

# Cheltenham Borough Council Planning Committee Minutes

**Meeting date:** 30 May 2024

**Meeting time:** 5.00 pm - 8.00 pm

---

## **In attendance:**

### **Councillors:**

Frank Allen, Glenn Andrews, Paul Baker (Vice-Chair), Adrian Bamford, Garth Barnes (Chair), Barbara Clark, Jan Foster, Tony Oliver, Simon Wheeler and Suzanne Williams

### **Also in attendance:**

Claire Donnelly (Planning Officer), Chris Gomm (Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance), Michael Ronan (Lawyer), Ben Warren (Planning Officer) and Lucy White (Principal Planning Officer)

---

## **1 Apologies**

No apologies were received. The Chair welcomed the new members to planning committee and thanked Councillor Baker as previous Chair of the committee and wished him luck in his year as Mayor.

Councillor Bamford was not present at the start of the meeting.

## **2 Declarations of Interest**

In relation to the first application, 456 High Street, the Chair read out a statement on behalf of the committee members who were present at the meeting 21st March. The application was not determined in March and whilst he and some other members of the committee were present this did not prevent them from taking part at the tonight's meeting in respect of that item. He confirmed that members have not predetermined the matter and hold no bias concerning the application. He confirmed that they are committed to evaluating the application based on its merits and considering all the information presented before the committee.

Councillor Foster declared a bias against Oakley Farm application as previously signed a petition against the development and will leave the chamber when it is discussed.

Councillor Clark declared that she has a friend that lives at Honeyborne Gate and will leave the chamber when 456 High Street is discussed.

The legal officer clarified that Councillors Clark's interest was a non pecuniary disclosable interest, as close associate.

Councillor Bamford had no declarations of interest.

### **3 Declarations of independent site visits**

Councillor Wheeler visited 456 High Street.

Councillor Andrews visited 456 High Street, Imperial Gardens and 320 Swindon Road.

Councillor Oliver visited 456 High Street and Honeyborne Gate on previous planning view.

Councillor Bamford had visited Swindon Road after planning view. He had visited St Peters, 456 High Street and Oakley Farm as part of previous planning view.

### **4 Minutes of the last meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 April 2024 were approved as an accurate record.

### **5 Public Questions**

There were none.

### **6 Planning Applications**

#### **6a 23/00625/FUL 456 High Street**

Councillor Clark left the chamber.

The Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance introduced the report as published and explained that the reasons for the return of the application were in the report and that following legal advice no decision was formally made at March meeting and is back at committee for debate, reassessment and a formal decision.

There were three public speakers on the item; the objector, the agent on behalf of the applicant and two ward members.

The public speaker in objection addressed the committee and made the following points:

- These words are on behalf of residents of Honeybourne Gate. The application was refused in March and is back before the committee on a legal technicality.
- Honeybourne Gate is exclusively occupied by older people, many that have limited mobility and spend most or all of their time in their apartments. Whilst residents are aware that there is no right to a view, the loss of amenity that will arise from being faced with a prison like four storey wall will be significant.
- The proposed development will come right up to the edge of the pathway which is narrow at this point and the development is immediately adjacent to the bridge.
- The professional advice regarding highway safety was disputed, since those that live at Honeybourne Gate witness near accidents every day on this stretch of High Street.
- Highway and pedestrian safety will be compromised by this development as vehicles already pull onto the pathway when moving out of the way of oncoming emergency vehicles, there will be nowhere for pedestrians to move without the current loading bay. Additionally, delivery drivers park illegally on double yellow lines outside the front of the development so the hazard is even greater.
- The residents accept the need for additional housing in Cheltenham and a much reduced development on this site would be acceptable. A development of this size into such a restricted site will significantly damage the street scene undoing much progress already made in the area.

The agent on behalf of the applicant then addressed the committee and made the following points:

- The application is not back at committee to ratify the previous resolution rather a fresh consideration of the merits of the application.
- The application involves redevelopment of a tired and redundant brownfield site at a location actively promoted for growth by the Council.
- The government and this council support the needs to meet the need for housing identified through JCS area through the redevelopment of brownfield land and sustainable town centre location.
- This committee has presided over many applications along the High Street and redevelopment of former commercial sites to provide much needed housing and which have been permitted. The site opposite was recently developed with a four storey high apartment block and this application has been designed to follow the scale of that building and is it not as high as Honeybourne Gate.
- This application has been through a long process, the original pre app discussions took place in 2019 and the final scheme has been developed in line with officer advice. Design changes have been made throughout the

process as requested by officers to ensure the best possible scheme is achieved whilst retaining viability.

- The scheme respects the local conservation area as outlined in the officer report and they have confirmed that there would be an acceptable level of impact on neighbours. All other policy criteria have also been met.
- It has been demonstrated through a robust financial viability report that any development at this site with affordable housing is not viable. This has also been confirmed by an independent district valuer commissioned by the council. This scenario is specifically provided for in policy and is a legitimate position.
- The scheme has been thoroughly tested by the local highway authority, with additional parking surveys in the neighbouring streets during evening hours, when they consider parking to be most in demand. These surveys confirmed that there is adequate parking in capacity terms.
- The highway authority has concluded that there would not be a severe impact in highways safety terms and the conclusion is that the scheme is acceptable.
- Clear advice previously given by the highway officer suggested that there would be no legitimate grounds for refusal in terms of lack of car parking given the opportunities for parking in the vicinity. Furthermore, the council was advised that the lack of a drop off bay would not form a deferrable reason, if that would be an issue in planning terms it would render all developments along the High Street as unacceptable as few benefit from this provision.
- The development may not be to individual taste. The planning authority are required to determine the application in line with the expectations of the development plan.

Councillor Willingham as ward member was then asked to address the committee and made the following points:

- Speaking on behalf of constituents at Honeybourne Gate, he asked the committee to refuse this application for the second time. It was refused 6 to 5 votes at March committee to do anything else would be undemocratic. Nothing has changed in the application.
- The application is still unlawfully non-compliant with policy SPD12 and requires the publication of the viability report if affordable housing is not provided. This development provides none and no viability report has been published.
- The council has a pecuniary interest as a landowner.
- The aesthetics of the design were criticised at March committee with the block being compared to a prison block.
- The residents of Honeybourne Gate are older and some have mobility issues and therefore spend more time in their homes. The design and visual amenity of the proposed development must be given more weight. The lack of residential amenity give robust grounds for refusal from policies SD4 and SD14.
- The safety and practicalities of deliveries to the development for the top floor flats will be difficult due to the internal design and site layout.
- The external layout will be problematic for deliveries and will cause severe traffic safety problems at a busy point near a congested junction on the High Street and Gloucester Road and close to a bridge which limits visibility.

- Delivery vehicles stopping outside the development will obstruct the visibility of the only height restriction sign protecting the Honeybourne Line bridge over the High Street. This bridge is owned by CBC has been repeatedly damaged by bridge strikes.
- If the development is permitted without the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) being changed it will cause highway danger due to the detrimental impact on parking in zone 12. Which planning documents show is 392% oversubscribed, allowing an extra 36 parking permits for this development will be dangerous with vehicles having to reverse out of cul-de-sacs onto Gloucester Road. Officers could have imposed a grampian condition to require the TRO to be varied before construction commences but didn't, the committee can.
- The committee should consider whether you would gift £15k out of public money to a developer out of a highways budget.
- The parking survey was conducted on a Wednesday when the busiest day is a Friday. To fail to condition that the TRO should be changed before the development commences would be an insult to the tax payer of Gloucestershire.

Councillor Atherstone as ward member was then asked to address the committee and made the following points:

- The committee refused the application at March meeting.
- She was initially excited by the development to provide much needed housing in the town. However, she was now disappointed that the developer will not be providing any affordable housing when up to 40% should be provided.
- The developer suggestion that it should be car free was questioned given that, friends and family visit the residents.
- There is no parking provision and inadequate availability of street parking in nearby streets. Parking zone 12 is significantly oversubscribed. One survey taken on one evening should not be accepted as enough evidence to base their assumptions on. It is hard to believe that only 0.5 car park spaces will be required per home.
- The NPPF states that development should be prevented where there is an impact on highways safety. The County council's comment that the harm arising from the increased demand for parking and inadequate availability of street parking is likely to affect the amenity of residents of the existing properties was highlighted as this would give rise to some road safety issues associated with drivers searching for parking spaces and having to reverse in narrow cul-de-sacs with no spaces found.
- As the proposed development goes right up to the pavement deliveries to the development will pose a danger for road users and pedestrians as they will park on the pavement and block the road.
- Honeybourne Gate residents are concerned with loss of privacy, visual impact of the development and general loss of residential amenity.
- There were concerns about the safety of site during construction as the development is right up to the pavement, the two blocks are closely packed together and close to the Honeybourne Line and to the low bridge.

The matter then went to Member questions and the responses were as follows:

- The application is to be considered and debated as a fresh application.

- A Health Impact Assessment has not been carried out and would not be expected for an application of this scale.
- The council owns a sliver of land alongside the Honeybourne Line within the red line of the application site. Land ownership is not a material planning consideration.
- Condition 4 requires the submission of a construction management plan and is a normal requirement for a larger application particularly in a location such as this one. The Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance is not concerned that the committee is imposing a condition that cannot be complied with and it is for the applicant to provide the detail to satisfy the condition. The council would consult with the highways authority to discharge condition 4.
- The highways officer said that there is survey information which shows that there is capacity in the permit areas of Bloomsbury Street, Stoneville Street, Market Street and Park Street. However, the highways officer does have concerns with Bloomsbury Street and Stoneville Street due to problems with the ability of vehicles to turn in those streets. That said, the applicant has sufficient evidence that were the application to be refused and go to appeal the applicant would be able to evidence that there is capacity for residents permits.
- The highways officer is concerned about on street parking on the A4019 but does not think those concerns meet the threshold to refuse the development. The NPPF is referenced in the report and whilst there may be an impact on highways safety it would not be so great as to refuse the application.
- The highways officer said that the original advice given to the planning officer was that the TRO should be amended. The document that the County Council uses states that the development should be excluded from having parking permits in oversubscribed areas. The applicant has argued that they are unable to pay the £15k cost for that variation to be made to the TRO. This does cause the officer concern that the public will pick up the cost. On the basis of the information we have received unable to recommend to refuse the application.
- The highways officer confirmed that the parking zone does need to be reviewed regardless of this development. The officer was unable to guarantee to the committee that TRO would be amended in time to preclude the residents of the development applying for parking permits.

The matter then went to Member debate where the following points were raised:

- A Member spoke against this development due to highways safety for four reasons:- firstly that a loading bay should have been considered; secondly that unlike other properties along the High Street, this development would not have access to slip roads or nearby roads; thirdly due to concerns that emergency services vehicles would not be able to access block B and finally it was felt that there was a flaw in the report as the following paragraphs 108e, 113b, and 116d from NPPF referring to highway safety have not been considered. When considering NPPF holistically this development should be refused on the basis of highways safety.
- The front of the development is no waiting which means that no vehicles should stop there unless it is due to traffic. Waste and delivery vehicles would stop outside the development.

- The whole development could be redesigned to keep part of a bay at the front available for drop off to allow for deliveries and waste vehicles. This is a dangerous area with the bridge and approaching the traffic lights, without drop off area it is difficult to see how there would not be highway grounds for refusal.
- The NPPF paragraphs were considered as part of the application as they were listed as policies relevant to the application. The highways officer is GCC transport adviser and whilst members may disagree, the committee need to be guided by their advice.
- Fire issues are the responsibility of building regulations not a planning consideration.
- There was a need to maximise the use of finite sites in our town for much needed housing. This development is next to the cycle path, on a bus route and not far from the train station.
- This is a difficult site and there was a loss of amenity when Honeybourne Gate was built to Stoneville Street. There will be loss of view. However, that is not a planning consideration.
- The highways officer confirmed that paragraph 140b that safe and suitable access can be achieved was applied to all users.
- Not against development at this site although without a drop off point struggle to find development acceptable. The development will not be accessible to all as it will not be for waste vehicles and deliveries it is only accessible by foot.
- The Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance clarified that if Members are minded to refuse they need to consider what the impact would be of not having a drop off bay. In terms of policy it would be highways safety issue or the impact on the network issue due to additional congestion.
- The Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Compliance said that a deferral on the grounds of exploring compulsory purchase of neighbouring properties would be unreasonable and the committee need to assess the application before them.
- The legal officer clarified that compulsory purchase is a separate regime from planning and is not a material planning consideration.
- The highways officer said that the development could have a drop off area but that it wasn't considered necessary to make the development acceptable.

The matter then went to the vote on the officer recommendation to permit subject to unilateral undertaking:

For: 5

Against: 3

### **6b 24/00605/CONDIT Imperial Gardens, Cheltenham**

Councillor Oliver left the chamber and took no further part in the meeting.

Councillor Clark returned to the chamber.

Councillor Bamford was in attendance for item 6b.

The planning officer introduced the report as published.

There was one public speaker on the item, the applicant in support of the application.

Helen Mole, Head of Place Marketing and Inward Investment addressed the committee as the applicant and made the following points:

- The ice rink was given planning permission to operate over three years as long as generators were not used after year one. When the application was originally submitted it was anticipated that a fixed power supply would be in place by year two. This has not been possible for reasons as set out in the application and why it is necessary to vary the condition.
- When the initial condition was set it was based on diesel generators being used. What was achieved in 2023 was a significant improvement and has been declared industry leading for events of this nature.
- CBC had worked with a local company which provided a high capacity battery which when backed up the existing on site power provision meant that a generator was only required for between one and four hours per day. This was a huge reduction from the 2021 ice rink.
- The power provision for the ice rink was quiet, it only used 12.7% of the fuel that was used in 2021 and it generated 98.7% lower fuel emissions.
- She had worked closely with the climate change team at the council to ensure that the monitoring and measurement of the fuel consumption and emissions were carried out in line with established methodology and that the figures quoted have been verified.
- The ice rink only used sustainably sourced HVO instead of diesel and were stringent that the fuel was sourced ethically and sustainably which was verified through two schemes. Assurances had been received that the fuel only came from waste feed stocks and every fuel delivery received had a certificate to confirm this.
- The event manager had worked closely with residents and businesses that were likely to be impacted by any noise. No complaints received relating to noise. High spec noise reduction equipment which was over and above what was required by the noise assessment.
- The event formed an important part of Cheltenham Christmas offer to residents and visitors. According to the economic impact report visitor to the ice rink spent an estimated £1.6m in Cheltenham during the ice rink period of which £868k was additional. It represents a return on investment of around £11 per £1 invested by the council. For 83% of visitors to the ice rink it was their main reason for visiting Cheltenham. The economic impact of the 2023 ice rink was independently assessed by a professional agency with significant experience in tourism and events. They were selected following a procurement process and were instructed to provide an independent and unbiased assessment. Their feedback on the survey that was carried out was that the methods used in the evaluation are robust as are the estimates provided for the additional economic value.

The matter then went to Member questions, the responses were as follows:



- The only comment received about noise disturbance was regarding the removal of the equipment not the operation of it. This was acknowledged and resolved.
- If the electrical supply and the battery supply is not sufficient then the generator would kick in.

The matter then went to Member debate the move away from the use of a diesel generator was welcomed, however, disappointment was expressed that the national grid hadn't been upgraded to provide power for events.

The matter then went to the vote on the officer recommendation to permit:

For: Unanimous

### **6c 24/00407/CONDIT St Peters Playing Field**

The planning officer introduced the report as published.

There was one public speaker on the item, the ward member.

Councillor Willingham as ward member was asked to address the committee and made the following points:

- The bringing forward of the sports hub is important to help with the regeneration of that part of St Peters and the Moors. This is an area which is recognised by central government through the big local that has multiple deprivation.
- It is important for the community not just as a focal point for football but for other activities.
- The recommendation is to permit and is hopeful that the committee will do that.
- The officer report is still referring to incorrect legislation relating to the public sector equality duty. The legislation is the Equality Act 2010 not Equalities Act 2010.

There were no Member questions or debate.

The matter then went to the vote on the officer recommendation to permit:

For: Unanimous

### **6d 24/00642/CONDIT 320 Swindon Road**

The planning officer introduced the report as published.

There was one public speaker on the item, the agent on behalf of the applicant.

The agent of behalf of the applicant then addressed the committee and made the following points:

- The proposed development has been in the pipeline for a number of years, having originally obtained consent in November 2021.
- The scheme was developed through extensive community and officer engagement and received unanimous support from the committee at that time.
- Since obtaining planning permission in 2021, Cheltenham Borough Homes has successfully implemented planning permission which means it can be completed at any time.
- Unfortunately, due to significant increases in build costs in the past three years it has become clear that the development as approved has significant viability challenges. The design team have optimised build costs without undermining its quality. The scheme details have been reviewed and identified all opportunities for scheme optimisation have been explored.
- The changes proposed are relatively minor but cumulatively make a significant impact on anticipated build costs of the development. The proposed changes include - small amendments to the brickwork detailing, admitting bin stores to the rear of the houses, removing rear planters, placing block paving with tarmac in areas away from the public realm, reducing window sizes and amending the design of balconies to the proposed apartments.
- The proposed changes have been worked through with the planning officers to ensure they do not contradict relevant policies or have impacts deemed unacceptable.
- The scheme remains focused on achieving high levels of sustainability and the energy strategy for the development remains unchanged. The renewable energy strategy for the site includes a mix of air source heat pumps and ground source heat pumps and solar panels to reduce the carbon footprint of the development.
- The proposed development is on a vacant plot in a reasonably prominent site on the junction of Swindon Road it is critical that this is developed to provide high quality affordable housing.

The matter then went to Member questions, the responses were as follows:

- A landscaping plan for the development had already been agreed and will include trees and planting.
- From a planning perspective there is not a minimum standard area for a balcony or to even provide one as there is an outside space. The balconies will still provide some amenity to the residents that will have them. There are some regrettable losses although not to the extent that the scheme would be unacceptable.
- There is significant cost associated with a green or sedum roof due to the planting system required. There will still be a roof on the bike storage as policy requires it to be covered and secure; it will not have green or sedum on top of it.

The matter then went to Member debate where the following points were made:

- Disappointment was expressed to not have the original application. However, a sustainable development was better than none at all. The planters and the green roof could be retrospectively fitted.

The matter then went to the vote on the officer recommendation to permit:

For: Unanimous

## **6e 23/01691/REM Oakley Farm Priors Road**

Councillor Foster left the chamber.

The planning officer introduced the report as published.

There were three public speakers on this item, the agent on behalf of the applicant and two ward members.

The agent on behalf of the applicant addressed the committee and made the following points:

- Addressing the committee on behalf of the two applicants of the scheme and not the appellants.
- As set out in the officer report the process undertaken leading to the meeting today has been highly collaborative. The applicants have responded positively and constructively to the recommendations made by planning officers throughout the 15 months pre application and determination period. This included the requirement for a section 73 application to clarify the wording of a condition on the outline permission.
- Further evidence was provided to justify the proposed layout and access configuration and explanation was given as to why alternative engineering options that were tested and rejected during the design process are unsuitable.
- The proposed scheme is the result of thorough iterative design process that has taken place against the terms of an externally funded planning performance agreement between Vistry, Stonewater and the council.
- The site is unusual in that it lies within the Cotswold national landscape and yet has an acknowledged suburban context provided by existing development which surrounds the site on three sides.
- In granting outline permission the appeal inspector stated that the character of the site would permanently and fundamentally change becoming more typical of its suburban setting.
- Key factors informing the original decision and design process that followed include the inspectors finding that the scheme will deliver 250 new homes including 100 affordable dwellings.
- The highly challenging site topography requires a bespoke design and engineering solution that works harmoniously with the site. The processes described in the committee report demonstrate that these challenges have been addressed comprehensively and successfully.

- From June 2023 onwards, the design team, planning officers and the highways authority engaged via the Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) process in a series of structured monthly meetings that examined all aspects of the proposed design process. The statement of engagement submitted with the application explains the core PPA meetings, associated topic focus and stakeholder meetings that supported the engagement strategy. The engagement tracker that describes the iterative process and provides a summary of actions across 11 topic areas in response to questions, challenges and revisions sought by planning officers. The tracker identifies 160 design iterations undertaken to revise and improve the scheme over the 4 month period to submission.
- During the pre-application stage, the design team also met with the representatives of the parish council, local residents group and presented formally to the Gloucestershire design review panel and to members of the planning committee. Comments arising out of these meetings helped to inform the design process.
- Further PPA meeting was held in November following responses from consultees on the application, this identified a minor series of revisions and clarifications recommended by officers to improve the scheme to which the design team responded positively to.
- The Cotswold Conservation Board commended the proposals as high quality scheme that accords with the Cotswolds national landscape strategy and the national landscape management plan.
- The councils urban design consultant had been engaged to provide dedicated advice throughout the pre-app and post app stages concluded that the proposals constitute a significant increase in quality over the more recently permitted housing schemes in the area.

Councillor Day as ward member was then asked to address the committee and made the following points:

- The proposed plans fail the test that it will provide good quality housing for all and does not conflict with the councils environmental targets.
- The council and highways must follow the Equality Act 2010. Section 149 defines the Public Sector Equality Duty. Key points for new developments include advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity.
- Given the long sections of steep gradients being proposed it was expected that there would be a legal opinion on Equality Act compliance.
- Equality Act compliance appears to be an issue as building regulations say a wheelchair ramp can have maximum gradient of 1:15 for 5 metres and a maximum gradient of 1:12 for 2 metres. British standards explain that where a gradient is too steep or for too long, a wheelchair user or companion pushing the wheelchair may not have sufficient strength to use that slope. Control and braking are difficult on steep slopes. The proposed length of gradients of 1:15 and steeper are much longer than these distances and appear to be unsafe for wheelchair users. A more detailed explanation of how equality act compliance has been established is necessary to avoid exposure of the council to potential legal challenge.

- In addition the proposed extended lengths of steep gradients do not comply with the council's planning policies which require the prioritisation of sustainable transport methods to address the climate emergency declared by the council and its target of achieving net zero by 2030.
- Climate change supplementary planning document states that all proposed developments are expected to support shifts towards the sustainable transport hierarchy which puts walking and cycling at the top. This proposed development will force people to drive rather than walk or cycle.
- Prioritising sustainable transport is included in policy SD4 which includes that transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes. The proposed gradients of the site mean the only option will be for people to use their cars.
- The manual for Gloucestershire streets includes that new developments should give priority to pedestrians and cyclists and that sites which have poor relationship to amenities, services, education and employment by active travel modes are unlikely to receive a positive recommendation.
- Due to planning policy non-compliance and the S149 duty of the Equality Act means that this application should be refused.

Councillor Pemberton as ward member was then asked to address the committee and made the following points:

- Concerned by the implications of this development as they need to give due regard to the Equality Act 2010 and the councils commitment to net zero 2030.
- The location of the site is up a steep hill on a narrow road, Harp Hill. It would seem unlikely that people will walk or cycle to site due to the distance and gradients involved. This will push people to use their cars along with the topography of the site.
- The developers of the site assumed a household would have three cars each; for a development of 250 homes this would mean an extra 750 cars. This would contribute significantly to local pollution and have an impact on the net zero 2030 commitments as well as adding to traffic and congestion in the local area.
- There doesn't appear to be any provision for public transport and the nearest bus routes are down on Priors Road which is quite a distance from the development. There was therefore no evidence of attempting to meet sustainable transport requirements.
- The development will be environmentally damaging due to pollution and contravening equality requirements. People with limited mobility and young children will not be able to access the development except by car.
- Whilst the need for additional housing in Cheltenham was accepted, this was not the right location or development.

The matter then went to Member questions and the responses were as follows:

- The highways officer confirmed that the roads would be adopted even though they could be block paving. Roads carrying through traffic tend to perform less well with block paving. However, cul-de-sacs with block paving without heavy goods vehicles seem to last longer than asphalt. The planning officer explained that there is a condition for subsequent approval of hard surfacing materials used for roads and discussions will be ongoing.

- There is a condition which requires the submission and approval of details relating to the construction of retaining wall structures.
- There will be 32 social rent properties, 38 affordable rent and 30 shared ownership properties.
- Provisions for wheelchair users include two fully wheelchair accessible properties in the north east corner. There are approximately 80 affordable units which are level access. The wheelchair accessible properties are affordable units.

The matter then went to Member debate where the following points were raised:

- The applicant was complemented on their engagement with planning officers and members over the course of the application.
- The development addresses climate emergency with water butts, permeable drives, no gas, solar panels and air source heat pumps. The provision of footpaths and the accessibility to cycleway and to the bottom footpath was welcomed.
- A Member felt that this was an excellent scheme which will deliver 100 affordable homes. The development is on a slope and therefore inevitable to have gradients on it. Equality issues have been addressed by officers.
- The biodiversity net gain and the landscaping of the site was welcomed.
- It will provide significant housing for the town as we do not have 5 year housing supply. No development is without its issues and most have been mitigated.
- Disappointment was expressed that the proposal was only have 32% social out of affordable housing.

The matter then went to the vote on the officer recommendation to permit:

For: Unanimous

## **7 Appeal Update**

These were noted for information.

## **8 Any other items the Chairman determines urgent and requires a decision**

There were none.