

PLANNING COMMITTEE**Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 9th July 2018 at 7.30pm in the Stanton Hall, Church Piece, Charlton Kings.**

Present Cllr Grimshaw (Chair), Cllr Hall (Vice Chair), Cllrs Gupta, Hodges, Honeywill, & Kuszniarski

In attendance There were no members of the public present

42/18/19 **Recording and filming of meetings.** There were no requests to record or film the meeting.

43/18/19 **Apologies.** Cllr Williams

44/18/19 **Declarations of interest.** There were none

45/18/19 **Minutes of the previous meeting.** The minutes of the meeting held on The 28th June 2018 were received, accepted and signed as a correct record.

DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

46/18/19 **18/01298/FUL**
The Haven 86 East End Road C.K. Two storey side and rear extension (revised scheme following 18/00327/FUL). **No objection**

47/18/19 **17/00710/OUT**
Land adjacent to Oakhurst Rise C.K. Revised plans or additional information. Outline application for residential development of 90 dwellings including access layout and scale with all matters reserved for future consideration. The application now proposes 91 dwellings, with 40% affordable housing provision. All comments previously submitted in respect of this application remain on file.

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.

48/18/19

18/01261/FUL

72 King William Drive C.K. Proposed single storey extension. **No objection**

49/18/19

Validations There were no new validations for our area

50/18/19

Any other business None

The meeting concluded at 7.45pm

Date of next meeting Monday 23rd July at 7.30pm

Chairman