

**Minutes of the Planning and Development Committee held on Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> March 2019 at Quedgeley Community Centre at 7.30pm**

**PRESENT** Cllr Powell, Cllr Potts, Cllr Wilcox, Cllr Hughes, Cllr Williams, Cllr Harries

<b>PD.082/18-19</b>	<b>Apologies</b> Apologies were noted from Cllr Lee	
<b>PD.083/18-19</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest</b> None received	
<b>PD.084/18-19</b>	<b>To Adopt the Minutes dated 20<sup>th</sup> February 2019</b> Cllr Hughes <b>PROPOSED</b> to adopt the above Minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting. Seconded                      Cllr Potts                      Vote                      Unanimous <b>So resolved</b>	
<b>PD.085/18-19</b>	<b>Applications for Determination Received Prior to the Meeting</b> <b>No objection raised to the following:</b>	
	P/076 19/00042/FUL	6 Gosswood Corner Single storey extension to rear and porch to front of property
	P/077 19/00181/FUL	36 Southrop Road Proposed two storey extension with alterations.
	P/080 19/00199/FUL	St James' Dental Practice St James Close Construction of a two-storey linked extension to an existing dental practice.
	<b>No objection in principle but would like to make the following relevant comments:</b>	
	P/079 19/00178/FUL	10 Hillcot Close Two storey rear extension. Extension of covered portion of front porch.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned the planned extension of the porch will displace parking to the highway and create highway safety issues and is therefore contrary to SD4 of the Joint Core Strategy and paragraph 9 of the NPPF. Wish to see further consultation to agree a plan to reduce the risk.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Object to the proposal for the following reasons:</b>	
	P/078 19/00026/FUL	63 Coltishall Close Single storey rear extension
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale of the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and does not respect the scale or density of the surrounding area. The garden will be reduced to an unacceptable level and will therefore restrict the amenities currently enjoyed by those residents, it will not provide an attractive and comfortable place to live and is therefore contrary to SD4 of the JCS and paragraph 4 of the NPPF.</li> </ul>	
	P/081 19/00149/OUT	29 Bristol Road Outline planning application with matters reserved apart from access and layout to include the demolition of existing house and outbuildings and construction of 6 new dwellings, formation of revised vehicular access.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current access and egress arrangements on to Bristol Road are dangerous, the proposals, on a bend and by a bus stop will restrict the view.</li> <li>The recommended extension of the central reservation will impede the egress for vehicle users in Sims Lane.</li> <li>An improved and safer plan would be to re design the site layout and direct all</li> </ul>	

	vehicular movements to the rear of the site onto Olympus Park	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The application is therefore contrary to SD4 of the Joint Core Strategy and paragraph 9 of the NPPF and should be refused until a safer traffic plan is submitted.</li> </ul>	
P/082 18/01286/FUL	The coach House (Plot 12) St James Close	Demolition of existing dilapidated Coach House and construction of a new dwelling.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building has good heritage value and is worthy of protecting. The Justification Statement, section 7 Economic Value, simply refers to the loss of refurbishing the Coach House but the original application was for, 'Erection of 11 bungalows and the refurbishment of the Coach House' therefore the whole site would already have returned considerable profit and is therefore not a reason for approval.</li> <li>Furthermore, the Coach House was originally considered a listed building, the developer would have been aware of this and refurbishment costs allowed for.</li> <li>Both national and local policy guidance set out the framework for considering applications, paragraph 16 of the NPPF pt 185 refers to a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. Local planning authorities should take account of the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Therefore, this application is contrary to both the NPPF and SD8 of the JCS for Gloucester City Council and should be refused.</li> </ul>	
P/083 18/00423/FUL	Gloucestershire MS Therapy Centre Goodridge Avenue	Demolition of existing building and erection of new B1(c), B8 Building divided into two units with ancillary access, parking and associated works.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed building should be moved away from the residential properties in Woolstrop Way by the distance of the height of the building to protect the amenities of these properties. The current proposal does not respect the character of the adjacent properties and does not fit with the overall layout, mass and form of the surrounding area.</li> <li>Provide mature native evergreen trees to protect the amenities of the occupants of Woolstrop Way</li> <li>The proposal is therefore contrary to SD4 of the JCS and paragraph 12 of the NPPF</li> </ul>	
<b>PD.086/18-19</b>	<b>Correspondence.</b>	
	a) Local resident, objections raised in relation to proposed development of up to 97 dwellings in Naas Lane. Reference 18/01228/OUT. Members discussed the concerns raised and agreed to support in principle but were mindful the ownership of land may be a civil matter.	
<b>PD.087/18-19</b>	<b>Business for Referral</b>	
	None received	
<b>PD.088/18-19</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting:</b> 17 <sup>th</sup> April 2019 - noted	

Meeting concluded: 20.45 hrs