

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

25 April 2017

2.35 pm – 4.53 pm
Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Stroud**3****Minutes****Membership**

Councillor Tom Williams **	P	Councillor Jim Dewey	Ap
Councillor John Marjoram *	P	Councillor Haydn Jones	P
Councillor Dorcas Binns	P	Councillor Jenny Miles	P
Councillor Chris Brine	P	Councillor David Mossman	P
Councillor Miranda Clifton	P	Councillor Gary Powell	P
Councillor Nigel Cooper	P	Councillor Mark Reeves	Ap
** = Chair * = Vice Chair	P = Present	A = Absent	Ap = Apologies

Officers in Attendance

Planning Manager	Senior Planning Officer
Planning Team Manager	Solicitor
Principal Planning Officer	Democratic Services Officer

Other Members in Attendance

Councillors Gordon Craig, Steve Lydon and Penny Wride.

DC.056 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jim Dewey and Mark Reeves.

DC.057 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

DC.058 MINUTES – 21 MARCH 2017**RESOLVED** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2017 are accepted as a correct record.**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLANNING SCHEDULE**

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

1	S.17/0557/FUL	2	S.16/2152/OUT	3	S.16/2837/FUL
4	S.16/2838/LBC				

Late pages had been circulated prior to the meeting to members regarding Scheduled Items 1, 2 and 3. Three photographs were also circulated showing the boat house and traffic congestion relating to Scheduled Item 3.

DC.059 **BATH ROAD TRADING ESTATE, BATH ROAD, STROUD, GLOS (S.17/0557/FUL) AND DANIELS INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, 104 BATH ROAD, STROUD, GLOS (S.16/2152/OUT)**

The Chair confirmed that the first two applications would be taken together for the officer reports and questions to officers. The Senior Planning Officer explained the layout of the proposed stores and the commercial parts of 16/2152/OUT that would be refurbished from plans that were displayed. When applying the town centre sequential test under paragraph 24 of the NPPF both sites had been found to be sequentially equal. The next test to be considered is the retail impact assessment test and the retail impact on the Towns of Stroud, Nailsworth and Stonehouse.

The Team Manager outlined a letter received from Dransfield Properties Limited stating they are in advanced discussions to purchase the Merrywalks Shopping Centre in Stroud. Paragraph 26 of the NPPF requires the retail impact assessment test to take into account planned town centre investment; more information was required from Dransfield Properties Limited before an impact assessment could take place on the planned investment and before members could properly determine the two applications on the Bath Road.

The Chair permitted questions to Matthew Morris the Council's Retail Consultant before moving forward. He confirmed that Stroud Town Centre was in a modest/fragile state and had low level food shopping. The Merrywalks Shopping Centre was tired and it would be good for the town if investment was made.

A motion was proposed by Councillor Tom Williams and seconded by Councillor John Marjoram to **DEFER** both applications until sufficient information was available from Dransfield Properties Limited and officers to do their best to bring the applications before Committee by July's meeting at the latest.

On being put to the vote there were 9 votes in favour of the motion to **DEFER** both applications, 1 vote against and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED To DEFER applications S.17/0557/FUL and S.16/2152/OUT until sufficient information was available from Dransfield Properties Limited and officers to do their best to bring the application before Committee by July's meeting at the latest.

DC.060 **BRIDGE HOUSE, PURTON, BERKELEY, GLOS (S.16/2837/FUL)**

The Principal Planning Officer drew attention to the late pages circulated to members prior to the meeting.

The Chair suggested that if speakers wished to speak on both applications that they do so at the same point and would give them both allotted times together (6 minutes).

Councillors Penny Wride and Gordon Craig, ward members opposed the two applications because local residents thought the facility would be better located at Sharpness and would not benefit the local community at all.

Geoffrey Forward spoke on behalf of Hinton Parish Council and local residents who did not want the applications granted. It would cause disruption, parking problems and affect the church which was the hub of the community.

Beryl Varum spoke on behalf of herself and other local residents from Purton who were worried that the church and their local community would be affected and begged Committee to refuse planning permission.

Christopher Dance, Planning Agent and Alex Isaac, Head of Sport at the University of the West of England stated the canal at Purton had perfect conditions for rowing and outlined the proposed use of the canal and buildings.

Officers replied to members' questions.

A motion was proposed by Councillor John Marjoram and seconded by Councillor Jenny Miles to **ACCEPT** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** the application.

On being put to the vote there were 3 votes in favour of the motion, 7 votes against and 0 abstentions. The motion was **LOST**.

A motion was proposed by Councillor Haydn Jones and seconded by Councillor Chris Brine to **REFUSE** the application on the grounds of policies CP15 and EI11.

On being put to the vote there were 8 votes for **REFUSAL** of the application, 2 votes against and 0 abstentions.

**RESOLVED To REFUSE planning permission for application S.16/2837/FUL.
REASONS Policies CP15 and EI11.**

DC.061 BRIDGE HOUSE, PURTON, BERKELEY, GLOS (S.16/2838/LBC)

The Chair confirmed that the application was for the proposed alterations to the internal layout of the building.

Clarification was given that the application was for the removal and addition of internal walls only and was for listed building consent that was separate to planning permission as applied for under the previous item.

A motion was proposed by Councillor Tom Williams and seconded by Councillor John Marjoram to **ACCEPT** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** the application.

On being put to the vote there were 9 votes in favour of the application, 0 votes against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED To GRANT planning permission for application S.16/2838/LBC, as outlined in the officer's report.

The meeting closed at 4.53 pm.

Chair