



# STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

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

Telephone 01453 766321

www.stroud.gov.uk

Email: democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

5 January 2021

6.00 pm – 8.40 pm

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                         | P | Councillor Jessica Tomblin | P |
| Councillor Norman Kay                          | P | Councillor Tom Williams    | P |

P = Present    A = Absent

### Officers in Attendance

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Head of Development Management       | Senior Planning Officer                        |
| Majors & Environment Team Manager    | Principal Planning Officer                     |
| Development Team Manager             | Principal Planning Officer (Majors)            |
| Principal Planning Lawyer, One Legal | Senior Democratic Services & Elections Officer |
| Planning Officer                     | Democratic Services & Elections Officer        |

### Other Member(s) in Attendance

|                           |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Councillor Gordon Craig   | Councillor Lindsey Green |
| Councillor Stephen Davies |                          |

### DC.021

### APOLOGIES

There were none.

### DC.022

### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Jones did not take part in the section of the meeting regards 6 Weir Green, Elmore, Gloucester, Gloucestershire (S.20/2403/HHOLD) due to family interest.

### DC.023

### MINUTES

**RESOLVED** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 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 Applications:

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| 1 | S.20/2403/HHOLD |
| 2 | S.20/1898/REM   |
| 3 | S.19/2678/FUL   |

**DC.024**                    **6 WEIR GREEN, ELMORE, GLOUCESTER, GLOUCESTERSHIRE**  
**(S.20/2403/HHOLD)**

The Planning Officer introduced the application and highlighted primary considerations in terms of the main policy HC8 criteria to ensure the plot size was large enough to accommodate the development without appearing cramped. Whilst the proposed scale of the extension was significant, it was not deemed to be of unacceptable size. Design elements were considered in keeping. Although parking would be lost with the removal of the garage, additional parking spaces would be added as part of the new extension, with the driveway providing further spaces.

The site was within flood zone 2 and 3 within the River Severn area. A Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted. As a household extension, this application would need to be compliant with the Government standing advice, which was satisfied by planned floor levels, connection to existing drainage routes and the established evacuation route out of the property. The applicant was a member of the Environment Agency (EA) flood risk advance warning hotline, which would help to ensure prior advanced warning of any flood events. A consultation with the Council's Water Resources Engineer had been favorable.

Councillor Kay asked about the level of flood risk in reference to the original application and in light of global warming, enquiring whether additional conditions were needed. The Planning Officer replied that as it is a minor development, it wouldn't qualify for consultation with the EA, but has been assessed in line with current EA information. Councillor Binns questioned further about the viability of the proposed bedroom on the ground floor, asking whether the risk of exposure to danger due to flooding would be increased, especially late at night. The Planning Officer informed that the bedroom was for an elderly family member with mobility issues. The River Severn usually flooded due to rainfall and the average advanced evacuation notice was normally 2 days with the flood systems already in place.

Councillor Clifton asked whether any problems might arise with future usage. The Head of Development Management recommended that a condition regarding this would not be required, since there was nothing in the plans to suggest the extension would be used as a separate unit and the Council held ultimate control over its use at a future date.

Councillor Binns proposed and Councillor Tomblin seconded the recommendation.

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

**RESOLED**                    **To APPROVE Permission for Application S.20/2403/HHOLD**

**DC.025**                    **PARCEL H16 & H19 LAND WEST OF STONEHOUSE, GROVE LANE,**  
**WESTEND, STONEHOUSE (S.20/1898/REM)**

The Principal Planning Officer (Majors) outlined the reserved matters application proposing 178 dwellings, associated infrastructure and landscaping. The proposal related to two land

parcels, H16 and H19, contained on the northeastern edge of an overall development of 1,350 dwellings, 9.3 hectares of employment land, a primary school and local centre, for which outline planning permission had been granted almost 6 years ago. The development was associated with the land allocation policy SA2 in the Stroud District Local Plan.

Changes to the layout of the development had been sought by Officers during the assessment of the application, principally to address permeability concerns, clustering of types of dwellings, landscape notes and general building design principals. Changes had been agreed and were considered welcome improvements. A site visit was conducted and a film had been taken from a roundabout to the southeast of H19, reviewing the outlook across H19, including the positioning of a proposed block of flats. An improved design to a node within H16 had been negotiated to better define and feature the public open spaces. Officers were satisfied that the development proposals were consistent with the outlined planning permission and the improved master plan which came later by condition.

The Highway Authority and Officers were satisfied that the combined cycle route and wide footway shared-user environment through the site would not create any severe highways or safety impact. Negotiations had been successful in alleviating clustering issues, opening out the concentration of affordable units and optimising permeability through the development. Visual markers had also been enhanced to improve the street scene. All this had successfully resulted in a much better proposal than originally submitted.

There were seven conditions proposed associated with the following aspects:

- The drawings, including landscaping and heights of buildings;
- Trigger points for the development to bring forward landscaping plans;
- Lighting to protect ecology and the bat-foraging environment along the site's fringe;
- The delivery of bird and bat boxes;
- The style of gates on public rights of way through the site;
- Street furniture, and
- 100% electric vehicle charge points.

Comments had been received from Stonehouse Town Council and Standish Parish Council after the report was compiled by Officers. Concerns and suggestions raised included:

- The potential impact on the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- Work carried out in support of Standish Neighbourhood Development Plan, focused on the proposed land allocation under policy PS19a in the emerging Local Plan;
- Further amendments to the submitted Green Infrastructure Plan;
- The impact on the public right of way network and lack of apparent detail on this, and
- Impacts on biodiversity noting the 20-year maintenance period for bird and bat boxes.

Members were informed that since the development had already been permitted in principle, these issues could not be revisited. The emerging Local Plan was not yet available for delivery and the Standish Neighbourhood Development Plan was not yet an adopted policy. The original outline planning consent contained a substantial suite of conditions which addressed all concerns in general terms. No further conditions were deemed necessary.

Jonathan Coombs, Principal Planner at Pegasus Group joined the meeting to speak in favour on behalf of the applicant. Details were given of the process undertaken for arriving at revisions to the proposal, addressing all comments from Officers and Parish Councils. A legal agreement would ensure ongoing responsibility for the maintenance of public areas by a private management company. Overall, the proposed development conformed with the local plan, national policies, outline planning permission and consented area master plan.

Councillor Kay asked about the assessment of the housing mix within the application, given the applicants had deviated from the guidance set out in the Local Plan. The Principal Planning Officer (Majors) informed of a 10% deviation allowable within individual land parcels under Section 106, provided that the site as a whole would deliver policy-compliant 30% affordable units. H16 and H19 were comprised of more mid-range units with some blocks of flats, but the housing mix should be considered within the context of the overall development. Smaller, affordable units would be more densely concentrated towards the centre of the resultant overall site. As the rest of the proposals were brought forward into the future, Officers would ensure a balanced mix was being delivered across the site as a whole, the onus for which lay with the developers. Councillor Miles raised concerns around the shortfall of 0.25% affordable houses within this application and the potential accumulation of such deficits leading to a denser cluster of affordable units further down the line. This had been checked with the Housing Enabling Officer and there were no concerns.

Councillor Clifton asked about the lack of amenity areas around the block of flats at the southeastern corner of the site, and an apparent shortfall in parking in this area. Members were informed that the Highways Authority had indicated that the number of parking spaces was policy-compliant and therefore acceptable. The block of flats had sufficient outside space to cater for the drying of clothes and refuse areas, and there was access to significant public open space in immediate proximity. Overall, amenity areas were deemed acceptable.

During questions from Councillor Lydon, the involvement of local residents in consultation on the developing scheme was raised. Site notices had been displayed as part of the application, Parish Council meetings were an established mechanism for participation and the Head of Development Management added that social media was increasingly being used to enhance engagement with local communities around larger planning applications.

Councillor Miles proposed and Councillor Clifton seconded the recommendation.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried with 11 votes for and 1 abstention.

**RESOLVED To APPROVE Permission for Application S.20/1898/REM**

**DC.026 PIER VIEW, 34 OLDMINSTER ROAD, SHARPNESS, BERKELEY**  
**(S.19/2678/FUL)**

The Senior Planning Officer informed Members that the Pier View Hotel was a non-designated heritage asset, for which there were local and national planning policies that seek to protect the significance and historic importance of the building. The site had a long history of planning applications for residential development both at formal and pre-application stages. A previous application was refused under delegated powers and dismissed upon appeal in 2016, due to the consideration of the Planning Inspector that any development, even well-designed, would cause an unacceptable impact on the heritage asset. The current application was largely reflective of this but with key changes: a reduction in the site area, changes to the unit design and the removal of a number of proposed units to be built in front of the Pier View Hotel. The Local Planning Authority were recommending refusal of the application due to the impact the development would have on the setting of the heritage asset as well as the total development of the site's substantial grounds which acted as an important feature for the asset and the community in which it served.

The application had not provided the required 30% affordable housing quota or the required financial contribution towards the adopted Ecological Mitigation Scheme. Confirmation had subsequently been received from the agent of the applicant that these issues would be

addressed via legal agreement should the application be carried. Notwithstanding this, principal objections over the scheme remained:

- The location of the development;
- The modern architectural style which was uncomplimentary to the heritage asset, and
- The general layout of the development and its impact as a whole.

Information had been received about a spring on the site. No concerns had been raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority nor the council's Water Flood Engineer. EA surface water flood maps had been checked and the site did not sit within any at-risk areas.

Ward member Councillor Craig spoke in support of the application, highlighted its green credentials, informed of a written agreement reached with an elderly neighbour to maintain the height and density of green screening and vehicular access, cited the natural spring which surfaced on the applicant's land near the boundary and asked whether these matters could be conditioned into the plan. A query was also raised about the ammonium nitrate store nearby and whether the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) had been consulted. The Senior Planning Officer informed that the size of the development would not warrant automatic consultation with the HSE, but the application had been run through the HSE online system which returned no recommendations to refuse. The right of access would be a civil matter and not come under planning scope. Screening would be possible to control under ecology and biodiversity guidelines and a suite of conditions could be added if the application were to be approved.

Ward member Councillor Green expressed further support for the development and highlighted that it had local support and had been well-considered including the innovative, eco-friendly design. This could set a positive example in the District of a sustainable, carbon neutral development on a small site. The applicant was a longstanding well-liked landlady who had served the local community for 33 years with dedication and created a thriving hub for the local community at the Pier View Hotel. If the application were to be refused, the community would lose this asset, causing wider community implications for Sharpness.

Christine Hawley, Applicant and Sarah Gibson, Architect from LABOX Design spoke in favour of the application and highlighted its strengths which included:

- It would help to provide a much-needed solution to the current lack of affordable housing for young local families;
- It would safeguard the future of the Pier View Hotel at the heart of the Sharpness community and inject a much needed boost to local life especially coming out of the Covid-19 pandemic;
- The understated, contemporary design features and materials referenced the Pier View Hotel whilst ensuring its ongoing precedence in appearance and scale;
- The low to zero-carbon design principles making it an ideal site for, and example of, sustainable development within the area, and
- All the appeal inspector's concerns had been addressed.

Councillor Williams sought clarification on whether the site was within the ammonium nitrate blast zone. The Majors & Environment Team Manager confirmed it was in the medium area according to HSE's consultation framework. No issues were raised for granting permission. Councillor Kay asked about ecological pressure caused by the development. The Senior Planning Officer detailed anticipated tensions between the existing green buffers and new private gardens and residences in immediate proximity in a small area. This would be likely to cause pressure to reduce or remove the ecology. Bats were known to roost on the site and the Biodiversity team had stated that external lighting would also need to be conditioned.

Councillor Miles asked about the distinction in affordable housing between rental and shared ownership, given the need for affordable rented housing within the Local Plan. The Senior

Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant had been proposing 100% shared ownership and the Affordable Housing Officer had confirmed this as not reflective. This would be taken forward through negotiations and revisions under Section 106 to ensure this was addressed.

Councillor Jones' questions included an enquiry about the consultation with the Strategy Team. Members were informed that this consultation had raised two issues, in line with the recommendations of Planning Officers: the impact on the historic building and policy EI6 regards impact on the community facility. It was considered that the development, if built, would detract from the future functionality of the public house and therefore lead to a negative impact on its attractability, as well as the loss of the open spaces surrounding the Pier View Hotel which were invaluable for community use.

Councillor Lydon asked, given the proposed development had previously been turned down at appeal by the Planning Inspector and the changes to the current application had not been deemed sufficient to warrant recommended approval, what would the implications be if the Committee were to vote to permit this application and would there be any subsequent appeal. The Head of Development Management confirmed the Officers' view that the scheme did not go far enough to overcome the earlier concerns of the independent Planning inspector. The current application still presented a harmful impact upon the non-designated heritage asset and there was a legal obligation to give this considerable weight. If the proposal was passed, Members would need to clearly outline and document the reasons why this proposal was deemed not to have a harmful impact on the non-designated heritage asset. This legal obligation was confirmed by the Principal Planning Lawyer.

Councillor Clifton asked about legal minimum unit size and usable amenity space. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed the unit size, although small, was passable. The Council's Residential Design Guide was referenced, which whilst allowing for individual variation, proposed an average garden area of 100m<sup>2</sup> across the whole development. At 75m<sup>2</sup>, the average garden area fell short for this application.

Councillor Binns asked about the criteria for a non-designated heritage asset. The Senior Planning Officer outlined that the Council's Conservation Officer and Planning Inspector had both highlighted that although it would not be eligible for national listing, the Pier View Hotel was a building of significant local, social and historical merit which warranted protection.

Councillor Kay proposed and Councillor Binns seconded the recommendation to refuse.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried with 9 votes for and 1 against.

**RESOLVED To REFUSE permission for Application S.19/2678/FUL**

**DC.026 APPLICATION & ENFORCEMENT PERFORMANCE STATISTICS OVERVIEW**

The Head of Development Management advised that future reports will follow from April 2021 then October 2021 and half-yearly thereafter, in line with the financial year.

**RESOLVED To NOTE the Application & Enforcement Performance Statistics Overview Report.**

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm.

Chair