



STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices • Ebley Mill • Ebley Wharf • Stroud • GL5 4UB
 Telephone 01453 766321
 www.stroud.gov.uk Email: democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

03 May 2022

6.00 - 7.46 pm

Council Chamber

Minutes

Membership

Councillor Martin Baxendale (Chair)

Councillor Chris Brine
 Councillor Martin Brown
 Councillor Jason Bullingham
 Councillor Helen Fenton
 Councillor Victoria Gray

*= Absent

Councillor Trevor Hall (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Haydn Jones
 Councillor Mark Ryder
 Councillor Lucas Schoemaker
 Councillor Ashley Smith *
 Councillor Loraine Patrick *

Officers in Attendance

Head of Development Management
 Majors & Environment Team Manager

Democratic Services & Elections Officer
 Principal Planning Lawyer, One Legal

DC.053 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Patrick, Smith and Gray.

DC.054 Declarations of Interest

There were none.

DC.055 Minutes

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 March 2022 were approved as a correct record.

DC.056 Planning Schedule and Procedure for Public Speaking

Representations were received and taken into account by the Committee in respect of Applications:

1.	S.21/2758/REM	2.	S.21/2759/REM
----	---------------	----	---------------

DC.057 Unit 1 Parcel E4 Land West of Stonehouse, Grove Lane, Westend, Stonehouse (S.21/2758/REM)

The Majors and Environment Team Manager introduced the application and explained that it was a reserved matters application for employment use. He further informed the committee of the following:

- The site location within the larger Great Oldbury development including residential dwellings.
- This application was to finalise the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the building.
- What the building would look like with a modern appearance and different shades of grey cladding.
- The landscaping plans included a line of oak trees along the highway access and some planting at the frontage of the building near to the roundabout.
- Late pages were circulated which included a revised comment from Highways and updated conditions.

Ms Kambites, Parish Councillor, spoke on behalf of Stonehouse Town Council against the application. She asked the committee to reject the application for the following reasons:

- The footpath diversion was unclear although this was in the process of being resolved.
- The number of bike parking and electric vehicle (EV) charging points was inadequate for the size of the development.
- The energy statement to prevent solar panels being put on the roofs was not in line with the emerging local plan policy SO5 – climate change and environmental limits.
- Concerned with the size and height of the unit as it was in close proximity to residential dwellings.
- Unit would obstruct views when looking across from Oldends Lane Playing Field.
- The planting scheme was unimaginative.

Mr Hooper, the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He asked the committee to support the application for the following reasons:

- The application related to a 2,192m² employment building at the southern end of the site.
- This parcel was the first of the employment area to be delivered as part of the wider mixed use allocation.
- The principal of the employment use was established as part of the outline application which also included parameters for the scale and height of the buildings.
- Details of building height, layout and setting were further approved by Members as part of condition number 46 on the outline application.
- Due to the legally binding site wide restriction on energy production, they were unable to put solar panels on the roof of the unit, therefore they had taken a fabric first approach to minimise the demand for electricity and heating.
- The existing Public Rights of Way were involved with an ongoing wider application through Gloucestershire County Council to vary the routes.
- During the course of the application all of the consultee comments had been addressed by the applicant.
- This proposal would deliver important local employment possibilities and would bring growth to the area.

The Majors and Environment Team Manager gave the following answers in response to questions from Councillors:

- The contract the agent had entered into with the energy supplier was not a material planning consideration.
- The outline planning application included maximum heights and size of buildings.
- This application was to look at the layout and the design.
- The layout plan showed two EV charging points with the potential for an additional two points if they were required.

The Head of Development Management confirmed in response to Councillor Jones that the decision to request solar panels on the roof would need to have been made in the outline application stage. She further informed the committee that the emerging local plan did not carry any weight at that point in time as it still needed to pass through the examination in public stage. The policies in the draft plan would need to have received no objections in order to begin to carry weight at an earlier stage, if objections were received then the policies still would carry little weight until the inspectors written views were received.

Further questions were asked and the following responses were given by the Majors and Environment Team Manager:

- The Officer recommendation was to approve based on the evidence provided which included consideration of the comprehensive objections from the Town Council.
- The outline permission had a longer period of time between the approval date and the commencement of work which explained the length of time between the outline application and this application.
- The late pages included comments from Highways for the gate to be set back 15m from the highway. It was believed that this had been updated in the plans where the gate could be seen to be set back from the dotted line of the highway. It was agreed to get this checked outside of the meeting.

Councillor Fenton questioned the 8 bicycle spaces provided and asked how many employees were likely to be using the unit in order to ascertain what proportion of bicycle spaces were available. The Majors and Environment Team Manager explained that the use of the building was currently unknown, it was likely to be either office use or warehouse use which would vary in the number of employees.

Councillor Schoemaker raised concerns with the unknown use of the building and questioned whether they could get any more detail. The Head of Development Management drew attention to condition 11 on page 38 of the document pack which stated that the development would not be brought into use until details of the bicycle parking and changing facilities had been submitted. They explained that at this time they should know more information regarding the use of the building which would allow some flexibility to request further bicycle parking should there be a larger workforce. It was confirmed that this was the same case with the EV charging which was covered by condition 12.

In response to Councillor Brown the Head of Development Management explained that the discharge of a condition wouldn't normally come back to Committee, the exception to

this was made when outline planning permission was granted however, this discharge of condition would not fall under that exception.

The Head of Development Management recommended the use of an informative for the Committee to show their views on maximising both the bicycle parking and the EV charging points.

In response to Councillor Jones, the Principal Planning Lawyer confirmed that the conditions were based on an assessment of the site from a Highways Authority and would require approval from the Local Planning Authority before the buildings could be used. He further mentioned that should the Committee feel strongly enough, they would need to provide justification in order to go against the Officers recommendations.

Councillor Ryder questioned condition 13 and the fact that there was no mention of construction working hours. The Majors and Environment Manager confirmed that they could add that the construction hours needed to be agreed as part of the Construction Management Plan under condition 13.

Councillor Ryder proposed the Officer recommendation with the amendment to condition 13 and an added informative relating to maximising the bicycle and EV charging spaces. Councillor Schoemaker seconded.

Councillor Schoemaker expressed support for the development.

Councillor Jones expressed concerns with the energy supplier contract and frustrations with the limited powers they had available to them due to the outline approval.

Councillor Brine expressed his wish to support the Town Council with their objections however, due to the outline approval he would be supporting this application. He debated how they could assist with changing people behaviours to cycle and walk to work and that they should try a soft approach and ask developers to consider their comments rather than trying to condition to a level that was outside their control.

Councillor Schoemaker debated setting up a charter for developers to sign up for minimum standards of sustainability.

After being put to a vote, the Motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED To PERMIT the application subject to the updates included in the late pages, the amendment to condition 13 to include the construction hours and the added informative to maximise the bicycle and EV charging provisions.

DC.058 Parcel E4 Land West of Stonehouse, Grove Lane, Westend, Stonehouse (S.21/2759/REM)

The Majors and Environment Team Manager introduced the application and explained that it was for the second unit which was next to the first application. He drew the Members attention to the following:

- The site was in close proximity to residential properties.

- The building was facing away from the residential properties with the service yard on the other side of the building to mitigate noise.
- He showed the plans for the site and the proposed building which was similar in style to the previous applications.
- There was a landscape bund with additional planting to the rear of the building which included hedge planting on the top of the bund and tree planting proposed between the residential properties and the hedges.
- The building was larger than the previous application with a height of 14.5 metres.
- Late pages were released which updated the conditions.

Ms Kambites, Parish Councillor, spoke on behalf of the Stonehouse Town Council against the application. She asked the committee to reject the application for the same reasons as listed in the previous application and the additional reasons listed below:

- This building was bigger than the previous and was a lot closer to residential dwellings.
- Concerned with how much the building and the bund would shelter the houses and deprive them of sunlight.

Mr Hooper, the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He asked the committee to support the application for the same reasons as listed in the previous application and the additional reasons listed below:

- The application related to a 5,215m² employment building at the western side of the site.
- The outline application had already established a number of parameters for both the scale and the height of the building as well as its uses.
- The landscaping bund included additional planting which would break up the view of the building and would provide sufficient screening once maturity was reached.
- There was a potential occupier already in talks with the developer which couldn't be named at the time but was a local business looking for room to expand and grow their business.

The Chair questioned how long ago the bund was planted and what species it included. The Majors and Environment Team Manager confirmed it had been there for longer than 2 years and consisted of a mix of native species such as: Hawthorne, Hazel, Holly, Blackthorne and Wild Privet which all have great biodiversity value.

The Majors and Environment Team Manager gave the following answers in response to questions from Councillors:

- The species were not evergreen however, they were dense hedges which would drop their leaves at different times which meant there would be sufficient coverage.
- There was very little room between the bund and the proposed building, not enough room to plant a row of Leylandii. If it were planted on top of the bund it would be likely that it would kill off the native species.

Councillor Ryder questioned the maintenance of the hedge and what was in place for this. The Majors and Environment Team Manager confirmed as part of condition 8 there was a request for a landscape ecological management plan where the maximum hedge height could be included.

Councillors debated the colour of the building and whether it was the best choice to blend in with its surroundings. The Majors and Environment Team Manager confirmed they had originally chosen a neutral non-descript colour in order for the building to not stand out.

Councillor Schoemaker raised concerns over the number of electric vehicle spaces as in the previous application. The Head of Development Management confirmed that the conditions they discussed on the previous application were also relevant to this one therefore they were hoping for the flexibility to amend these at the discharge of the condition stage.

In response to Councillor Schoemaker the Majors and Environment Team Manager confirmed that the site had always been a mixed use residential and employment site.

Councillor Brine proposed and Councillor Ryder seconded the Officers recommendation with the addition of the informative as above in the previous application, the amendment to condition 13 to include construction hours and the amendment to condition 8 to include the hedge height maintenance and maximise the bicycle and EV charging spaces.

Councillor Brine reminded Councillors that this was a mixed use site and therefore would always be difficult however, they could try to mitigate the noise and the views as best as they could. He further reminded them that if there were noise or other issues after the build then there were other ways to manage those such as Environmental Health.

After being put to a vote, the Motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED To PERMIT the application subject to the updates included in the late pages, the amendment to condition 13 to include the construction hours and the amendment to condition 8 to include the hedge maintenance and the added informative to maximise the bicycle and EV charging provisions.

DC.059 Application and Enforcement Performance Statistics Q1 2022

The Head of Development Management Advised the Committee that there would be a meeting of the Development Management Advisory Panel (D-MAP) tomorrow where they would be looking into the figures in more detail.

There were no questions or comments.

RESOLVED To NOTE the report.

The meeting closed at 7.46 pm

Chair