

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

3

22 January 2019

5.00 pm – 9.10 pm
 Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Stroud

Minutes

Membership

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| Councillor Tom Williams (Chair) | P | Councillor Haydn Jones | P |
| Councillor John Marjoram (Vice-Chair) | P | Councillor Steve Lydon | A |
| Councillor Martin Baxendale | P | Councillor Karen McKeown | P |
| Councillor Dorcas Binns | P | Councillor Jenny Miles | A |
| Councillor Miranda Clifton | P | Councillor Jessica Tomblin | P |
| Councillor Nigel Cooper | P | Councillor Mark Reeves | P |

P = Present A = Absent

Officers in Attendance

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Planning Manager | Solicitor |
| Development Manager | Principal Planning Officer |
| Team Manager | Democratic Services Officer |
| Conservation Officer | Biodiversity Officer |

Others in Attendance

Councillor David Mossman
 Two Planning Consultants from Prospero Planning Consultancy

DC.052 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lydon and Miles.

DC.053 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLANNING SCHEDULE

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

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---|---------------|
| 1 | S.17/2729/FUL | 2 | S.17/2730/LBC |
|---|---------------|---|---------------|

Late pages relating to items 1 and 2 on the schedule had been circulated to committee prior to the meeting. A further document from the County Council, relating to highways matters, had been received by the Planning Manager at 6.00 pm.

DC.054 **FORMER STANDISH HOSPITAL AND FORMER WESTRIDGE HOSPITAL,
STANDISH, STONEHOUSE (S.17/2729/FUL)**

Exclusion of the Press and Public Section 100A and Schedule 12A, Local Government Act 1972

Members noted that this application would involve the consideration of a report from the District Valuer on the viability assessment of the development produced by the Applicant.

This would be a significant planning consideration in evidencing the minimum amount of enabling development required to secure the restoration and preservation of the listed buildings with which the application was concerned. The District Valuer's report had been marked commercially sensitive and not for publication as it contained sensitive commercial and financial information relating to the applicant. Members were therefore asked to consider whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the District Valuer's report (a) because the information should be considered as "confidential" pursuant to section 100A of the 1972 Act and/or (b) because the information was of the nature referred to in paragraph (3) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to that Act. Regarding the latter issue members were advised that they must balance the public interest in disclosing the information against the public interest in excluding the public.

Members considered the issues referred to above and resolved to exclude the public from the meeting during the consideration of the District Valuer's report. The exclusion of the public commenced at 5.17 pm and the Committee resolved to re-admit the public at 6.00 pm.

The Districts Council's planning consultants presented the report which set out the background and history of the site and the proposals; for 48 residential units through the conversion of Standish House and ancillary buildings and 99 new build units across the Standish House site and Westridge site.

The Council's consultants highlighted that the proposal was an 'enabling' development and a development such as this may not normally be supported but could be considered an exception site because of the high heritage value of the listed buildings and the site.

The Ward Councillor, Councillor David Mossman spoke in support of the proposal. He commented that along with Standish Parish Council there had been much work on the scheme over a long time and a lot of interest had been shown by the local community. He acknowledged that some aspects of the scheme gave cause for concern such as; the 6 units in the north east corner and transportation within the site.

Standish Parish Councillor Jackie Knight presented a response on behalf of the Parish Council. The views of the Parish Council were finely balanced; recognising the historic value of the site and also its challenging nature. There were concerns about access to public transport and local services. There were concerns too about the safety of cyclists with a need to ensure there was improved safety. It was suggested that traffic speed through the site should be 20 mph.

The Parish Council requested that it be consulted on a number of the conditions attached to the application.

Richard Wilshaw, Planning Manager of PJ Livesey presented the views of the applicants. He highlighted the need for the new build homes to support the viability of the site and to

help boost the supply of housing in the area. He acknowledged that it was a unique site and by its nature would set a precedent for other developments. He commented that the application had been developed over a long period of time and was now ready to move forward.

The Planning Manager reported to the Committee that a late submission had been received from the County Council as highways authority. The comments from the County Council proposed an additional condition to the internal layout of the site which would result in a more engineered design. This would include widening carriageways and additional lighting. In the opinion of the Planning Manager, this condition could not be attached because its potential impact of matters of heritage, landscape and biodiversity could not be addressed without knowing the full details of the changes required.

If the condition could not be attached, the recommendation from the County Council's Highways Officers was to refuse the application as the site did not provide safe and suitable access for all visitors and a reason for refusal was read out by the Planning Manager.

The Chair, expressed his concern about the response from the County Council at such a late stage in the process.

The Council's Solicitor advised the Committee that it was not compelled to agree with the County Council's recommendations. The Committee could demonstrate that it had taken due consideration of the comments from Highways.

The Chair opened the discussion for questions. A Member noted the poor state of the buildings and asked how soon the work would start. The Planning Manager acknowledged that an application could last for three years but the expectation was that work would commence as soon as possible.

In response to questions about development in the north east corner of the site, the Council's consultants stated that this was to reduce the landscape impact.

A question was raised about maintaining the historic value of the buildings. The Conservation Officer reported that a lot of work had gone into the design of the main building to maintain its character.

In response to questions on the visual impact, the Planning Consultant outlined the landscape photographs showing the impact one year on from development. The screening would develop more over time.

Members asked for assurances that the local community would be able to use the open space. After the adjournment, it was confirmed that all the open space within the development would be available for the general public to access with the exception of private garden areas and a field to the north of the Lodge.

Part of the Section 106 would set up a master plan and a management company would be established management of the site.

The Biodiversity Officer informed Members that there were a number of bat roosts on the site some roosts would be moved to other areas and some existing areas would remain. The overall ecological balance of the area would be retained. Some of the scrub areas would be cleared and native species would be encouraged.

In respect of the future operation of the Lodge it was confirmed that it would be a facility for community use. The area around the Lodge would accommodate 16-20 car parking spaces.

The meeting adjourned at 7.50 pm and reconvened at 8.06 pm.

The Planning Manager confirmed that the proposal was to provide public access to the site except for the field which would be for the person running the lodge and facilities. This would form part of the management plan.

Members asked further questions in respect of highways issues. It was noted that as this would be a privately managed development speed limits throughout the site could be set at 20mph, speed could also be reduced by landscaping.

In response to questions about lighting the Planning Manager advised that the lighting would be subdued and could include bollard lighting.

Councillor Haydn Jones proposed a motion to accept officers' advice; subject to the addition that Standish Parish Council be consulted on the certain planning conditions attached to the approval, this was seconded by Councillor Nigel Cooper.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried by 8 in favour and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED To permit application S.17/2729/FUL, subject to the conditions recommended within the schedule and to the conclusion of a Section 106 Agreement on terms acceptable to the Planning Manager and for Standish Parish Council to be consulted on the discharge of the relevant planning conditions.

DC.055 FORMER STANDISH HOSPITAL AND FORMER WESTRIDGE HOSPITAL, STANDISH, STONEHOUSE (S.17/2730/LBC)

The Conservation Manager presented the Officers' report which set the proposals for the maintenance and conversion of the historic building.

Richard Wilshaw, Planning Manager of PJ Livesey thanked Members for their consideration and support of the developments and that the company wishes to commence the work as soon as possible.

Members asked questions about specific features of the building and were advised that as many features as possible would be retained.

Councillor Haydn Jones proposed a motion to accept officers' advice; this was seconded by Councillor Miranda Clifton.

Members debated the application and when put to the vote there were 9 votes in favour, and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED To grant consent to application S.17/2730/LBC.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm.

Chair