaces and with people now staying home longer will necessitate the need for somewhere to park in the future. Five houses in a very limited area was overdevelopment of the site, the houses were near the road, were elevated and would be overlooked. He welcomed the charging points and asked if the development could be given double yellow lines in front of the properties to discourage parking on Mount Pleasant.

Mr J Rooney spoke on behalf of the Agent, the main issues seemed to be density and parking. Four houses had been approved at a density of 47 dwellings per hectare with an additional dwelling the density would be similar. There would be 5 dwellings, gardens and 10 parking spaces. He referred to census data for the area and 17% of residents had access to 3 vehicles. There had been quite a few revisions made to the design of the properties and amended accordingly for overlooking. He hoped that Committee would support the application.

Officers gave the following replies to Members' questions:-

- The materials being used for the walls were Bath stone and render; for the roof plain tiles (Condition 3 required samples).
- There were 10 parking spaces, and the parking space in the corner No8 on the plan can be accessed. The GCC Highways Officer confirmed that he had raised no objections and there was a fair amount of space in front of this space.
- A request for double yellow lines was a highway matter and not for planning.
- There would be no overlooking from the side and the windows to the front and rear overlooked public areas.
- There would be 2 electric charging points to the back of bays 5 and 6 in the car parking spaces (drawing No87) and the Highway Authority were happy with this proposal.
- The parking spaces are not designated and would serve the whole of the development.
- Confirmation was given that there was access to bin stores.

Councillor Baxendale proposed a Motion to grant permission; this was seconded by Councillor Binns.

Members debated the application and thought that the development was cramped and the area had already had parking problems but did not think that they had any grounds to refuse the application.

On being put to the vote there were 10 votes to grant the application and 1 vote against.

**RESOLVED To Grant Full Planning Permission for Application S.19/2329/FUL, subject to Conditions, as set out within the report.**

Councillor Lydon left the meeting.

**DCC.007**      **PARCEL H16-20 LAND WEST OF STONEHOUSE, GROVE LANE, WESTEND (S.19/2165/DISCON)**

The Chair outlined the above application for the discharging of Condition 46 on the area masterplan on permitted application outlined in application S.14/0810/OUT.

The Senior Planning Officer displayed a plan showing the development H16-H20 in the north easterly corner of the site. Condition 46 of the outline planning application required an area master plan to be approved by Committee for each phase of the development. Some concerns had been raised from Eastington Parish Council and Stonehouse Town Council regarding the amount of vegetation along the boundary. There would be a minimum of a 3m green buffer along the boundary. No public comments had been received on this application.

A plan showed the residential site, the green spaces marked with a G and tree planting along the road. The proposed green infrastructure plan showed a green corridor to the western and northern boundaries. There would be tree lined main streets throughout the site. A plan showed the proposed new planting in light green and the current in dark green.

The proposed movement masterplan showed the main routes in blue, the solid yellow lines pedestrian routes and the dashed yellow lines a new cycle lane. Pedestrian and cycling movements would be encouraged on all of the site, with the traffic speed limited at 20 mph.

Parish Councils had raised concerns regarding the increased density. Two plans were shown on the screen showing the approved density plan on the left and the proposed on the right. There was a slight increase towards the north parcel H16. A plan showing which applications had been approved was displayed. The proposed building heights had not changed from the outline planning application.

Councillor Davies, Ward Member for Eastington, stated that all applications would be coming to Committee and was grateful for all of the Officers' work. Officers had listened to the comments and improvements had been made. But there needed to be attention to detail, e.g. the erection of gates rather than stiles.

Ms K Lynch-Beddows, the Agent appointed to manage the discharge of Condition 46 confirmed that the objectives had been met and there would be an extra layer of detail to ensure that reserved matters continue. There was a good level of communication with Officers and others. This site had the potential to deliver between 300-350 dwellings, which included approximately 100 affordable houses.

Officers' gave the following replies to Members' questions:-

- The level of detail would be on the next application for reserved matters.
- The proposal was for one specific cycleway built into the road infrastructure and the whole road network would be restricted to a 20 mph speed limit. All surfacing would be within the reserved matters application.
- The two plans that displayed 2 extra roads on H6 and H19 are for approval and Officers stated that they were not saying these roads could extend out of the application site.

Councillor Cooper proposed a Motion to grant permission; this was seconded by Councillor Jones.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was unanimously carried.

**RESOLVED To Grant Permission to discharge Condition 46 for Application S.19/2165/DISCON.**

**DCC.008 PHASE 4A LAND WEST OF STONEHOUSE, GROVE LANE, WESTEND (S.20/0449/REM)**

The Chair outlined the above application regarding reserved matters for the primary infrastructure pursuant to outline planning permission S.14/0810/OUT.

The Majors and Environment Team Manager displayed a plan showing the primary infrastructure, final spine road and pavements. He had received comments from the County Highways who had raised no objections.

Councillor Davies, Ward Member for Eastington raised concerns on biodiversity, sewerage and hedges.

In response to Members' questions the Officer showed a plan and indicated the locations of bus stops, dropped kerbs and crossing points. Concerns regarding biodiversity had been addressed by a Condition on the outline planning permission and the discharge of the Condition would be looked at separately.

Councillor Baxendale proposed a Motion to grant permission; this was seconded by Councillor Clifton.

On being put to the vote there were 9 votes to grant the application and 1 abstention.

**RESOLVED To Approve Application S.20/0449/REM, subject to the Conditions as set out within the report.**

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm.

Chair