

Coleford Town Council

Planning Committee
Tuesday, 8 February 22
10.30 - 12.30pm
Council Chamber
Minutes

Attendees: Cllrs. M Cox, S Cox, Elsmore, Drury & Kyne Cllr. Beard joined the meeting at 11.05am

- **1.** There were no apologies
- 2. There were no declarations of interest regarding items on the agenda
- **3.** There were no new dispensation requests
- 4. The minutes of the Planning Committee of 3 February were unanimously agreed

Cllr. M Cox signed a copy of the minutes as a true record

- 5. There were no matters arising, from the minutes of 3 February 22, other than those being taken under Items on this Agenda
- **6.** There were no members of the public present

7. To consider the following applications:

| Reference | Address | Proposal |
|--------------|---|--|
| P1911/21/FUL | 41 North Road Broadwell Coleford Gloucestershire GL16 7BX | Erection of a two-storey residential dwelling with associated works. Demolition of garage, creation of off road parking and dropped kerb access. |

OBJECTION: based on specifics below.

- Car Parking: We support GCC Highways comments in that there are insufficient parking spaces for the proposed property (should be two minimum) and there will be no parking spaces or vehicular access for the existing property. We would suggest vehicular access is reconsidered, via The Long Drive, to minimise the number of access points on this busy road. The presence of the bus stop and shelter adjacent to the site works against multiple access points. We also note a pending application for the site allocated at North Rd for 70 dwellings, just up the main road, which would mean another significant increase in traffic movements.
- Size and shape of the property on the plot: The shape, and size of the property is disproportionate to the width and frontage of the plot: it appears very tight to the boundaries, and no measurements have been given from building to edge of plot.
- Character: whilst there is a variety of types/designs of property here, the common and distinctive feature is the existence of the front stone garden wall, which should be retained (excepting the gap for vehicular entrance).see Appendix A CNDP
- Water Issues: We need to see Dwr Cymru comments re foul water: as Severn Trent have said, it is not their responsibility.

| mare early the met alon responsibility. | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| P1973/21/FUL | Owen Farm Staunton Road | Demolition of pig cot and erection of holiday let. |
| | Coleford Gloucestershire | Demolition of barn and revisions to site layout, |
| | GL16 8QR | parking arrangements and landscaping to that |
| | | approved under applications P1937/19/FUL, |
| | | P0098/18/FUL and P1176/19/FUL |

There is unclear and insufficient information, to make a full decision, as clarification re points below is required. We will respond accordingly.



Coleford Town Council

- Location of Barn D: Assuming this is as shown on 2022/2, (see also yellow notes, when hovering) the location of Barn D is outside the main site, on the crossing point of the popular PROW, where the rest of the holiday-let traffic enters/exits and where the farmhouse access and the route to the rear for agricultural vehicles converge. Condition 8 of the original permission requires 3 inter-visibility passing places along the drive to the main road. This condition will need to be revisited if the parking for proposed barn D dwelling subsumes any passing place. This is relevant to the comments made by GCC PROW officer, noting especially part 2c.
- Materials: The intention is stated as replacement of timber building Barn D with new timber building, but Barn D is not timber. It is of Forest stone construction, and this should be retained.
- No stated reasoning/justification for the demolition of the Pig Cot is presented. Without explanation we can only object to its demolition.

| P0040/22/FUL | Rosedene Bungalow | Erection of a detached annexe accommodation |
|--------------|--------------------------|---|
| | Parkend Walk, Coalway | ancillary to the main dwelling |
| | Gloucestershire GL16 7JS | |

Objection:

- Parking / Access: There is no specific parking allocated adjacent to the Annexe: some
 provision is the other side of Rosedene Bungalow, but no more than has been applied
 for previously without this Annexe. This suggests parking is insufficient/ in inappropriate
 location.
- Scale and position of proposed Annexe is inappropriate: The building would be on top of the Northern Boundary of the plot at the rear, with no space to allow for maintenance.
- **Height of Ridge:** This not shown for the Annexe, and we note electrical cables are evident in that location from an existing pole in the adjacent boundary hedge.
- **Boundary Hedging:** This needs to be maintained in character with this semi-rural area, where boar roam.

Should this application be given consent, there must be a condition that the Annexe is exactly that i.e. it relates to and cannot be separated from the existing dwelling.

8. To note recent planning decisions

Decisions were noted

9. To update and review tracker with actions/responses, as attached, including actions from 25 January 2022

Cllr. M Cox updated on a number of issues, as follows:

Lidl:

- Planting completed, and noted
- Litter issues on North-East Boundary, and Town Clerk to write to Lidl re: litter on their
 property especially on lower level beyond the walkway, to the rear of the Marshes (still
 in Lidl ownership).

Licensing: Cllr. M Cox has sought clarification from Wendy Jackson, FoDDC re: use of parking bays on St. John's Street, now that widening pavements legislation has ceased. WJ reports back that further consultation re this finishes Friday and Government will consider evidence, with possible report back late year.



Coleford Town Council

Water: Town Clerk to contact Joe Baker/Peter Siret for update re: Thurstan's Rise stage of infrastructure alteration and system adjustment; then Gloucester Road timing if got to that stage. Clerk to inform Newland PC that we are still in contact with Flood Authority.

NPPF: To be covered in training

See revised tracker (sent as separate spreadsheet)

10. To consider CNDP Review

Cllr. M Cox updated following the last meeting, and contact with Nigel Gibbons. It was likely that a Local Action Plan Full Consultation would be scheduled for spring 22. The District Council working party still have at least two meetings before making report to FoDDC. It was proposed, and unanimously agreed for Nigel Gibbons to be taken up on his offer to attend a meeting re: emerging Local Plan with CTC Planning Committee, and other CTC Members to be invited, at 5.45pm, Council Chambers, 29 March 22 (before Full Council)

Questions to consider for that meeting to be discussed under a specific agenda item at next Planning Committee meeting.

11. To consider Planning Enforcement, FoDDC document and specific queries.

Cllr. M Cox introduced the FoDDC Enforcement Policy document as circulated, and, after further discussion, it was proposed, and unanimously agreed, that the Clerk should write to FoDDC, seeking clarification on any final end date, once all stages have been entered into. '; Clerk to also seek data re: activity regarding enforcement, success rates, and backlogs.

Cllr. M Cox also reported on a 'noise' related enquiry, regarding Tufthorn Avenue development, following a concern from local business and, after some discussion, the Clerk was asked to write to FoDDC to seek clarification regarding the construction of the Acoustic Fence (P0812/21/FUL). Also to check whether the 'Pre-Occupation Validation Noise Survey' had been carried out (Condition 10)

It was proposed, and unanimously agreed to take this meeting into 'Committee' In Committee

12. To consider pre-application progress

Cllr. M Cox updated re correspondence relating to Application ref. P2100/21/FUL: Land at Ellwood Road Milkwall. The Clerk confirmed that the Developers had been informed of the Town Council's comments, submitted to FoDDC.

Cllr. M Cox also reported that the Developers had asked whether we wanted a meeting with them, now that the Application had been submitted. It was agreed that a meeting wasn't seen as necessary; unless the Developers wanted to meet. The Clerk was asked to inform the Developers accordingly.

Meeting closed: 12.07pm