

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 5th November 2018 at 7.30pm in the Stanton Hall, Church Piece, Charlton Kings.

- Present** Cllr Grimshaw (Chair), Cllrs Honeywill, Hodges, Gupta & Cllr Pat Palmer
- In attendance** There were 7 members of the public present & Cllr Matt Babbage
- 157/18/19** **Recording and filming of meetings.** There were no requests to record or film the meeting.
- 158/18/19** **Apologies.** Cllrs Hall & Kuznierski
- 159/18/19** **Declarations of interest.** There were none
- 160/18/19** **Minutes of the previous meeting.** The minutes of the meeting held on The 18th October 2018 were received, accepted and signed as a correct record.

DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- 161/18/19** **18/02062/TPO**
12 St Edwards Walk C.K. T1 – Sycamore – crown reduction up to 7m
No objection, subject to CBC Tree Officer’s approval
- 162/18/19** **18/02073/TPO**
22 Copt Elm Road C.K. T2 – Scots Pine – removal of two low – lying Branches **No objection**, subject to CBC Tree Officer’s approval
- 163/18/19** **18/02106/FUL**
Land at Ham Close C.K. Provision of CCTV cameras mounted on two 4-metre slimline poles. **No objection**, but would ask for a condition be made that the cameras must not be able to view into other residents’ properties
- 164/18/19** **18/02087/CACN**
Cooper 282A London Road C.K. 2 Larch Trees facing London Road – fell
Given that trees have previously been felled from this line of trees (with consent) the Committee objects to this application, unless the CBC Tree Officer judges that there is a need for the trees to be felled. If there is such a need then we would ask that a condition be made to plant & maintain suitable replacements, with the variety and location to be agreed with the CBC Tree Officer.
- 165/18/19** **18/02119/FUL**
48 Copt Elm Road C.K. Single storey side/rear extension following removal of existing conservatory and loft conversion including rear dormer **No objection**

166/18/19

18/01910/FUL

1 Okus Road C.K. Two storey side and rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer

Objection:

While various properties in Okus Road have been extended and altered, they are all still very much “of a piece”, with a cohesive design and street scene. Extensions are generally set back from the front building line. Each property maintains the curved arch above the front door and the bay window is the foremost part of each property.

The proposed WC, cloakroom and entrance hall extension forward of the building line and the bay window would obscure the arched porch to the front door and is out of character / place with the rest of the properties in the street, diminishing the cohesiveness of the street scene.

Similarly, the proposed materials for the dormer clash with the design of the rest of the properties and due to its prominent corner location will be very visible from the Cirencester Road.

The Committee has no objection to the principle of extending this dwelling but consider the front extension and choice of materials for the dormer to be inappropriate / of unsympathetic design.

167/18/19

18/02155/FUL

53 Copt Elm Road C.K. Proposed two storey and single storey extension to Rear

Objection: The proposed two storey extension is overbearing in character To the adjacent properties, given their proximity.

The change in pitch between the original roof and that of the two-storey extension is an awkward design, made more significant as the property is in the St. Mary’s conservation area.

The Committee were concerned as to the impact on light levels at the windows of No.51, but understand that the design does just satisfy the minimum requirements.

168/18/19 **18/02156/FUL**
55 Copt Elm Road C.K. Proposed single storey extension to rear **No objection**

169/18/19 **18/02147/FUL**
Ridgeways Oakley Road C.K. Proposed extensions and alterations, including replacement of conservatory with a two-storey side extension, and a proposed roof terrace over the garage in place of the pitched roof and removal of a two-storey side projection containing stairwell. **No objection**

170/18/19 **18/02171/OUT**
Land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise C.K. Outline application for residential development of up to 69 dwellings including access, layout and scale, with all other matters reserved for future consideration (revised scheme following refusal of application ref. 17/00710/OUT)

Objection:

Further to the CKPC Planning Committee Meeting of 5/11/18, we object to the above application with the following comments:

This application does little to address the Committee's concerns to the previous application for this site (17/00710/OUT), copied below for reference, except the reduction in numbers of dwellings.

With the limited time to assess the revised layout it has not been possible to corroborate the claimed reduced impact on the existing trees and hedges and the Committee would defer to the CBC Tree Officer's view on this.

With reference to drainage and flooding we again have found no reference as to how the attenuation system is to be maintained and managed. While the Committee is not qualified to check the adequacy of the proposed design, without such a management strategy in place the attenuation will not be effective in the long term.

As before, the Residential Travel Plan is simply not credible. The severity and length of the slope of Oakhurst Rise means that local amenities and services are not practically accessible on foot or by bicycle. Therefore, the vast majority of movements to and from the development, even to local amenities, will be by car. The Committee notes the plan to offer a grant towards the cost of one e-bicycle per dwelling, but would comment that the dwellings will have multiple occupants of varying age / size and that this is hardly a long-term plan. For example: what would happen when properties change hands? This e-bike promotion is little more than a gimmick and merely shows that the developer accepts that the site is not practically accessible on foot or by bike via Oakhurst Rise. Such isolation from the surrounding amenities is a poor design and will hinder the integration of residents of these new dwellings into the surrounding community.

We note the increase in open / wild spaces but would still comment that even if the re-location of the badgers to a new artificial sett was successful, the fact remains that the bulk of the area that the badgers now forage in will now be private gardens or open public spaces or roads and car parking. This can only bring the badgers in to conflict with people both in terms of damage to private and public landscaping and the likelihood of collisions with cars at night. The Committee would wish to see evidence / proof that such sett relocations, in close proximity to new housing, is sustainable and does not bring about conflict with people.

Lastly, as before, we reiterate our objection on the grounds that the impact on the quality of life for the existing residents of Oakhurst Rise is unacceptable. While the reduction to 69 dwellings would reduce the impact on these existing residents compared to the previous application, it would still transform the area from a quiet cul-de-sac to a busy through route. Sustainable Development is meant to have a positive impact on peoples' quality of life. This proposed development, while less damaging than the previous scheme due to the reduced number of dwellings, would again, beyond any reasonable doubt, have the opposite effect. The proposed access to the site remains unsuitable.

17 Jul 2018

Further to the CKPC Planning Committee meeting of 9/07/18, we object to the above application with the following comments:

The revisions to the Application in documents published on 2nd & 3rd July do not appear to make any material difference to what is only an outline application and do not address any of our previously stated objections as listed below.

We also note with some surprise that the Case Officer has published her report, recommending permit, on 12th July, even though the Statutory Consultation period expires 17th July.

Previous Comments:

In addition to those previous comments we note that the Barton Hyett Associates Arboricultural Review of the proposals suggests that the proposed development substantially under-estimates the impact on the trees on the site, including trees with TPO's, with the locations of trees being mis-recorded, their size under-measured and the required Root Protection Zones under-calculated. While the Committee is not qualified to assess which approach to the classification of trees and calculation of their Root Protection Areas is correct, this report does support and reinforce concerns previously raised by the public.

With respect to flooding concerns we also note the further objections from the Cheltenham Flood & Drainage Panel. The proposal does contain an attenuation system, but we have not found details of how it would be managed & maintained in the future. While the Committee is not qualified to check the adequacy of the proposed design, without such a management strategy in place it will not be effective in the long term.

The Residential Travel Plan is based on the premise that "The local accessibility of the site meets the bottom tier of the pyramid as it is accessible by walking and cycling, and is within close proximity to a range of local services and amenities". Since this is patently incorrect, the document's conclusions are similarly incorrect. The Committee understands that it has been suggested that the CBC Planning Committee site visit is organised so that the members of the Committee walk the route to assess the viability of pedestrian access at first hand. CKPC Planning Committee whole-heartedly support this call and would suggest that walking from the Sixways public car park, adjacent to the Doctor's Surgery, would be a good assessment of the viability of pedestrian or bicycle use to and from the site. Lastly, we reiterate our objection on the grounds that the impact on the quality of life for the existing residents of Oakhurst Rise is quite simply unacceptable. Sustainable Development is meant to have a positive impact on peoples' quality of life. This application would, beyond any reasonable doubt, have the opposite effect.

Comments from 14/9/17:

Environmental:

Members of the public have raised concerns over the environmental impact of the proposed development with concerns raised over the many mature trees, including large oaks, on the site and how many of them are protected or not protected. There are long established hedgerows on the site and the low intensity of use and cultivation has made the site a haven for wildlife including a well-established badger sett.

Heritage:

The development would have a significant impact of the setting of the listed buildings of the St. Edward's site

Drainage & Flood Risk:

A member of the public reported that a previous application in 1984 for this site for a three-acre scheme was objected to by Severn Trent on the grounds that the existing sewer system in the area had inadequate capacity for the additional volumes that would be generated. It was unclear whether this objection related to foul or surface water.

The geotechnical report in the application confirms that the underlying ground is impervious and will allow for no infiltration of surface water, ie that surface water cannot be managed by soakaways and that all surface water will have to be attenuated to prevent exacerbating downstream flood risk from the existing surface water system.

Local facilities:

Local public services are already under strain. All the local primary schools in the Parish and both Balcarras (in the Parish) and Pittville (the next nearest secondary outside the Parish) Schools are oversubscribed. The GP Surgeries at Sixways and Berkeley Place are reported as already having substantial waiting times. This development should not proceed without sufficient developer contribution to ameliorate the impact of increased demand on these services from the resultant population increase. Failure to provide sufficient additional capacity in these local services would make this Application detrimental to the quality of life of the existing residents of the Parish and make severely limit the availability of the services to the residents of this proposed development.

Transport & Access:

The access to the area via Oakhurst Rise is not suitable. The Committee would urge Officers and Members of the CBC Planning Committee to assess for themselves the length and severity of the slope to the top of Oakhurst Rise. This climb to the site would greatly limit the proportion of journeys that would be undertaken to or from the site by foot or bicycle, even to local facilities, preventing meaningful levels of sustainable transport.

Concerns were raised that the figures stated in the application documents for distances to local amenities such as Holy Apostles School are incorrect.

It is reported that during icy weather and snow the residents of Oakhurst Rise have to leave their cars parked at the bottom of Oakhurst Rise and around the Ewens Farm estate due to the severe risk of slipping and causing injury and / or damage. Such arrangements would clearly be impractical for the cars from a further 100 dwellings.

The forecast volumes of traffic to be generated by the development forecast are unrealistically low. A common-sense estimate of volumes may be an average of two cars per household each morning and evening. The Committee would suggest that CBC commission an independent forecast / modelling of potential traffic flows to and from the site to better assess the impact on existing residents and the road network (particularly the flows through Ewens Farm and the junctions onto London Road and Hales Road.

Lastly, and most significantly, the impact on the quality of life of the existing residents of Oakhurst Rise would be quite simply unreasonable. Those residents currently live in a quiet cul-de-sac. Their relatively narrow street will be transformed into a through route for all the movements of the residents of another one hundred dwellings and all associated deliveries to those properties. The National Planning Policy Framework clearly lays out a presumption in favour of Sustainable Development. Cl. 9 of the NPPF states:

"Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life, including (but not limited to):

- improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure."

This application can in no way improve the conditions in which the existing residents of Oakhurst Rise live, and fails to provide any realistic access to sustainable transport for residents of the proposed development.

- 171/18/19 18/02172/FUL
Lake End 39 Charlton Close C.K. Demolition of out buildings to side of dwelling and erection of new two storey side extension **No objection**
- 172/18/19 Validations There were no validations for our area
- 173/18/19 Any other business. There were None

the meeting concluded at 8.55pm

Date of next meeting Wednesday 21st November 2018 7.30pm **(please note change of day)**

Chairman