

Notes of the meeting scheduled for 16th June 2021, the scheduled meeting was not quorate, the comments below were collated and submitted to Gloucester City Council through the planning portal.

ALL OTHER BUSINESS IS SUSPENDED AT THIS TIME.

1.	Applications for Determination Received Prior to the Meeting		
	No objection to the following applications:		
	P/017 21/00595/FUL	4 Littlefield	Garage conversion & rear extension
	P/018 21/00668/FUL	4 Pegasus Gardens	Two storey extension to side
	P/019 21/00589/FUL	15 Blackthorn Gardens	Single Storey extension to dwelling
	P/021 20/01077/FUL	Athena House Olympus Park	Proposal for 2 new storage units on the existing courtyard area to allow for a more permanent form of storage.
	P/025 21/00641/FUL	1 Nene Close	Single storey rear extension & part garage conversion
	Wish to object the following application for the reasons provided below		
	P/020 21/00627/OUT	32 Curtis Hayward Drive	Resubmission of outline application for the erection of a single dwelling on land adjoining an existing residential property.
	<p>The track to the existing property is currently owned by Gloucester City Council, Quedgeley Council understands a request has been made, by the owners, to purchase this land, if this is approved a permanent right of way to the LNR and the parking area MUST be included. The path should not be fenced or in any way restrict access to pedestrians, cyclists or vehicles, including maintenance vehicles.</p> <p>The parking area and track must not be allowed to be encompassed into the boundary of the proposed or existing properties.</p> <p>Believe the construction of two properties is an overdevelopment of the site (see also 21/00626/OUT), the proposal will offer a poor level of amenity space and is therefore contrary to policies SD4, SD10 & SD14 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy and the provisions of the NPPF</p>		
	P/022 18/00852/FUL	Kingsway Local Centre Thatcham Avenue	Assisted living / care facility (Use Class C3), comprising of 22 no units & associated works, including car and cycle parking & landscaping.
<p>Gloucester City Council agreed to extend the consultation period on this application to allow for further comments from neighbours to be received. In view of this, the application will be presented to members again at the July meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The original plan for this site was a licenced restaurant or small food outlet units with a large part reserved for parking to complement the existing units on the site 			

and to help alleviate the on-going parking problems in the area. If this application is approved, the extra parking will be lost.

- The parking facilities offered as part of the application will not meet the demands of the care home.
- The traffic plan states there is a 20mph speed limit in place, this is inaccurate, and the figures used are out of date.
- Construction of a church opposite the site will also add to the parking chaos and believe the forecast in the traffic plan is pessimistic at best.
- The traffic report does not represent the on-going issues and the only acceptable application for this site is a much smaller development offering additional parking.
- This is the wrong development in the wrong place.
- The proposal is out of scale, the nearby school and community centre were required to be 'low rise', and this should be adopted for this application also. The roof height should be no higher than the school and or community centre.
- Restrictions should be placed on the type of individual that can be housed at this facility due to the nature of the location, schools, community centres, nurseries etc all in the vicinity.
- The site lies within busy community facilities, it suffers from anti social behaviour and the PCSO team are often called to the site during the evening. There are schools, nurseries, a community centre, a church and a pub together with a collection of retail units all within a few metres of the proposed site, the health and welfare of the residents will be compromised.
- Policy SD4 of the JCS requires new developments to respond positively to and respect the character of the site and its surroundings, enhancing local distinctiveness and addressing the urban structure and grain of the locality in terms of street pattern, layout, mass and form. The two-storey element and large square design does not address these issues. In addition, there is the grade 2 listed building and ancient monument less than 150m from the development site.
- The site appears to be an increase in the density of development. This has not been allowed for in the flood alleviation design for Kingsway, and it is proposed to use existing off site flood alleviation measures - these have been designed to accommodate development elsewhere, and do not include this proposal.
- There should be no increase in run-off from the site over and above the green field state for all rainfall events of up to 1 in 100yr frequency.
- Attenuation on site should provide balancing for all rainfall events up to 1 in 100yr frequency plus 40% of the predicted volume required.
- Flood alleviation modelling to predict flows as a greenfield site and after completed development, should include rainfall events calculated at 15min, 30min, 60min, 90min, 120min, 360min and 480min duration at 1 in 1yr, 1 in 5yr, 1 in 10yr, 1 in 20yr, 1 in 30yr and 1 in 100yr frequency.
- The maximum flow discharge velocity should be attenuated to be no greater than the green field velocity for all rainfall events.
- The maximum flow volume per quarter hour should be attenuated on site to reduce the discharge volume to the green field state.
- The volume of balancing on site should be sufficient to attenuate all rainfall events up to 1 in 100yr frequency, plus 40% by maximum volume.
- The flood alleviation measures should be 'self-cleansing' and requirements for maintenance must be detailed in the proposals.
- The cost of maintenance should be included in S106 / CIL calculations.
- A contribution towards community facilities should be agreed through CIL/S106.

The proposal is therefore contrary to the policies within the JCS and should be refused.

P/023
21/00490/OUT

Land North of Rudloe
Drive

Residential development (upto 150
dwellings), associated infrastructure,

		ancillary facilities, open space & landscaping.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications numbers S.18/1947/OUT 160 dwellings, S.17/1446/FUL 118 dwellings, 17/01199/OUT 80 dwellings 18/01228/OUT 97 dwellings will add the inability of the infrastructure to cope. Consideration must be given, as per policy INF6 of the Joint Core Strategy, to negotiate a CIL/S106 contribution to mitigate the on-going issues faced by residents. The roundabout at the junction with Rudloe Drive, Naas Lane, New Haven Road and Telford Way, at peak times, is backing up into the Kingsway estate. The M5 junction 12 continues to be problematic. • Seek an S106/CIL for the improvements required at Waterwells Sports Centre and Kingsway Sports Pavilion as per INF7 of the JCS • School places, it is difficult to support the claim by the applicant in relation to school places, the SPS clearly identifies the need and is the document supported and adopted by the education authority. Planning application 21/00317/REM has negotiated a payment of £1.5m towards education the criteria should not be changed for this application. • Provision to upgrade the local park run route and seek the provision of informal play equipment. In accordance with NPPF item 8 para 91 & 92 • There is a large area of open space within the boundary of the proposed development, this should be safeguarded in accordance with policies SD4 and INF4 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewksbury JCS • This site was original set aside for commercial purposes and therefore S.106 contributions must be recalculated to reflect the increase in residential properties.
P/024 21/00626/OUT	32 Curtis Hayward Drive	Resubmission of outline application for the erection of a single dwelling on land adjoining an existing residential property.
		<p>The track to the existing property is currently owned by Gloucester City Council. Quedgeley Council understands a request has been made, by the owners, to purchase this land, if this is approved a permanent right of way to the LNR and the parking area MUST be included. The path should not be fenced or in any way restrict access to pedestrians, cyclists or vehicles, including maintenance vehicles.</p> <p>The parking area and track must not be allowed to be encompassed into the boundary of the proposed or existing properties.</p> <p>Believe the construction of two properties is an overdevelopment of the site (see also 21/00627/OUT), the proposal will offer a poor level of amenity space and is therefore contrary to policies SD4, SD10 & SD14 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham & Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy and the provisions of the NPPF</p>

Additional notifications were received as follows; comments were not invited from Quedgeley Town Council.

Severn Vale

Application Number 21/00573/LAW

Address: 32 Waterside Close Quedgeley Gloucester GL2 4LF

Proposal: Alterations to existing front porch/hallway, indoor storage area, outdoor storage area and roof overhang into one area. Access to property to be moved from left hand side to right hand side of front porch/hallway.

Application Number 21/00667/LAW
Address: 40 Sims Lane Quedgeley Gloucester GL2 3NJ
Proposal: Proposed Garage and Home Office

Kingsway

Application Number 21/00609/PREAPP
Address 21 Leeming Walk
Proposal Reduce parking on property to 1 parking space, erect fence over to neighbours garage (non-contact) use new space to erect a 10ft x 10ft x 2.45m shed move gate to garden to behind lamppost in communal access area

Application Number 21/00651/PREAPP
Address 25 Marham Drive
Proposal To adapt garage (which is attached to main house and flush to lounge) into additional household reception room.

Quedgeley Fieldcourt

Application Number 21/00598/PREAPP
Address 275a Bristol Road
Proposal single storey rear extension to form new lounge.

Application Number 21/00656/NMA
Address: Rudloe Drive Kingsway Quedgeley Gloucester
Proposal: Non material amendment to planning application reference: 20/00359/REM for the substitution of fencing in replacement of screen walls to properties numbered 33, 25/26, 40 - 41, 44, 15/48, 14/51, and 75.