

d r a f t m i n u t e s

Planning Committee

18th December 2014

Present:

Members (13)

Councillors Barnes, Chair (GB); Fletcher, Vice-Chair (JF); Babbage (MB); Baker (PB); Chard (AC); Clucas (FC); Colin Hay (CH); Lillywhite (AL); McCloskey (HM); McKinlay (AM); Seacome (DS); Thornton (PT).

Substitutes: Councillor Rowena Hay (RH)

Officers

Tracey Crews, Head of Planning (TC)
Martin Chandler, Team Leader, Development Management (MC)
Chloe Smart, Planning Officer (CS)
Cheryl Lester, Legal Officer (CL)

1. Apologies

Councillors Fisher, Stennett and Sudbury.

2. Declarations of interest

14/01276/OUT Land off Stone Crescent

Councillor Babbage – personal only - plays team football at King George V Playing Field, adjacent to the site.

3. Declarations of independent site visits

14/01276/OUT Land off Stone Crescent

Councillor Baker and Councillor Rowena Hay.

14/01632/FUL Hobart House, Princess Elizabeth Way

Councillor Lillywhite.

Present on Planning View: Councillors Babbage, Barnes, Chard, Lillywhite, Mason, McCloskey, Seacome and Thornton.

4. Public Questions

There were none.

5. Minutes of last meeting

Resolved, that the minutes of the meeting held on 20th November 2014 be approved and signed as a correct record *without* corrections.

d r a f t m i n u t e s

Councillor Barnes welcomed Councillor Lillywhite to the meeting, now representing PAB as a permanent Member of the Committee rather than as a substitute.

6. Planning applications

Application Number:	14/01276/OUT
Location:	Land off Stone Crescent, Cheltenham
Proposal:	Outline application for residential development
View:	Yes
Officer Recommendation:	Permit subject to a 106 Obligation
Committee Decision:	Permit subject to a 106 Obligation and added informative
Letters of Rep:	7
Update Report:	None

MJC introduced this outline application for residential development of a parcel of land identified in the map on Page 15 of the agenda. It is an outline only, with all matters reserved, other than access. Members must consider whether the principle is acceptable and whether access to the site is acceptable. Officers recommend that planning permission be granted, subject to 40% affordable housing being achieved, and a contribution to education and playspace being made.

Public Speaking:

There was none.

Member debate:

AC: doesn't like outline applications, and is concerned about access to the site. The roads the Planning View bus went down to reach the site are narrow. MJC has said there could be 20 houses built on the site, which could mean 40 additional cars. Highways officers have stated that this is alright, but what are the views of other Members and officers?

PT: is also concerned about the access road to Wharfedale Square – on Planning View, this was blocked with cars from top to bottom. Can double yellow lines be introduced to ensure proper access 24/7? The area looked very congested.

PB: considers this application to be excellent use of this piece of land, with 40% affordable housing a massive bonus. If there is any concern about numbers, this can be discussed at the reserved matters stage, together with highways issues; the outline application aims to establish that residential use of the site is OK.

MB: has the contaminated land officer any further information, for the future application?

JF: this may be just an outline application to establish the use of the land for houses, but the decision made tonight regarding access will be set in stone. Members have been caught out in this way before. The access road does seem rather narrow, and this will not change with the full application.

AC: agrees with JF. Outline applications often don't even come back to Committee; this one might be nodded through by officers, which would be wrong.

d r a f t m i n u t e s

CH: is happy to go forward with this. Understands the problems with the access roads, but is confident that officers are listening to Members' concerns. It will be recorded in the minutes that Members consider the outline application is OK but have some concerns about access as against the types of housing. This will give the developer a clue about what will be acceptable, for example if for a tower block, it would not be acceptable.

PT: can we ask for the full application to come back to Committee for determination?

MJC, in response:

- appreciates Members' reservations about outline applications, but reminds them that this is a perfectly legitimate application to make; the authority is being asked to consider simply if the principle of residential development is acceptable and the access appropriate;
- the County Council highways officers have considered the application and concluded that the access is appropriate for up to 20 additional houses;
- the original submission was for 13 houses; officers weren't comfortable with this, and felt that the developer could make better use of the site and get more dwellings out of it, at least another three or four, which will be an important contribution to the borough;
- the County Council is happy with the access arrangement. In response to PT's comment, the cars in Wharfedale Square are an existing situation and the applicant cannot be expected to mitigate for this;
- with the REM application, the developers will have to ensure that the proposal meets its own needs for parking; highways officers will be looking for this. It's likely that two parking spaces will be provided for each dwelling - this is the kind of information required at the REM stage;
- to PT, there is no requirement for further double yellow lines in Wharfedale Square; the County is happy with the highway situation in the area, and officers are standing by its advice;
- to MB, the contaminated land officer considered the application and made no comment. He is routinely consulted and checks records etc to ensure there are no concerns in this area;
- assuming the outline is granted, the REM application doesn't automatically come back to Committee but officers would expect the ward councillor to call it in if minded to do so. In response to AC's comment, no application is ever 'noddled through' – officers scrutinise applications equally thoroughly, whether they are going to Committee or decided under delegated powers;
- all that Members are being asked to decide today is whether the principle of residential development and the access road at this site are OK; the advice on both of these issues from officers and the County Council is that it is.

PT: Members are all aware of a new development at Priors Farm where the roads are too narrow for a refuse lorry to pass get through. It is obvious that parking in this area is already a problem, so how can Members be expected to decide whether or not the access is OK? Why can't Members ask for this scheme to come back to Committee for final determination, having seen the situation and the site?

GB: there is provision in the scheme of delegation for the Planning Committee to say that the reserved matters application is to come back to Committee for determination.

PT: can Officers clarify what exactly on the map Members are supposed to be considering? Presumes this is just the shaded area, not the access roads from the main road.

MJC, in response:

- Members need to consider the immediate access from the main road as a means of access threshold between the application site and the road;
- PT referred to Priors Farm with roads too narrow for a refuse lorry, but that development is on a very different scale and has a variety of flaws which Members have discussed in the past. Since

d r a f t m i n u t e s

that application, the County and officers have wised up to the potential problems of narrow roads and parked cars making access difficult for refuse vehicles. As Mark Powers explained in his recent presentation to Members, officers have, over the years, worked to guidance and ended up with some estates of which they are not particularly proud. The problems have been worked through, and officers are confident that the reserved matters proposal will meet its own needs regarding parking provision. County highways officers are also supportive of this;

- reminded Members again that this sort of detail doesn't need to be considered now – it will be dealt with at the reserved matters stage. Members are being asked to vote on the principle and the access arrangements. If they are unhappy about access and parking in the reserved matters application, it would be legitimate to refuse the scheme at that stage.

JF: if the outline application is passed today, can the reserved matters application to come back to Committee for determination?

GB: this has already been agreed.

MJC, in response:

- confirmed that this request from Members has been noted, and the reserved matters application will be brought to Committee as and when it is received;
- there is, however, no guarantee that a reserved matters application will be made. The County Council wants to dispose of the land; another developer may make a full application, but whatever the case, the next application will come to Committee for a decision;
- if the outline proposal is approved tonight, a standard informative should be added at the end of the conditions relating to the NPPF stating that the application has been dealt with in a positive and proactive way.

GB: having now established that any future reserved matters or full application will be brought to Committee for consideration, will move to the vote.

Vote on officer recommendation to permit, subject to S106 agreement and added informative

13 in support – unanimous

PERMIT subject to S106

Application Number:	14/01632/FUL		
Location:	Hobart House, Princess Elizabeth Way, Cheltenham		
Proposal:	Replacement windows and doors and associated external alterations to Hobart House, nos. 33-55 Shelley Road and nos.170-192 Shakespeare Road		
View:	Yes		
Officer Recommendation:	Permit		
Committee Decision:	Permit		
Letters of Rep:	0	Update Report:	None

CS introduced the application for replacement windows and doors as above, which was at Committee because it concerns a council-owned site. The recommendation is to approve, subject to a condition in relation to commencement.

Public Speaking:

There was none.

d r a f t m i n u t e s

Member debate:

AL: had been concerned that the 2-inch concrete band surrounding the existing windows was to be removed leaving a white band which would not have looked good, but understands that this has since been amended and is acceptable.

AC: was going to make the same point; missed the amendment.

CS, in response:

- there has not been any amendment. Officers have looked at supporting documents and clarified this evening that the windows will feature a timber surround sub frame with rosewood uPVC on top; there will be no thick white frame.

Vote on officer recommendation to permit

13 in support - unanimous

PERMIT

Application Number: **14/01810/FUL**

Location: **Mellersh House, Painswick Road, Cheltenham**

Proposal: **New bin store area located by the communal front entrance in Andover Road and drop kerb on Andover Road**

This application was **DEFERRED** and will be considered at the January meeting

Application Number: **14/01901/COU**

Location: **1 St Michaels Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire**

Proposal: **Proposed change of use from residential dwelling (C3) to pre-school and nursery (D1)**

This application was **WITHDRAWN** on 16th December 2014

Application Number: **14/01956/FUL**

Location: **29 - 31 Millbrook Street Cheltenham Gloucestershire**

Proposal: **Conversion of 2no. B1 commercial offices to 2.no flats**

This application was **WITHDRAWN** on 18th December 2014

The meeting ended at 6.25pm.