

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held at the Council Offices,
Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 17 October 2023 commencing
at 9:30 am**

Present:

Chair
Vice Chair

Councillor P E Smith
Councillor S Hands

and Councillors:

H J Bowman (Substitute for M Dimond-Brown), M A Gore, D J Harwood, M L Jordan,
J R Mason, R J E Vines, P N Workman and I Yates

also present:

Councillor P W Ockelton

PL.35 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 35.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.
- 35.2 The Chair gave a brief outline of the procedure for Planning Committee meetings, including public speaking.
- 35.3 The Chair advised that, in accordance with Procedure Rule 1.2 of the Council's Constitution, he had exercised his discretion to vary the order of business so that Agenda Item 6 – Appeals Report would be taken after Agenda Item 4 – Minutes.

PL.36 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 36.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Dimond-Brown, G C Madle, G M Porter and R J G Smith. Councillor H J Bowman would be a substitute for the meeting.

PL.37 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 37.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 24 January 2023 and took effect on 1 February 2023.

37.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Agenda Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
S Hands	Item 5c – 23/00044/OUT – Land at Horsbere Drive, Longford.	Is a Borough Councillor for the area. Had taken part in discussions with members of the public regarding the application.	Would not speak or vote and would retire to the public speaking area for this item.
J R Mason	Item 5b – 21/01496/FUL – Almsbury Farm, Vineyard Street, Winchcombe.	Is Chair of Winchcombe Town Council, which had discussed the application due to its size, but he had retired to the audience and taken no part in the debate. Winchcombe Town Council had attended a meeting with the applicant, at the applicant's request, which he had attended but had not expressed an opinion.	Would speak and vote.

37.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

PL.38 MINUTES

38.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2023, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PL.39 CURRENT APPEALS AND APPEAL DECISIONS UPDATE

39.1 Attention was drawn to the current appeals and appeal decisions update, circulated at Page No. 163. Members were asked to consider the current planning and enforcement appeals received and the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities appeal decisions issued.

39.2 The Development Management Manager explained that, at the last meeting of the Committee, Members had been provided with an update regarding the appeal decision in respect of Truman's Farm, Gotherington and its impact on the Council's five year housing land supply. Since that time, clear implications had been identified for the Council in terms of various appeal cases and urgent decisions had been taken in relation to three cases in Fiddington, Highnam and Bishops Cleeve. The updated annual position for the authority would be published today and would show that the Council could demonstrate a housing land supply of 3.23 years – the

Gotherington Inspector had determined this as 3.39 years at best. Members would be aware of the Agenda for today which included various housing proposals, and, with the tilted balance engaged, he highlighted the importance of taking into account the provisions of Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

39.3 Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED That the current appeal and appeal decisions update be **NOTED**.

PL.40 DEVELOPMENT CONTROL - APPLICATIONS TO THE BOROUGH COUNCIL

40.1 The objections to, support for, and observations upon the various applications as referred to in Appendix 1 attached to these Minutes were presented to the Committee and duly taken into consideration by Members prior to decisions being made on those applications.

21/01307/FUL - Moat Farm, Malleson Road, Gotherington

40.2 This application was for erection of four dwellings following the demolition of existing agricultural buildings.

40.3 The Development Management Team Manager (East) advised that this was a full application for the demolition of a range of existing agricultural buildings and the erection of four dwellings and associated infrastructure. The application related to a parcel of land at Moat Farm located to the northern edge of the village of Gotherington. The site had previously been utilised for agricultural and equestrian uses and currently comprised a number of existing agricultural buildings, formed around a yard area, which were associated with the surrounding agricultural land that was also in the applicant's control. The site was currently accessed off Malleson Road via an existing domestic access and a farm track to the south-west. The north-western corner of the site was located within a designated Special Landscape Area, which provided the foreground setting for the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, to the north of Gotherington, and to the east of the site was a public footpath which linked to Malleson Road. The nearby Moat Farmhouse was considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. It was noted that the site was wholly located within Flood Zone 1. It was proposed that the site would be laid in a courtyard arrangement and the amenity space would project out from the dwellings, leading to a concentrated built form in the centre of the site. The buildings were designed to reflect the existing functional agricultural character of the site. The finished materials would include timber cladding, standing seam roofs and metal sheet cladding in order to maintain the functional appearance of the site. An assessment of the main material considerations was set out in the Committee report and identified a number of key harms and benefits. The application site was located adjacent to Gotherington which was identified as a Service Village in the Joint Core Strategy hierarchy and was recognised by Joint Core Strategy Policy SP2 as a location where dwellings would be provided to meet the identified housing needs of Tewkesbury Borough; however, the site was predominantly outside of the defined settlement boundary and was not allocated for housing through the development plan. It was therefore necessary to assess whether there were any material considerations which indicated whether a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The Committee report set out the impacts that the application was likely to have upon the landscape character of the area, amenity to existing and proposed residents, the highway network and the nearby heritage asset. No objections had been raised by any statutory consultees and whilst the site was located outside of the settlement boundary, it was considered to represent sustainable development on the edge of a Service Village. Given the current position regarding the Council's five year housing land supply, although there was some harm arising from the conflict with the spatial housing policies,

significant weight should be given to the provision of sustainable housing where none of the identified harms would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits in the overall planning balance. It was therefore recommended that the application be permitted, subject to the conditions listed within the report. An outline application for 42 dwellings on the site had been refused by the Planning Committee in 2014 and an appeal dismissed by the Planning Inspector on the grounds of landscape impact and the setting of the heritage asset. Members were advised that a late representation had been received from the County Archaeologist after the publication of the Additional Representations Sheet, attached at Appendix 1, responding to the concerns raised by the Parish Council regarding the destruction of ridge and furrow and the medieval moat. The County Archaeologist had advised that the ridge and furrow was not of any particular merit and was not a scheduled ancient monument; however, the moat could be of some interest and recommended the inclusion of a pre-commencement condition to carry out mitigation on the site. The applicant had accepted this condition and was happy to move forward on that basis.

- 40.4 The Chair invited the applicant to address the Committee. The applicant explained that his family had lived and run businesses at Moat Farm for the past 60 years and had decided it would be a good opportunity to create a unique, individual, self-built development on the footprint of the existing agricultural buildings. The one house and three bungalows had been designed for their own occupation. It would mean a lot to them to be able to remain at Moat Farm, in the village where they had lived for most of their lives, and they intended to use local trades for the majority of the construction work.
- 40.5 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to permit the application and he sought a motion from the floor. A Member sought clarification as to whether the applicant was on the self-build register. In response, the Development Management Team Manager (East) advised that when an application was submitted, there was an opportunity to declare the proposal as self-build on the application form by ticking the relevant section; it was also expected that this would be included in the description of development. In this instance it had not been declared as self-build and the applicant was not on the self-build register; however, this did not preclude the applicant from self-building. In response to a Member query regarding how the farm would continue without the existing agricultural buildings, the Development Management Team Manager (East) explained that the applicant had advised that, once the existing farm buildings had been removed and residential development implemented, the remaining land would be rented by a nearby farmer who would not require any buildings.
- 40.6 It was proposed and seconded that the application be permitted in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to the inclusion of a standard pre-commencement archaeology condition to allow mitigation to take place regarding the moat, and, upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That the application be **PERMITTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to the inclusion of a standard pre-commencement archaeology condition to allow mitigation to take place regarding the moat.

21/01496/FUL - Almsbury Farm, Vineyard Street, Winchcombe

- 40.7 This application was for redevelopment and conversion of Almsbury Farm Barns to provide a mixed residential and commercial development comprising circa. 900sqm of Class E commercial floor space and 18 new residential units including demolition of non-historic portal framed barns and the provision of new car parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure.

- 40.8 The Development Management Team Manager (East) advised that the application site was located to the south of Vineyard Street, Winchcombe, wholly within the Winchcombe Conservation Area, and incorporated the Grade II listed Almsbury Farmhouse and the adjacent Grade II listed farm buildings, currently in a derelict condition. The site was also within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Adjoining, but not within the site, the land immediately to the north was within Flood Zone 3; however, the site itself was within Flood Zone 1. The site also adjoined and comprised a very small part at the extreme south of the application site - not proposed for development - which fell within the Sudeley Historic Park and Gardens. The application proposed the redevelopment and conversion of Almsbury Farm Barns to provide circa. 900 sqm of Class E commercial floor space and the provision of 18 residential units which involved the conversion of the listed buildings to four dwellings and the construction of 14 new build residential dwellings. An assessment of the main material considerations was set out within the Committee report and a number of key harms and benefits had been identified. In terms of the principle of residential development, the application site was located adjacent to Winchcombe, which was identified as a Rural Service Centre in the Joint Core Strategy hierarchy and was recognised by Joint Core Strategy Policy SP2 as a location where dwellings would be provided to meet the identified housing needs of Tewkesbury Borough; however, the site was located outside the existing built up area of Winchcombe and was not allocated for housing through the development plan or the Winchcombe and Sudeley Neighbourhood Development Plan. It was therefore necessary to consider whether there were any material considerations which indicated that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. In terms of the principle of commercial development, the Winchcombe and Sudeley Neighbourhood Development Plan allocated this site for new or expanded uses which included Class E use. The policy also referred to the use of this site as a mixed use to include residential to support the commercial proposals. Given the site constraints, Officers had worked collectively with the applicant over the past two years to negotiate a scheme that would have an acceptable impact upon its sensitivities. This included a re-design of the new buildings to have a more appropriate impact upon the historic buildings and their setting and the reduction of residential units. One of the main areas of concern was the intensification and impact upon the road network, given the existing traffic issues along Vineyard Street. This was the only objection raised by the Town Council and the applicants had worked closely with County Highways to ensure that the impacts would be limited by providing highways improvements along this road. No objections had been raised by any statutory consultees, other than Historic England, and whilst the site was located outside of the settlement boundary, it was considered to represent sustainable development on the edge of a rural Service Village and would deliver important commercial provisions to Winchcombe. With this in mind, and given the current position regarding the Council's five year housing land supply, although there was some harm arising from the conflict with the spatial housing policies, significant weight should be given to the provision of sustainable housing where none of the identified harms would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits in the overall planning balance. It was 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 Section 106 legal agreements.
- 40.9 The Chair invited the applicant's agent to address the Committee. The applicant's agent indicated that those Members who had been on the Planning Committee for a long time would be well aware of the history of this site. Almsbury Farm Barns was an incredibly important site, located close to the main tourist entrance of Sudeley Castle and framing its important historic setting between the town and Sudeley. The site comprised a range of stunning Grade II listed Cotswold stone barns, which were of the highest standard of historic and architectural quality; however, they were now disused and a long-term viable use needed to be found to restore them to their

former glory. The site also included a number of modern portal framed barns that were in a poor state of repair and were harming the heritage value of the site and the setting of Sudeley's parkland – it was included within the Winchcombe and Sudeley Neighbourhood Development Plan as an allocation site for that reason, supporting its conversion for redevelopment. The Winchcombe and Sudeley Neighbourhood Development Plan designation envisaged support for commercial, care and residential type uses. This proposal comprised a mix of small-scale commercial and residential uses and therefore fitted squarely with the Winchcombe and Sudeley Neighbourhood Development Plan aspirations for the site. Winchcombe Town Council had stated its support, in principle, for the scheme on that basis. The conversion of the historic barns has been sensitively handled and the new build elements that replaced the non-historic barns amounted to a significant visual improvement. The new builds comprised a range of Almshouse type terraces and four separate family homes of Cotswold and barn-like design. The surfacing and building materials and finishing were truly of the highest quality and far exceeded that of standard schemes elsewhere. The applicant's agent indicated that they had worked positively with the Council's Planning and Conservation Officers to secure a scheme that everyone was happy with. The Conservation Officer recognised the importance of bringing this historic site back in to viable use and County Highways was happy with the access and parking arrangements for the site. A balanced approach had to be taken between maintaining highway standards and protecting the heritage value of the site. Winchcombe Town Council's existing concern over parking on Vineyard Street had also been resolved via the requirement for a traffic management scheme, the full detail of which was to be secured by condition. The Council's consultees were satisfied in terms of ecology, flood risk and drainage, landscape, arboriculture and amenity and the scheme would secure Biodiversity Net Gain well in excess of the future 10% requirement. The applicant's agent stated that, in over 20 years of dealing with planning applications on either side of the fence in Tewkesbury Borough, this was one of the most special and positive developments that he had the pleasure to be involved with. The opportunity to bring this gateway site back into viable use; restore its heritage barns; and replace buildings that were of no merit with Cotswold vernacular design was so important for the town. The community wanted a solution for this site once and for all, and this was certainly it.

- 40.10 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to delegate authority to the Development Management Manager to permit the application, subject to any additional/amended planning conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement, and he sought a motion from the floor. A Member sought clarification as to whether Community Infrastructure Levy would be payable and confirmation was provided that it was. The Member indicated that the chevron parking in Vineyard Street was problematic and the gap had narrowed over time as vehicles had got larger; it was a particular issue for refuse vehicles which could get blocked in due to indiscriminate parking – this was something which was regularly discussed at Town Council meetings. He asked whether County Highways would be happy to address this by putting parallel parking down one side and retaining chevron parking along the other. In response, the County Highways representative confirmed that County Highways had considered the parking configuration and, as outlined on the Additional Representations Sheet, attached at Appendix 1, a condition had been included to require a traffic management scheme to restrict parking along Vineyard Street to allow two vehicles to pass to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. He reiterated that no details had been agreed at this stage and County Highways wanted to have a further conversation with the Town Council in terms of what the final scheme would look like. In response to a query as to whether the trees had Tree Protection Orders (TPOs), the Development Management Team Manager (East) indicated that to his knowledge they did not but the site was within a Conservation Area which was protected in its own right and Officers had requested additional details in relation to

that. Another Member sought clarification as to what was covered by Class E use type and was informed that it could be a broad spectrum but, in this case, would be limited, by condition, to Class E9(g) – uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to its amenity: i) an office to carry out any operational or administrative functions, ii) the research and development of products or processes, or iii) any industrial process – and E9(c) – for the provision of the following kinds of services principally to visiting members of the public: i) financial services, ii) professional services (other than health or medical services) or, iii) any other services which it is appropriate to provide in a commercial, business or service locality.

40.11 A Member expressed disappointment that there were no affordable units on site and she asked how the offsite contribution for affordable housing provision calculation of £99,000 had been reached. The Development Management Team Manager (East) advised that the calculation was based on information provided by the applicant's agent to the Housing team and the Legal Adviser confirmed that the Housing team applied a technical formula which calculated a sum equivalent to need on site. The money would go into the pot to be utilised for affordable housing within the administrative area of the Council. Another Member noted that the new dwellings had chimneys and asked if it was intended they would have working fireplaces, thereby producing pollution, or if they would be decorative. In response, the Development Management Team Manager (East) advised that he did not have a direct answer but he imagined they would be for woodburners and he clarified that any pollution would be dealt with by building control legislation.

40.12 It was proposed and seconded that authority be delegated to the Development Management Manager to permit the application in accordance with the Officer recommendation. The proposer of the motion indicated that the site had stood vacant as a farm for many years in a very beautiful area and it was necessary for something to be done to it. He was of the view that the proposal was a good design which would fit well with the local architecture and would be a welcome addition to the entrance to the town. The seconder of the motion shared this view and congratulated Officers on finding a solution for this particular site. A Member indicated that Vineyard Street was the starting point for several walks around the town and surrounding area but it was not pedestrian friendly; he noted that consideration had been given as to how the vehicular traffic might move but not to pedestrians and he was concerned that narrowing the access would increase the amount of traffic and impact negatively on pedestrians. The Development Management Team Manager (East) advised that, should Members be supportive of the Officer recommendation, a condition for improvement to verges for walking would be attached to the planning permission. The representative from County Highways advised that Vineyard Street currently had shared use by pedestrians and vehicles and, although undesirable, there was no record of any incidents in the area. There were footways either side of the street but the application proposed improvements to the verges between both access points so pedestrians could move away from the shared surface area. Double yellow lines being introduced along Vineyard Street would allow cars to pass and improve visibility in the event of pedestrians walking along the road.

40.13 Upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED

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 Agreement.

23/00044/OUT - Land at Horsbere Drive, Longford

- 40.14 This was an outline application for residential development of up to 21 apartments, associated infrastructure, ancillary facilities, open space and landscaping with all matters reserved (amended description). The Planning Committee had visited the application site on Friday 13 October 2023.
- 40.15 The Senior Planning Officer drew attention to the Additional Representations Sheet, attached at Appendix 1, which set out that the application site fell within Longford Parish rather than Innsworth Parish, as stated in the Committee report; this was due to a recent boundary change. Seven additional representations had been received from members of the public objecting to the proposal on the grounds that Longford had enough housing, there should be additional shop parking, the proposal was visually unattractive, the GP surgery was at capacity, the estate did not need more people and cars, risk of flooding, contribution to antisocial behaviour and the development being unwelcome next to the school. These aligned with the substantial number of objections that had been received and considered during the consultation period. Whilst the application was submitted in outline and was only seeking to establish the principle of delivering up to 21 apartments, quite a lot of information had been included – this was unusual but illustrated how the scheme might appear in future. If Members were minded to permit the application, it would be subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure affordable housing and other contributions for environmental mitigation. Heads of terms had been agreed and the development would also be Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable. Longford was deemed by Officers to be a sustainable site. A similar scheme had been refused at the start of last year for 24 apartments; however, as well as reducing the number of apartments, there had also been amendments to the articulation of the apartment blocks which the Urban Design Officer considered added architectural interest, as well as good use of materials and colour, albeit this was indicative at this stage. Members would be aware there was substantial opposition to the development, in part because there continued to be local expectation of the site being used for community purposes; this was based on the masterplan which followed the 2008 outline planning permission; however, delivery of the masterplan was dependent on subsequent reserved matters applications. He drew attention to Pages No. 113-114, Paragraph 3 of the Committee report, which outlined the relevant planning history, in particular 11/00385/FUL which had a decision date of 17 May 2013. That planning permission included a condition that all reserved matters were required within three years of that date i.e. by 17 May 2016; after that date the outline planning permission effectively lapsed so reserved matters applications could only be submitted before that date. A number of reserved matters applications had been made between 2013 and 2016 for infrastructure, a school and a Co-Op but there was no reserved matters application for the current application site, therefore, since 2016 there had been an opportunity for any development to be proposed on the site. The outline and reserved matters applications had now all lapsed and the masterplan had no relevance to how this application was considered. In terms of the relevance of the Churchdown and Innsworth Neighbourhood Development Plan, the Senior Planning Officer clarified that, notwithstanding that the site was now in Longford Parish, the boundaries of the Neighbourhood Development Plan were unchanged, therefore it remained a material consideration in determining the application. In conclusion, Longford was an urban fringe settlement of Gloucester, as named in the Tewkesbury Borough Plan, where the principle of new residential development was supported. Having regard to the indicative plans submitted and the Council's housing land supply situation, Officers considered there was sufficient likelihood of acceptable development coming forward at the reserved matters stage.

- 40.16 The Chair invited a representative from Longford Parish Council to address the Committee. The Parish Council representative indicated that this application for flats would create a blot on the landscape that would seriously detract from the character of the new place at Longford. It was in an area where residential development had been rejected twice and the vast majority of issues from the previous applications which had been refused on this site remained relevant. Whilst the previous outline planning permission had expired, the need for infrastructure still existed. The proposed development was squeezed in and would still fail to integrate and relate to its surroundings, or respect the character of the site, which was mainly two storey houses, and would fail to contribute positively to the wider Longford development. More importantly, with regard to the previous application, the Urban Design Officer had stated that its loss as a retail, employment or community use would be disappointing and would have a negative effect on the overall quality of the new place that had been created at Longford and, in the long-term, this area would see significant residential growth without the facilities to serve them, risking the creation of very unsustainable developments where people must drive to access facilities. The Parish Council felt that more dwellings without infrastructure was unsustainable. This application failed to adhere to the social objective within Paragraph 8b) of the National Planning Policy Framework which was to help support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, with accessible services that reflected current and future needs and supported communities. As highlighted by local residents, parking around the school caused issues, there was outdated flood risk evidence in the area, a lack of available school places and issues with foul water controls among other things. The development would also be contrary to Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CHIN2 and CHIN3 of the Churchdown and Innsworth Neighbourhood Development Plan. As Members would be aware, planning guidance was subjective so the application could be refused. The Parish Council felt the Committee needed to be very careful not to set a dangerous precedent that could potentially undermine the strength behind local plan policies as, if approved, the development could be used as justification for unsustainable development across Tewkesbury Borough. As such, the Parish Council urged Members to refuse the application.
- 40.17 The Chair invited a local resident speaking in objection to the application to address the Committee. The local resident indicated that the original planning for the development at Horsbere Mews designated the land in question for a commercial space with parking, opposite another which was built in the early stages of the development. The developer later proposed its first application for apartments, citing specifically that the existing commercial development had not been adopted – the residential development itself only half-complete. As of October 2023, the existing commercial development had been fully adopted and heavily used for over 24 months, with parked vehicles regularly overflowing onto Horsbere Drive itself. He pointed out that, for a significant period of time during the consultation period for the application, the online portal for objections had been unavailable meaning many residents were unable to register their objections - he was aware of significantly more public sentiment against this proposal than evidenced. In terms of the local residents' main concerns, the overall scale, bulk and massing of the apartments remained unsuitable for this development, as was the case when it was refused in July 2020 and February 2022. There were no existing apartment blocks on this development and their addition would contrast poorly against the small homes they would sit beside. The introduction of circa. 42 additional private vehicles to an area with demonstrably poor traffic management, only a few metres from a busy primary school and with an extant shortage of parking spaces, would be of significant detriment both to traffic management and highway safety. The proposed apartments would be built only a few metres west of several existing homes on Whitefield Crescent, significantly reducing the sunlight to the living spaces within. It would also expose bedrooms and indoor and outdoor living spaces to overlooking from the occupants of the proposed apartments. Since the residential part of this

development was completed 24 months ago, it has suffered from prolonged sewage leaks as the drainage system had been overwhelmed and it would be irresponsible to build further housing until sufficient drainage has been installed to sustain it. On behalf of his fellow residents, he asked that the Planning Committee recognise the continuing legitimacy of its previous judgements and the concerns of local residents and refuse the application.

- 40.18 The Chair invited a local Ward Member from the area to address the Committee. The local Ward Member reminded the Committee that the whole site was determined by a Planning Inspector and a part of that decision was for a local centre that would make the site viable for 550 new homes. The previous two applications in 2020 and 2022 had rightly been refused by the Planning Committee and aside from the total number of flats being reduced from 24 to 21, nothing else had changed. As was the case today and with both previous applications, Tewkesbury Borough Council could not demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Given the context of the site and its surroundings, the development as proposed, by virtue of the overall scale and the resulting bulk and massing, would not be of an appropriate scale, type and density and therefore would fail to respond positively to, and respect the character, appearance and visual amenity of the site and the surrounding area. It therefore followed that the development would fail to represent good design and this weighed heavily against the proposal. In terms of the policy justification for refusal, the development would be contrary to Paragraph 130 and guidance in section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies INF4, INF6, INF7 and SD4 of the Joint Core Strategy, Policy RES5 of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan and Policy CHIN2 and CHIN3 of the Churchdown and Innsworth Neighbourhood Development Plan. With regard to the local centre, the loss as retail, employment or community use would be disappointing and would have a negative effect on the overall quality of the new community that had been created at Longford. Long term, this area had seen significant residential growth and, without the facilities to serve the dwellings, there was a risk of creating very unsustainable developments where people had to drive to access facilities. If this application was agreed, it would give the green light to developers to take more profit rather than deliver local centres, with badly designed cramped housing and limited or total lack of local facilities. The indicative plans provided were simply that and, once outline planning permission had been granted, the developer could come back with a scheme for even more apartments. He hoped Members would follow the same approach as the previous applications and refuse this application.
- 40.19 The Chair invited Councillor Hands, speaking as a local Ward Member, to address the Committee. She indicated that, in 2020 and 2022, applications for flats on this piece of land were refused by the Planning Committee and nothing has changed in terms of the site or surrounding areas; reducing the amount of flats from 24 to 21 did not make any difference to the previous refusal reasons. When the initial application was won on appeal, the Planning Inspector had stated that the piece of land in question was to be set aside for commercial/community use. Residents were sold homes and moved in good faith that where they were going to live would be adequately equipped for the growing community. Being close to Gloucester City did not justify the loss of community land. The school on site was oversubscribed, the current local centre on the opposite side of Horsbere Drive was full and the car park was too small for the current volume of traffic using the centre. Section 8, Paragraph 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework stated that decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places. and she believed that applied here; the building of 21 flats on communal land would add to the current lack of community meeting places and the lack of school places. She noted that County Highways had no objection to the application; however, the developments to the left and right of Horsbere Drive had been complete for over six and four years respectively and, in that time, none of the roads have been handed over by the landowner/developers for adoption by County Highways. Currently, streets were full

of cars parked on the kerb or over driveways during the evenings and weekends with a substantial amount of cars parking dangerously at school drop off and pick up times. This dangerous parking put the safety of pedestrians, including a large number of primary school age children, at risk on a daily basis. The addition of a potential 42 or more cars, notwithstanding visitors, with 'up to' 35 parking spaces would only add to that and, as the roads were not adopted, Traffic Regulation Orders could not be obtained for double yellow lines nor could active enforcement take place to control the sheer volume of cars parking in the area on a daily basis. The potential, and only viable, access to the proposed flats was through a small estate road off a bend into what was currently a turning area - the objection from Waste Services had addressed this in terms of access for refuse lorries. She was speaking as a local Ward Member to represent residents who did not object to development of this piece of land in general - in fact, the way it had been left to become an unkempt unattractive entrance to their community was unacceptable to them – but did object to placing an inappropriate development in terms of bulk, design and amenity rather than providing community facilities which they had been led to believe would be built when purchasing and renting their properties. She asked Members to consider refusing this application in favour of a sustainable, well designed community area for the residents of Longford.

- 40.20 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to delegate authority to the Development Management Manager to permit the application, subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement, and he sought a motion from the floor. A Member sought clarification as to whether the tree/landscaping objection and the urban design comments at Page No. 115, Paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 respectively, were from Borough Council Officers and the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the first response was from a tree and landscape consultant and the second from an urban design specialist. The Member noted that Innsworth Parish Council's objection did not appear to be listed in the consultation responses and the Senior Planning Officer advised that, as far as he was aware, no response had been received from Innsworth Parish Council. He noted that a substantial response had been received from Longford Parish Council setting out its concerns. The Member drew attention to Page No. 120, Paragraph 8.19 of the report which stated that no concerns had been raised by the urban design specialist regarding scale and massing yet Page No. 115, Paragraph 4.3 talked about lack of ground level amenity space. The Development Management Manager advised that this was addressed at Page No. 120, Paragraph 8.20 of the report. In terms of the comment made by the various public speakers that no changes had been made compared to the previous refusal, he advised that the original scheme was for 33 units whereas this was for 21 and there had been a change in the format of the application in terms of the design issues raised. One of the public speakers had alluded to the fact that, should the outline planning permission be granted, the developer could seek to increase the number of units on the site through the reserved matters applications and, whilst that was the case, it did not mean that would be considered favourably by the Committee; the proposal before Members today was for 21 units and that was what needed to be assessed. The indicative scheme sought to address concerns raised previously by adding more variety and articulation through height differentials and change of materials and, on balance, considering all the issues around the sustainable location, site history and the material considerations for an outline proposal, although there were unresolved concerns for certain consultees, these were capable of being addressed through submission of detailed reserved matters applications.
- 40.21 A Member noted that local residents were expecting the site to be developed for community use and she asked who would have been expected to build that and why it had not happened. The Senior Planning Officer explained that outline consent was granted in 2008 and included a Section 106 obligation for £544,000 of community funding albeit that had not been allocated for anything in particular. Delivery of the

masterplan approved as part of the outline consent could only happen within the lifetime of that planning permission which had now lapsed; notwithstanding this, the Section 106 had already generated the community funding. Another Member indicated that this was being referred to as an existing application and she asked why that was the case – she looked at it as a new application. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed it was a new application and any reference to the existing scheme was simply to identify it as the current scheme rather than either of the two previous schemes. The Member asked what weight the Inspector's appeal statement carried in terms of the land being retained for a community asset and was advised that the Inspector was obliged to consider the application within the remit of that specific application at the time and was therefore considering the community benefits of the scheme in terms of the wider application site which was considerably bigger than this. The community facility had not come forward during the lifetime of the planning permission therefore the relevance of the masterplan had fallen away. The Legal Adviser made the general point that whilst land may have been put forward for community use in one application, that did not necessarily prevent someone putting in an application for an alternative use – it did not matter that the previous consent allocated this site for community use as this did not preclude an application coming forward for residential development now. The Development Management Manager reminded Members that each case must be determined on its own merits; clearly the two previous proposals for residential units on the site had not been supported but perhaps more relevant was that the principal reason for the last refusal was design.

- 40.22 A Member asked if County Highways had visited the application site or carried out a desktop assessment and the County Highways representative confirmed that a site visit had been carried out. Another Member noted that Officers had given reassurance that the concerns raised by the urban design specialist and the tree and landscape consultant could be addressed through reserved matters applications; however, he failed to see how concerns about dominant parking, the views from the lower windows of Block B facing Longford Lane being straight into the sloping bank and lack of ground level amenity space could be addressed. He also questioned whether it was appropriate to have an apartment with a balcony overlooking the school which was the other side of the road. In response, the Senior Planning Officer advised that there was a substantial response from the urban design specialist and, whilst the concerns were outlined at Paragraph 4.3 of the report, in the round their comments had been very positive. Broadly speaking, the urban design specialist did not have an issue with the number of units provided and felt that their scale and height was appropriate to the surrounding context of the site. It was the Planning Officers' responsibility to weigh up all of the competing interests and consultation responses to come up with a balanced opinion. In terms of the sunlight issue, the windows were set back in Block B and, in any event, the south facing sunlight would not be limited for the south facing block to the degree mentioned in the consultation responses; Officers did not think it was a significant issue and not one which would warrant refusal. In terms of parking, it was considered that 35 parking spaces for the apartments with an additional five for visitors was sufficient; this would be assessed at the reserved matters stage and, if it was not policy compliant, either an amendment could be sought, or it could be refused. He appreciated the concern in respect of the school but it was at a distance where it would be very difficult to justify refusal from a privacy and overlooking perspective. The Development Management Manager (South) advised that there were existing dwellings at Horsbere Drive with a similar relationship and outlook to the school. In response to a query as to what use classes A1 to A5 represented in terms of the earlier applications, and how many interested parties had approached the planning authority with a view to developing the site for

commercial/community use, the Development Management Manager advised that former use classes A1 to A5 were retail use, e.g. shops, wine bars, takeaways etc. Information was not retained in relation to enquiries but no formal applications had been made.

40.23

It was proposed and seconded that authority be delegated to the Development Management Manager to permit the application in accordance with the Officer recommendation. The proposer of the motion recognised the concerns regarding the proposal but felt it would be very difficult to justify a refusal. The seconder of the motion noted that the landscape and tree consultant and the urban design specialist had both raised concern but Officers had stated they could be resolved at the reserved matters stage and that determination of this application was based on the principle of development only. Should the motion be carried, she expected all reserved matters applications relating to the site to be brought to the Planning Committee for determination. A Member pointed out that the site was bordered on three sides by very busy roads and all traffic accessing the estate used the main roundabout. The entrance to the development was through an established settlement which was not designated as a through road and she felt this would cause problems with access for existing and new residents as well as refuse collections. There were parking issues on the road serving the school as well as problems with speeding vehicles but County Highways had raised no objection to the proposals. If Members were minded to permit the application, she asked for further investigations into the suitability of the access. In terms of the windows from Block B facing onto a bank, she felt this would impact quality of life for those residents and she raised concern regarding the air quality given that the site was bordered on three sides by busy roads and asked for this to be looked at if the application was permitted. In terms of drainage and sewage, this was a serious issue which needed to be addressed for the whole area which suffered from a failing sewage system. With regard to aesthetics and design, she reiterated that, although supportive of the scheme overall and in terms of its scale and height, the urban design specialist felt there was insufficient provision for walking and cycling, lack of ground level amenity space, dominant parking and limited sunlight to ground floor apartments facing Longford Lane. The site itself was the entrance to the estate and set the tone for the area. There were currently no flats on the estate so the proposed apartments would be totally out of keeping with the general layout on a prominent corner and would conflict with the rest of the design. She found it bizarre that the indicative plans included roof gardens which highlighted the lack of outdoor space and she felt that the suggested extension of the balcony by 0.5 metres was little compensation. She went on to reference overlooking of Whitefield Crescent and the impaired view from the school area as well as the lack of social housing. If this application was permitted, the site would have a greater number of units than the original scheme and she felt that new development should be resisted at all costs. Local services were stretched and there would be increased pollution as a result of residents travelling to Cheltenham and Gloucester. She questioned whether the land had been actively marketed robustly for community assets, although she appreciated that was not up for discussion today. The Joint Core Strategy, Tewkesbury Borough Plan and Churchdown and Innsworth Neighbourhood Development Plan all set out that community uses were an essential part of sustainable communities and open spaces and green infrastructure should be prioritised. In response, the Development Management Manager noted these comments and concerns and indicated that a range of issues had been considered in bringing the application forward with the recommendation before Members today and the clear concerns of the community could be fully considered at the reserved matters stage. He reiterated that the urban design specialist was generally supportive and the concerns raised could be addressed through the detail of the scheme.

40.24 A Member expressed support for one and two bedroom apartments as this tenure type was lacking within the borough and they were much needed by those looking to downsize. This was a sustainable site on a bus route and next to a shop so there were some positives associated with the scheme. Another Member advised that, having listened to the arguments and relooked at the plans, the entire site would be taken up by the footprint of the flats and car parking which would result in indiscriminate parking by people dropping off and picking up children from school or popping to the shops, as had been seen on the Planning Committee Site Visit. Whilst he felt that the site needed something done to it, he did not see how it could be sustainable for residential development. The Development Management Manager reminded Members this was an indicative scheme for up to 21 units so that number could be reduced and the plans were indicative and did not show the final scheme. The concerns raised by the urban design specialist could be addressed by a change to the footprint and these were all matters to consider at the reserved matters stage. Whilst he understood Members' thoughts, he stressed that the plans were indicative both in terms of layout and facades. With regard to parking, there was no requirement for this application to deal with existing concerns and County Highways had provided comments in relation to parking provision for the development. There would be a benefit in terms of having more parking spaces than were set out in the Churchdown and Innsworth Neighbourhood Development Plan and there was adequate provision to deal with the requirements of the scheme. A Member continued to be of the view that the site was completely unsuitable for flats, regardless of their design, particularly as none would be affordable units. The Chair agreed this was a difficult decision but no other suitable scheme had been put forward for the site which was now available for any use and he reminded Members of the risk of losing an appeal if there were no defensible grounds for refusal.

40.25 Upon being put to the vote, there was an equal number of votes for and against. The Chair exercised his casting vote and it was

RESOLVED That authority be **DELEGATED** to the Development Manager to **PERMIT** the application, subject to a Section 106 Agreement.

22/01004/APP - Parcel 2988 Downfield Lane, Twynning

40.26 This was a reserved matters application for 47 zero carbon dwellings including layout, scale, appearance and landscaping pursuant to original outline application 19/01084/OUT granted at appeal.

40.27 The Principal Planning Officer advised that the principle of development on the site was established through outline consent reference 19/01084/OUT which was granted at appeal in April 2022; access to the site was approved at outline stage. The site was located to the north of Fleet Lane and to the west of Downfield Lane and the western boundary of the site adjoined the rear gardens of existing dwellings which fronted onto Goodiers Lane.

40.28 The site was currently open grazing land with mature hedges on the roadside boundaries. The appeal Inspector for the outline scheme concluded that the development would result in moderate harm to the character and appearance of the area through the introduction of built development on a greenfield site but that there would be scope through the reserved matters to retain the existing hedges and provide landscaping in order to soften the impact. The submitted scheme proposed retention and reinforcement of the existing boundary hedges as well as incorporating areas of open space to the corners of the site. Officers considered that helped to soften the impact of the development and provide a transition between the site and the adjoining open countryside. Overall, Officers felt that the proposed density of development, layout and design of the house types reflected the context of the site adjoining a rural settlement and was in keeping with existing residential development adjoining the site. The layout incorporated several areas of open

space and the proposed landscaping of the development was considered to be appropriate and acceptable. As set out in the Committee report, the application was recommended for approval.

- 40.29 The Chair invited the applicant to address the Committee. The applicant indicated that, rather than reiterate the robust Committee report which recommended approval, he would introduce the developer to those unfamiliar with the company. He indicated that it was a privately owned regional property developer based in Gloucestershire, specialising in bespoke residential developments, with sites in and around the south-east of England and a successful history of developments locally. It had built a solid reputation for developing carefully crafted, high quality homes and enhancing local communities. Good design was a defining element to this process and each project had a unique character suitable for twenty-first century living which responded sympathetically to the site and its surroundings. This approach was evident within the proposals and was noted within the Committee report. This had, in part, been enhanced further through engagement with the Parish Council and it had been a rewarding opportunity to evolve the designs with the Parish Council to ensure the proposals best responded to this important location. The aim with all sites was to enhance the communities in which they built and create homes that people wished to live in, now and for future generations to come; this site was no exception to that approach. The developer's high standards and track record for quality developments had been recognised numerous times and resulted in many awards over the years. One of the many construction advances, in addition to the high-quality and sustainable materials that formed part of this proposal, was the commitment to delivering 100% of the homes, both open market and affordable, as zero carbon making this site one of the first, if not the first, of its kind to be built in Tewkesbury, which would mark a significant milestone for the Council.
- 40.30 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to approve the application and he sought a motion from the floor. A Member drew attention to Page No. 143, Paragraph 4.13 of the Committee report, which stated that Severn Trent Water had no objection but drew attention to assets on the site, and asked what this referred to. In terms of Paragraph 4.15 which set out that Twynning Parish Council had no objection subject to the resolution of certain details, the Member asked who was responsible for this. With regard to Paragraph 5.1 of the report, a third party representative had noted that self/custom built had been mentioned in the application but not identified and he was unsure how this was relevant to the site in question. Furthermore, he noted the comment about controls being needed to prevent loss of hedgerow and asked what the controls would be. In response, the Principal Planning Officer explained that, with regard to the comment from Severn Trent Water, there was a drainage easement through the site so Severn Trent must have equipment on the site but she was unsure of its nature. She advised that two of the dwellings in the scheme were to be custom built as specified in the Section 106 Agreement at the outline stage. The landscape management plan was dealt with as part of the information included on the Additional Representations Sheet, attached at Appendix 1, which had been discussed with the Parish Council prior to the Committee. Hedgerow retention should be included within the landscape management plan and it would be part of the conditions of implementation for this to be retained during the course of the development. The Member acknowledged the intention for the hedgerow to be retained but similar promises had been made on other sites where hedges had subsequently been removed so he was seeking real assurance that the hedgerow would be retained in this instance. In terms of Severn Trent Water's assets, there was a large water main beneath the site and he believed the plans suggested that houses would be built on top of that, which was concerning. He asked if this had been looked into and sought assurance there would be no houses built above the water main. The Principal Planning Officer understood that the water main would run under the main road through the site. In terms of hedgerows, the Development Management Team Manager (East) pointed

out that the applicant was present at the meeting and had heard the concerns expressed. Removal of the hedgerow would represent a breach of the condition and the enforcement team would take action if required.

- 40.31 A Member indicated that she had been expecting something exceptional in terms of design and was sadly disappointed with its 'cut and paste' nature; nevertheless, the sustainability credentials were fantastic. She asked what the solar panels would look like, i.e. whether they would be tiles or large ones on top of each house, and where the air source heat pumps would be located for each property as she was aware they emitted a humming noise so wanted to ensure there would be no disturbance to neighbouring residents. The Principal Planning Officer advised that additional conditions could be included to address both of these issues. The Development Management Manager advised that the scheme had been designed with the assets in mind and the Development Management Team Manager (East) drew attention to Page No. 149, Paragraph 8.23 of the Committee report which referred to the landscape management plan and advised there would be a mix of new and old planting throughout the site – this had been written into the plan and a condition had been added to the reserved matters to secure that. A Member continued to raise concern regarding the potential placement of houses over the water main and the Development Management Team Manager (South) pointed out that the landscape plan at Page No. 157 of the Committee report appeared to show the easement and all dwellings were set outside of that.
- 40.32 A Member noted that the developer had aspirations to deliver a zero carbon development which exceeded the building regulation requirements and she asked if this could be included as a condition of the planning permission. The Legal Adviser explained that building regulation requirements were the minimum standard the developer would be required to provide and it would be unreasonable to replicate this as a condition in the planning permission. The documents submitted by the applicant demonstrated intentions to deliver dwellings over and above building regulation requirements and the plans were conditioned so there would be a requirement to comply with those.
- 40.33 It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to the inclusion of additional conditions to stipulate the details of the solar panels and air source heat pumps. A Member indicated that he had voted against the outline application when it had been considered and refused by the Planning Committee, as such, he did not feel able to support the reserved matters application; however, he was in favour of the green credentials of the site and the developer had delivered another scheme in Twynning which was superb so he had every belief that this would be a very good site when finished.
- 40.34 Upon being put to the vote, it was
- RESOLVED** That the application be **APPROVED**, subject to additional conditions to stipulate the details of the solar panels and the air source heat pumps.

The meeting closed at 12:10 pm

Appendix 1

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS SHEET**Date:** 17th October 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.

Agenda Item No.	
5a	<p>21/01307/FUL</p> <p>Moat Farm, Malleson Road, Gotherington</p> <p>Report Correction</p> <p>Paragraph 8.1 refers to Gotherington being a Rural Service Centre within the settlement hierarchy of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). This is incorrect and a typing error; Gotherington is a Service Village for the purposes of the settlement hierarchy of the JCS.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this typing error, the assessment set out within the Committee report is correct and the recommendation remains.</p> <p>Biodiversity Update</p> <p>Paragraph 8.64 of the Committee report references an update on ecological matters. The applicant had submitted updated surveys and additional information at the request of the Council's Ecologist. This information was not reviewed at the time of writing the report.</p> <p>The Council's Ecologist has now reviewed the submitted information and is satisfied with the findings. Conditions have been proposed by the Council's Ecologist to secure ecological mitigation. Additional conditions are proposed below.</p> <p>Additional Conditions</p> <p>1. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a lighting plan has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority. The lighting plan shall accord with, and expand upon where necessary, the measures outlined in section 5 the associated Ecological Impact Assessment of July 2023. The agreed lighting plan shall be implemented, adhered to, and maintained in accordance with the agreed details.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the proposed development does not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and does not harm biodiversity within the site and the wider area.</p> <p>2. The proposed Landscaping Plan detailed in condition 5 shall also include ecological mitigation and enhancement measures as outlined in section 5 of the Ecological Impact Assessment of July 2023. The Landscaping Plan shall include measures to detail location of GCN hibernacula, bird and bat boxes (incl. new night roost) and demonstrate that bat roosting features will not be illuminated.</p>

Reason: To protect and enhance the habitat of the site.

Additional Comments from Parish Council

Following the publication of the Committee report the Parish Council has submitted the following comments in relation to the application:

Dear Sir.

We refer to our comment made in November 2021 on this application and reiterate again, the land owner is farming this land with livestock and crops. If the current barns are to be removed as part of this application, they will probably need to be replaced thus adding to even more development on this very sensitive site on the north of Malleson Road.

Gotherington is a linear development to the north and this application is in contrast with that.

Also, at the time of the last application, there were some valuable ridge and furrow fields highlighted, which have since been destroyed by the landowner by ploughing to plant crops. Also the medieval moat is currently empty of water for the first time in living memory and residents are concerned that this is to facilitate easier access to the development and it might be lost forever. It is not mentioned at all in the conservation officers report.

The inordinately long time between application and determination might give the impression that the village might be in favour of this development but its impact on our valuable amenity space that is Freeman Field is unacceptable. We are being overrun with new developments currently and this one is not in keeping with the surrounding buildings. It is out of place and out of character.

Comments from Councillor Adcock

Councillor Adcock has raised the following comments:

Our objections are that this development should it go ahead would allow further encroachment into the SLA. It would be seen from the AONB. It would spoil the integrity of the northern village boundary. Moat Farm itself is a non-designated heritage asset and is surrounded by other listed buildings. A planning inspector stated that a previous proposal would be detrimental to the area by causing material harm. It was also stated that any building would outweigh the benefits to the village. TBC local plan excludes this site for development as other areas have been allocated for development.

Further this development is not in accordance with the Gotherington NDP which allows for redevelopment of Existing agricultural buildings. The proposed buildings for this site are of no architectural merit and will be viewed from Woolstone Hill. The farm buildings are currently in use and the land is farmed. By allowing for the removal of farm buildings on this site. The farm buildings will need to be built elsewhere on adjoining farmland and will add to the building mass.

5b	<p>21/01496/FUL</p> <p>Almsbury Farm, Vineyard Street, Winchcombe</p> <p>Access and Highways Safety Update</p> <p>Paragraphs 8.32 - 8.36 of the Committee report set out the impact of the proposal upon the existing highways network. The proviso of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is discussed and, following extensive talks with Gloucestershire County Council and the applicant, a condition has been suggested to secure the additional information and the implementation of the TRO. The condition would firstly require the applicant to outline the traffic management measures proposed and the timescales for doing so, the second element would require the agreed works to be implemented prior to any occupation or use of the site. Both the applicant and the County Council are content with the proposed condition and its requirement.</p> <p>Additional Conditions</p> <p>Following the review of the highways information and further discussions with Gloucestershire County Council and the applicant, the following conditions are recommended should permission be granted:</p> <p>1. Prior to the commencement of development a traffic management scheme to restrict parking along Vineyard Street to allow two vehicles to pass shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The traffic management measures hereby approved shall be completed prior to the first use or occupation of the permitted development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic onto the highway.</p> <p>2. The Development hereby approved shall not be brought into beneficial use until the site access works comprising verge surface treatment, as shown on drawing SK04, have been constructed and completed.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the safe and free flow of traffic onto the highway.</p> <p>3. Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted details of a construction management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan shall be adhered to throughout the demolition/construction period. The construction management plan shall include but not be restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking of vehicle of site operatives and visitors (including measures taken to ensure satisfactory access and movement for existing occupiers of neighbouring properties during construction); • Advisory routes for construction traffic; • Any temporary access to the site; • Locations for loading/unloading and storage of plant, waste and construction materials; • Method of preventing mud and dust being carried onto the highway; • Arrangements for turning vehicles; • Arrangements to receive abnormal loads or unusually large vehicles; • Highway Condition survey; • Methods of communicating the Construction Management Plan to staff, visitors and neighbouring residents and businesses.
----	--

	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.
5c	<p>23/00044/OUT</p> <p>Land At, Horsbere Drive, Longford</p> <p>The application site now falls within Longford Parish, following a recent boundary change. The Parish Council was notified of the application and has made representations as set out in the Committee report.</p> <p>Seven additional representations have been received from members of the public. The additional comments reflect those previously raised and are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Longford has enough housing already - Should be additional shop parking - Visually unattractive - GP surgery at capacity - The estate does not need more people and cars - Should be a communal area according to masterplan - Risk of flooding - Would contribute to antisocial behaviour and is unwelcome next to school <p>The recommendation remains a delegated permit as set out in the Committee report.</p>
5d	<p>22/01004/APP</p> <p>Parcel 2988, Downfield Lane, Twynning</p> <p>Paragraph 8.12 of the Committee report stated that amended boundary treatment details had been requested. An amended plan has now been submitted removing the proposed fencing where it would have been prominently visible in the public realm and replacing it with brick walling. Elevation details of the proposed boundary treatments to be used on the site have also been submitted and are considered acceptable.</p> <p>At Paragraph 8.23 the Committee report states that 67 individual trees are to be planted but the agent has confirmed that this should in fact have stated 89 individual trees.</p> <p>The recommendation is for approval as set out in the Committee report.</p>