

TO EACH MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 March 2023

Dear Councillor

PLANNING COMMITTEE- TUESDAY 21 MARCH 2023

Further to the Agenda and papers for the above meeting, previously circulated, please find attached the Additional Representations Sheet.

Should you have any queries regarding the above please contact Democratic Services on Tel: 01684 272021

Yours sincerely

Head of Democratic Services



Agenda Item 5

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS SHEET

Date: 21 March 2023

The following is a list of the additional representations received since the Planning Committee Agenda was published and includes background papers received up to and including the Monday before the meeting. A general indication of the content is given but it may be necessary to elaborate at the meeting.

ltem No	
5a	22/00251/APP
	Phases 4 And 6, Land At Perrybrook, North Brockworth
	Late Representations
	Since the preparation of the Committee report, an additional letter of objection has been received. The details of this letter are summarised below:
	"I wish to make the following further comments on and objections to the proposals for the development of Perrybrook North stages 4 & 6 .
	1) Can we have an assurance that work will not commence to this phase of the development until the new roundabout on Valliant Way is completed? Otherwise construction traffic will cause a great deal of nuisance to current residents of Brockworth.
	2) I wish to object to the close proximity of the gable ends of houses on the proposed development (plot numbers 353-368) to several existing houses in Maple Drive. These new houses will cast the gardens in Maple Drive into shadow and create severe loss of light and amenity.
	3) With reference to the attenuation basin in the landscaped area running north-south in south west part of the site, how will this be drained and maintained? A muddy dip full of weeds will look most unsightly.
	4) I wish to object to the fact that the so-called Re-inforced Landscape Edge between the new development and the existing houses in Ermin Park and Maple Drive has got so thin as to be completely ineffective. In places it consists only of a path and minute patch of soil scarcely wide to plant anything in. Why is the path intermittent, when this is currently a route regularly used by walkers? In particular I object to the very narrow planting beds at the back of my neighbour's house, 34 Westfield Road. How will access be provided to such a narrow area, to maintain it and so prevent it filling up with brambles, nettles and unwanted nuisance tree species such as ash and sycamore?
	5) What are Tewkesbury Borough's proposals for a pedestrian link between the new development and Westfield Avenue/Prince Albert Court, across the existing rough patch of grass (not owned by the current developer)? Who owns this patch of grass?
	6) A point of detail: I welcome the bulb plantings shown, but as a garden designer with 40 years experience, I strongly recommend that all the crocuses shown should be Crocus tommasinianus, as these survive well and multiply better than any other species".
	These comments have been considered and an update will be provided to Members within the Officer's introduction to the application. Notwithstanding these additional comments, the Officer recommendation remains as set out in the report to Committee.

21/01	173/FUL
Land	Off Ruby Avenue, Bishops Cleeve
Amer	nded Condition 5
Cond	ition 5 to read:
that w confir	development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance the updated CEMP vas received by the LPA on 20.02.2023 and approved by the Highway Authority as med in writing on 13.03.2023. The approved plan shall be adhered to throughout the olition/construction period.
	on: In the interests of safe operation of the adopted highway in the lead into opment both during the demolition and construction phase of the development.
Para	8.52 to read:
in size develo these amen would space south	semi-detached properties (Plots 1-6, 17-22) would have rear private gardens ranging e from 51.79sqm -75.72sqm which is considered to be acceptable. The flatted opment at plots 7-12 would have amenity space in the form or front gardens. Each of e units would have Juliet Balconies. The flatted units at 13 and 14 would have private hity space of 22.2sqm and 26.12sqm respectively. The flatted units at 15 and 16 d have an amenity space of 37sqm and units 7-12 would also have shared amenity e of 102sqm. The development also provides public open space at 969sqm in the newstern corner of the site. The dwellings are therefore considered to be served by ient amenity space.
Para	8.58 to read:
2x2b4	4p 80.7sqm
Para	8.60 to read:
In terr	ms of the tenure mix, the following is proposed:
	nits will be for shared ownership (Plots 1-6: six 1-bedroomed maisonettes, four 2- nom maisonettes, two 2-bedroom houses and four 3-bedroom houses)
- 16 u house	units will be for social rent (Plots 7-22: four 2-bedroom houses and two 3-bedroom es)
Para	8.65 - 8.70 to read:
Drain INF6	Policy INF2 (2) (iv) requires new development to incorporate Sustainable Urban age Systems (SUDS) where appropriate to manage surface water drainage. Policy also requires that the infrastructure requirements generated by a proposal are met, ding by adequate on and off site infrastructure.
Risk / mode	site is partially in flood zone 2 according to the Flood Maps for Planning. The Flood Assessment (S11479-JNP-XX-XX-RP-C-0001-P01; August 2021) states that elling carried out in 2010 for the planning application for the wider development site s that the site should actually be considered in flood zone 1.
by the climat flood imper wider provid	applicant provided updates to the site layout plan in order to address concerns raised e Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in relation to surface water management and te change. The FFL of the dwellings has been raised so that it's above the predicted level and it has been shown that the proposed residential site has a lower rmeable area than the previous site layout design so it can be accommodated in the drainage network it is discharging into. Simulations of the drainage have been ded that show there will be no flooding in the 1 in 30 year 1 in 100 year rainfall events 40% for climate change. Finally, it is confirmed that the drainage will be put up for
The a by the climat flood imper wider provic	applicant provided updates to the site layout plan in order to address concerns rais e Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in relation to surface water management and te change. The FFL of the dwellings has been raised so that it's above the predict level and it has been shown that the proposed residential site has a lower rmeable area than the previous site layout design so it can be accommodated in t drainage network it is discharging into. Simulations of the drainage have been ded that show there will be no flooding in the 1 in 30 year 1 in 100 year rainfall even

	adoption by Severn Trent Water who will be responsible for future maintenance.
	The LLFA has no further objections to the proposal and do not require any conditions.
	The development is therefore considered satisfactory with regard to flood risk and drainage subject to a condition to ensure the implementation of the development in accordance with the approved drainage scheme.
	Para 10.1 to read:
	In the absence of policies in the NPPF which would provide a clear reason for refusal, it is not considered the harms of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits set out above. It is therefore recommended that authority be DELEGATED to the Development Management Manager to PERMIT the application subject to any additional/amended planning conditions; and the completion of a section 106 legal agreement to secure the following:
	- The provision of 100% affordable housing.
	- A contribution of £73 per dwelling, (£1,241 based on 22 dwellings), towards recycling and waste bin facilities.
	Additional Consultations
	Since writing the Committee report, an additional 81 objections have been received from members of the public. These new objections raise no new concerns that have not previously been raised by objectors or consultees, bar an objection to loss of open space.
	Officer Update
	The proposed scheme provides 969sqm of public open space. Furthermore, there are public open spaces provided across the wider area and the Council currently has a number of planning applications under consideration for a LEAP and the provision of sports pitches. Therefore, all objections have been addressed as set out in the main Committee report.
5e	22/00609/FUL
	Starvealls Cottage, Postlip, Winchcombe
	The Conservation Officer has requested that the following condition be attached in the event that Members resolve 'delegated permit':
	No demolition shall take place until a programme of archaeological building recording work including a Written Scheme of Investigation followed by a final report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The scheme shall include an assessment of the pair of cottages which are to be recorded to a standard equivalent to a Level 2 (descriptive record) as specified by Historic England in its publication Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice (2016).
	Reason: In the interests of the historic environment. This condition is required to be pre- commencement as archaeological building recording work is required prior to the loss of the historic buildings.

5f	22/00650/FUL
	Trumans Farm , Manor Lane, Gotherington
	There is an error in Paragraph 7.2 of the Committee Report. This should state:
	The Development Plan currently comprises the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (JCS) (adopted December 2017),Tewkesbury Borough Plan to 2011-2031 (adopted June 2022) and a number of 'made' Neighbourhood Development Plans. Of relevance to this application is the Gotherington Neighbourhood Plan (GNP) 2011-2031 (Made September 2017)