**Planning Committee**

 **Tuesday 27 September 2022**

 **10.30am - 12.30pm**

 **Council Chamber**

 **Minutes**

**Present: Cllrs M Cox; S Cox; M Beard; P Kyne & C Elsmore**

1. **Apologies received from Administrative Assistant Laura Jayne**

 **Chris Haine, Clerk, took minutes**

1. **There were no declarations of interest**
2. **There were no dispensation requests**
3. **The minutes of 16 August Planning were proposed and unanimously agreed**

**Cllr M Cox signed a copy of the minutes**

1. **Matters arising from the minutes of 16 August 2022**

**Item 9 b. Re: 5-Acres Development**

 Cllr. M Cox updated following recent meetings, as follows:

* **Swimming Pool** site now allowed for if funding found later, on the latest Plan.
* **Bike Hub** location changed to preferred location
* **Pavilion**, not varied and location confirmed
* **G4 rugby pitch** stayed as before
* **Partnership Agreement:** consultation report by GRCC should NOW be on FoDDC website. Clerk to check dates for meeting with Wendy Jackson, FoDDC, as partners need to consider further before it is progressed through FoDDC Planning stage

**Item 9. c. Re: Cycle/ Footpaths** Updates re Active Travel Strategy, with further delays due to change of FoDDC personnel, and thus implications regarding opportunities for funding via developers with Section 106 monies. Cllr. M Cox further explained Section 106 procedures, conditions and allocation. CTC have submitted Atkins report etc to SW, which has been forwarded on, but unlikely that GCC would ask for such monies directly (eg Ellwood Rd, see below).

**Item. 9. E. Re: Ellwood Road**

Cllr. M Cox summarised,

**Recommendation**: it was proposed, and unanimously agreed, that Sarah Williams should be put in touch with Nathan Choat, GCC Highways to discuss further re the use of the road to connect with the end of the existing cycle way as their perspectives disagreed re that stretch. (That would affect the decision to progress or not the off road route with Forestry England)

SW wanted to be updated re the Independent Assessor decision re the viability report. concerns also raised regarding costs. It was proposed, and unanimously agreed, that this matter needed to be referred back to Marketing & Regeneration Committee, for further consideration, and/or recommendations..

1. **Comments from the Public Forum:** no Members of the Public were present.
2. **The following applications were considered:**

 **Cllr. M Cox proposed, and it was unanimously agreed, that feedback should be made to FoDDC regarding the poor quality of submitted plans, the orientation within drawings obscuring the relation to roads, and their overall accuracy/completeness.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Address** | **Proposal** | **Due by** |
| **P1111/22/FUL** | **Foxes Moon Palmers Flat Coalway Coleford GL16 7HT** | Erection of single storey rear extension | 29 Sept 22 |
| **No objection, subject to the following:** mitigation to be put in place if overlooking occurs from proposed kitchen window toward Primrose Cottage, and also insufficient distance from boundary.  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P1103/22/FUL** | **The Royal Forest Factory Rock Lane Coleford GL16 8JB** | Erection of two number C02 Tanks adjacent to the existing | 29 Sept 22 |
| **No objection:** although height of tanks is noted as a metre higher than surrounding tanks |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P1100/22/FUL** | **27 Edenwall Road Milkwall GL16 7LA** | Erection of a two storey extension and garage with associated works | 29 Sept 22 |
| **No objection subject to the following:** mitigation required re easy access to rear garden, given nearness of extension to boundary. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P1209/22/FUL** | **1A Poolway Road Broadwell Coleford GL16 7BE** | Erection of single storey rear extension, removal of small utility room | 29 Sept 22 |
| **No objection** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P1105/22/FUL** | **Poolway Farm Gloucester Road Coleford GL16 7QA** | Proposed development of 90 dwellings with associated access, roads, footways, parking, drainage, open space and landscaping, retention of Poolway Farmhouse and demolition of associated redundant ancillary buildings. | 29 Sept 22 |
| **Objection particularly on access and water, noting also parking, environment, sufficient affordable housing (Note: To be considered further at CTC Full Council, Tues, 27 Sept. 22)** Whilst most of this site was allocated for housing through the FoDDC Local Plan, with which the NDP had to be in general conformity. Following further application, a total of 140 was allocated and the defined settlement boundary drawn. The two “spikes” which reach north are outside that, in the Green Ring around Coleford (CNE2) and thus should not be developed. However, **as long as the biodiversity is conditioned to be enhanced and there is no housing constructed**, “within Green Ring Zones 1-3 proposals that would consolidate or enhance outdoor recreational facilities and to assist in the delivery of biodiversity objectives will be supported.” Without conditioned enhancement of biodiversity, then the two Green Ring areas should not be included**Access:** great concern is raised re the roundabout at the bottom of Bakers Hill.Traffic from Mile End will approach round a blind bend, down the steep hill at 40 mph. There is a high risk of collisions given the large number of HGVs, who will not have sufficient braking distance, Very careful planning of the design with full details of how the traffic will flow safely and effectively need to be seen and agreed. Traffic from Poolway Place must be able to turn right into town.The traffic numbers given are disputed, as sample CTC figures show below. More data is being collected. Furthermore:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| At traffic lights Glos Rd | Out of Gloucester Rd  | Into Gloucester Rd |
| **Thurs 27/01/22** | **Total** | **HGV** | **LGV** | **bus** | **Total**  | **HGV** | **LGV** | **bus** |
| 07.00-07.59 | 218 | 10 | 40 | 1 | 141 | 9 | 34 | 3 |
| 08.00-08.59 | 299 | 15 | 45 | 2 | 227 | 11 | 45 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Fri 26/8/22** | **Total** | **HGV** | **LGV** | **bus** | **Total**  | **HGV** | **LGV** | **bus** |
| 14.00-14.45 | 132 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 109 | 5 | 14 | 0 |
| 15.00-15.45 | 169 | 12 | 30 | 0 | 181 | 7 | 21 | 0 |

* There are NO bus services along Gloucester Road at all now, so traffic generated here will be higher than is implied
* HGV numbers are much higher (NB 26/8/22 figs are for 45 mins, & the turning at Glos Rd/ Lords Hill is the designated lorry route, including for the Suntory lorries).
* Total vehicle numbers are higher than stated.

Concerns are raised about the positions and acceptability of the rerouting of the PROWs (becoming pavements?) and this requires the approval of the PROW officer in his detailed response.**Housing:** 20/90 dwellings are noted as affordable. This is not the 40% required by FoDDC. Poolway farmhouse is being retained as of non- designated heritage value, but it has no plan - it appears not to be updated/adapted for use. Will this be made ready for occupation? If not, then who will maintain it?Block A’s height and design is concerning, and its position. Given the opportunities with the orientation of the housing, there should be more useful inclusion of solar panels to increase renewable energy. The importance of renewable energy initiatives has been recognised in terms of increased sustainability, and given changes with Design Code.A number of roads do not appear to be adoptable, and if this is the case, then lighting/ cleansing/ refuse etc must be assured in the management contract.**Water:** There is currently work going on with GCC Flood Authority around modelling the water flow, and especially combined sewer infrastructure in the Parish, to assess the impact on flooding, mitigate against it, and attenuate upstream to relieve pressure at times of extreme rainfall at certain sites, including in the town centre. This is critical to offset the impact of increasing development around the defined settlement and maintain the efficiency of the water infrastructure in and around the bowl of Coleford. There is a need for SUDs given the scale and position of this housing re Thurstan’s Brook, and much scope for attenuation. GCC Flood Authority require conditions, and emphasise no surface water to go into the **combined** sewer. With regard to the comment from Welsh Water re sewage, we emphasise that this same combined sewer will take the sewage from half of the 203 Forest Grove development, when Dwr Cymru required this be split due to capacity (with the sewer down Sunnybank). There is also a current application at North Road for 35 out of a potential 65 houses which will also use this same combined sewer. Whilst Welsh Water now say there is sufficient capacity in the network for this scheme, we would like them to check further and report back on their current data compared to expected flow, given the cumulative effect of all these developments relating to this particular combined sewer. The **cumulative** potential for hydraulic overload is higher risk given that the whole network links up in the historic centre of the Town (Conservation Area). The topography of the town and increased building on this side of the bowl has increased flow of the foul and surface water into the focus in the Market Place, and into Newland St. Severn Trent say this is not their area for surface water, but they, Dwr Cymru and GCC Flood Authority all need to be satisfied that mitigation requirements will have zero flooding effect. This is especially true as a further application is expected on this site.**Parking**: the required number of parking spaces for the housing described should be 124, not 90 as stated, given that plans show 34 houses have at least 4 bedrooms (ie need 2 spaces per dwelling).**Environment**: the landscape setting of Coleford, and especially its key views (Map 15 CNDP) will be compromised by the development, and this must be mitigated by improving the green infrastructure (NB CNE2, CNE3).With climate change, there is a greater need for shade provided by native mature trees, which would also be effective in water infiltration/ masking . The proposed cover is mainly herbaceous. This wildlife corridor must be protected, and we await the sustainability report especially regarding bat requirements (noting especially the relevant barn proposed for demolition) and wildflower/bog plants. Boundary hedges are noted, but hedging could also replace fences and better the hedgehog provision (no fencing details evident here). There does not appear to be complete 1 year round surveys for bats nor full information re newts.The Local Green Space on the corner of Poolway and Glos Rd must be respected (CC3). (CTC has already asked enforcement to address the work done there by others.) Where exactly is the relocated PRS unit going?SUDs ponds must ensure there is no negative effect on dwellings here and downstream (CITPA4) and the position of the LEAP should be checked, given local experience on Thurstan’s Rise, where the original position did not allow it to be used.As this area has undergone mining in the past, the Coal Authority response is required, both for opencast works on site and for historical workings underground, where the pithead was on the corner of Gloucester Road and Poolway Rd to Broadwell.NB this field was used for burning of animals in the Foot and Mouth epidemic, so toxicity should be checked. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P1076/22/FUL** | **Perouges , 31 Newland Street, Coleford, Gloucestershire** | Erection of a single storey rear extension to include alteration to existing terrace levels to rear garden and new retaining wall. New entrance canopy and levelling of front entrance door. | 5 Oct 22 |
| **Objection: flood risk**Reference to EA zone 3 **High** risk zone (not medium); CNDP CITP4 Policy and need for zero flood impact**.**The reorganisation of the land to the rear, the steepness of the bank, and the potential for flooding the property and increasing flow of surface water from the Council offices toward Newland St , thus increasing risk for other properties is of great concern**.** The flood risk assessment refers to lack of reports, but from local knowledge the extreme rainfall and runoff is highly significant in this area, which is the lowest point in the bowl leading to the Wye, draining a very large and built-up area. Further investigation and comment on flood risk from officers is vital. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P1254/22/FUL** | **26 Speedwell, Mile End, Gloucestershire, GL16 7NJ.** | Proposed conversion and extension to existing garage into a annexe | 6 Oct 22 |
| **Objection re: insufficient parking** As the garage parking space is removed, the whole property would require min 2 parking spaces (assumed then to be 4 bedroomed) which is not present. Further information on the number of bedrooms in the house is required (floor plans) and the conditions re annexe must be applied to prevent this ever becoming a separate dwelling**.** |

1. **Recent planning decisions**

Cllr. M Cox raised concerns re: P0069/22/DISCON [**Discharge of Conditions 10 (designed and constructed) and 11(noise survey) relating to:**](https://publicaccess.fdean.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=RE8Q6HHII5300&activeTab=summary) **Former 59 (Sononco Industrial Packaging) Tufthorn Avenue Coleford**. Town Clerk to raise with FoDDC Planning (Tony Pope) as it appears a refusal and approval notice have been issued re Condition 10 (noise – which should be 11) and no decision refers to condition 10 (construction etc).

1. **Update on tracker and consideration of specific actions/recommendations:**

Cllr. M Cox deferred full consideration of tracker to next meeting, though some updated and referenced elsewhere.

**Note: It was proposed, and unanimously agreed, to take Committee into ‘ Committee’**

**12.25 It was proposed, and unanimously agreed to extend the meeting by 15 mins.**

Cllr. M Cox reported that a Pre-Application enquiry had been received by the Office, and it was proposed, and unanimously agreed for her to initially speak further on site, with enquirer with no prejudice. Town Clerk to arrange.

**Note: It was proposed, and unanimously agreed to take Committee out of ‘Committee’**

 **12.40pm It was proposed and unanimously agreed to extend the meeting to 1.00pm**

1. **Draft Local Plan consultation response for Full Council 27 Sept 22**

Discussion around initial draft ensued and amendments made: prepared for Full Council meeting that evening: Tuesday, 27 September 2022. MC to speak to document.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **P0063/22/DISCON** | Land Opposite 40 Sparrow Hill Coleford Gloucestershire | Discharge of condition 05 (remediation works and mitigation measures) and 06 (site investigations) P2104/20/FUL |
| A further response is needed from Coal Authority following additional information. |