



# 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

24 November 2020

6.00 pm – 6.50pm

Remote Meeting

Minutes

# 3

### Membership

<b>Councillor Martin Baxendale (Chair)</b>	P	Councillor Steve Lydon	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	A	Councillor Jessica Tomblin	P
Councillor Norman Kay	P	Councillor Tom Williams	P

P = Present    A = Absent

### Officers in Attendance

Head of Development Management  
Planner  
Principal Planning Lawyer, One Legal

Development Team Manager  
Senior Democratic Services & Elections Officer  
Democratic Services & Elections Officer

### Other Member(s) in Attendance

Councillor Nigel Prenter

### DC.017

### APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Haydn Jones and Councillor Sue Reed.

### DC.018

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

### DC.019

### MINUTES

**RESOLVED** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2020 were approved as a correct record.

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLANNING SCHEDULE**

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

1	S.20/1686/FUL
---	---------------

**DC.020**                    **5 KITESNEST LANE, LIGHTPILL, STROUD, GLOUCESTERSHIRE**  
**(S.20/1686/FUL)**

The Planner introduced the application and outlined the key features. It was a resubmission of a previous application that was withdrawn, which was for a similar scheme including two bungalows to the rear of the site. The former shop had not been in use for about twenty years and was derelict. The site fell within the defined settlement limits of Stroud and the conservation area on the opposite side of Kitesnest Lane.

The Planner informed Members that the loss of the community shop had been considered by Officers, but given the length of time it had been out of use and the existing nearby supermarket and DIY store, the loss of retail use wasn't deemed an issue. The Planner drew attention to objections that had been received from some of the neighbours in Hill Close Estate. Concerns had been raised regarding the potential overlooking and overbearing impact, particularly from the two new dwellings. These concerns had all been considered but given the distances involved and the oblique angles between all the first floor windows, the level of overlooking wasn't considered to be unacceptable or to warrant refusal. There were no concerns from Conservation in terms of the setting of the conservation area. An ecology survey had been undertaken for the site which recommended a condition for enhancements.

Ward member, Councillor Nigel Prenter, advised that he was at the meeting on behalf of the residents at Hill Close who had raised concerns, he acknowledged that the plans met legal recommendations regarding overlooking and overbearing impact and that it was not unacceptable in terms of policy. However, he expressed that the concerns of the neighbours were nevertheless understandable.

Laura Gregory, a neighbour, read out a letter from the residents at 22 Hill Close which suggested that the footings on plots 3 and 4 be lowered from 1.5 to 1m to make the building less intrusive, and bring the height more in line with the existing shop building. Many neighbors felt that reverting to the original plans which were for bungalows would be a better solution and would reduce the problem of extra vehicles with inadequate access. Another letter was summarised from the neighbours at 20 Hill Close, who welcome the renovation of the derelict shop but consider the original application for bungalows to be more sympathetic and considerate proposal given the impact to their garden in terms of overshadowing and compromised privacy. Laura Gregory advised that they were not opposed to the development of the site and were in support of the regeneration of the old shop, but her main concern was the new proposal of two-storey houses, which would have a significant impact on light, privacy and overlooking of neighbouring properties.

The Chair advised that Councillor Kay, had joined the meeting but had missed the beginning of the report and therefore would not be able to participate or vote on this matter.

Councillor Binns asked questions about overshadowing and whether there would be any first-floor windows which would overlook houses to the north. The Planner confirmed there are no windows proposed on the north and south facing side elevations, and the mature line

of trees to the south of the site mitigates any overshadowing as does the setting down of the new properties within the site.

The Head of Development Management reminded Members that this application is to be treated on its own merits and not in relation to or in comparison with the previous scheme. There is a residential design guide, and the distances from the north of the new plot to the existing properties are well within, and complies with, these standards.

Councillor Tomblin asked questions regarding plans for the access from the proposed plot to the existing road, its proximity to the junction and whether there was any risk of loss or damage to the trees between the new building and the chalet bungalow during the build. The Planner confirmed that the hard standing laid to the front of the shop had historically been used for parking and the adjacent access point from the front of the plot comes out at the cul-de-sac entrance to Hill Close Estate. The Highways Authority had raised no objection with the level of traffic which would be entering and exiting the plot. It was also confirmed that the trees were within the neighbouring properties boundary.

Councillor Miles asked questions about the style and height of the boundary to the north of the plot starting at the traffic access point, and ownership and usage of the additional car-parking spaces. The Planner confirmed the north boundary is part of the neighbouring properties' boundary and that Highways had deemed there was enough visibility if exiting the plot. There is no clarification as yet about the additional parking spaces, but it is likely they will be attached to one of the dwellings rather than being shared.

The Chair provided clarification that the proposal to approve the application included the additional updated condition in the Late Pages which had been published online.

On being put to the vote the motion, including the updated condition detailed in the late pages, was carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED To APPROVE Permission for Application S.20/1686/FUL**

The meeting closed at 6.50 pm.

Chair