

## 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.

| Item No |  |
|---------|--|
| 5a      | <p data-bbox="284 539 456 566"><b>22/00251/APP</b></p> <p data-bbox="284 602 987 629"><b>Phases 4 And 6, Land At Perrybrook, North Brockworth</b></p> <p data-bbox="284 665 555 692"><b>Late Representations</b></p> <p data-bbox="284 728 1324 786">Since the preparation of the Committee report, an additional letter of objection has been received. The details of this letter are summarised below:</p> <p data-bbox="284 822 1337 880"><i>"I wish to make the following further comments on and objections to the proposals for the development of Perrybrook North stages 4 &amp; 6 .</i></p> <p data-bbox="284 916 1334 1005"><i>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.</i></p> <p data-bbox="284 1041 1318 1158"><i>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.</i></p> <p data-bbox="284 1193 1326 1283"><i>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.</i></p> <p data-bbox="284 1319 1353 1556"><i>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?</i></p> <p data-bbox="284 1592 1361 1682"><i>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?</i></p> <p data-bbox="284 1718 1345 1807"><i>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".</i></p> <p data-bbox="284 1843 1358 1933">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.</p> |

5b

21/01173/FUL

**Land Off Ruby Avenue, Bishops Cleeve**

**Amended Condition 5**

Condition 5 to read:

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance the updated CEMP that was received by the LPA on 20.02.2023 and approved by the Highway Authority as confirmed in writing on 13.03.2023. The approved plan shall be adhered to throughout the demolition/construction period.

Reason: In the interests of safe operation of the adopted highway in the lead into development both during the demolition and construction phase of the development.

**Para 8.52 to read:**

The semi-detached properties (Plots 1-6, 17-22) would have rear private gardens ranging in size from 51.79sqm -75.72sqm which is considered to be acceptable. The flatted development at plots 7-12 would have amenity space in the form or front gardens. Each of these units would have Juliet Balconies. The flatted units at 13 and 14 would have private amenity space of 22.2sqm and 26.12sqm respectively. The flatted units at 15 and 16 would have an amenity space of 37sqm and units 7-12 would also have shared amenity space of 102sqm. The development also provides public open space at 969sqm in the south western corner of the site. The dwellings are therefore considered to be served by sufficient amenity space.

**Para 8.58 to read:**

2x2b4p 80.7sqm

**Para 8.60 to read:**

In terms of the tenure mix, the following is proposed:

- 6 units will be for shared ownership (Plots 1-6: six 1-bedroomed maisonettes, four 2-bedroom maisonettes, two 2-bedroom houses and four 3-bedroom houses)
- 16 units will be for social rent (Plots 7-22: four 2-bedroom houses and two 3-bedroom houses)

**Para 8.65 - 8.70 to read:**

JCS Policy INF2 (2) (iv) requires new development to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) where appropriate to manage surface water drainage. Policy INF6 also requires that the infrastructure requirements generated by a proposal are met, including by adequate on and off site infrastructure.

The site is partially in flood zone 2 according to the Flood Maps for Planning. The Flood Risk Assessment (S11479-JNP-XX-XX-RP-C-0001-P01; August 2021) states that modelling carried out in 2010 for the planning application for the wider development site shows that the site should actually be considered in flood zone 1.

The applicant provided updates to the site layout plan in order to address concerns raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in relation to surface water management and climate change. The FFL of the dwellings has been raised so that it's above the predicted flood level and it has been shown that the proposed residential site has a lower impermeable area than the previous site layout design so it can be accommodated in the wider drainage network it is discharging into. Simulations of the drainage have been provided that show there will be no flooding in the 1 in 30 year 1 in 100 year rainfall events plus 40% for climate change. Finally, it is confirmed that the drainage will be put up for

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
|                  | <p>adoption by Severn Trent Water who will be responsible for future maintenance.</p> <p>The LLFA has no further objections to the proposal and do not require any conditions.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Para 10.1 to read:</b></p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The provision of 100% affordable housing.</li> <li>- A contribution of £73 per dwelling, (£1,241 based on 22 dwellings), towards recycling and waste bin facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Consultations</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Officer Update</b></p> <p>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.</p> |
| <p><b>5e</b></p> | <p><b>22/00609/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Starvealls Cottage, Postlip, Winchcombe</b></p> <p>The Conservation Officer has requested that the following condition be attached in the event that Members resolve 'delegated permit':</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>  |

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| <b>5f</b> | <p><b>22/00650/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Trumans Farm , Manor Lane, Gotherington</b></p> <p>There is an error in Paragraph 7.2 of the Committee Report. This should state:</p> <p>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)</p> |
|-----------|--|