



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

06 September 2022

6.00 - 7.48 pm

Council Chamber

Minutes

Membership

Councillor Martin Baxendale (Chair)

Councillor Martin Brown
 Councillor Victoria Gray
 Councillor Haydn Jones
 Councillor Chris Brine
 Councillor Mark Ryder

*= Absent

Councillor Helen Fenton (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Jenny Miles
 Councillor Loraine Patrick
 Councillor Lucas Schoemaker
 * Councillor Jason Bullingham
 * Councillor Ashley Smith

Officers in Attendance

Head of Development Management
 Majors & Environment Team Manager
 Senior Planning Enforcement Officer
 Development Team Manager

Locum Planning Lawyer
 Planning Officer
 Democratic Services & Elections Officer

Other Member(s) in Attendance

Councillors Jockel

DCC.074 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Smith, Bullingham, Brine and Ryder.

DCC.075 Declarations of Interest

There were none.

DCC.076 Minutes

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 June and 26 July 2022 were approved as a correct record.

DCC.077 Budget Monitoring Report Q1 2022/23

The Principal Accountant introduced the report and explained that the purpose of these reports was to notify Members of any known significant variances within the budget which for this report, there were none.

The Chair, Councillor Baxendale, proposed and Councillor Brown seconded.

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

RESOLVED To note the outturn forecast for the General Fund Revenue budget for this Committee.

DCC.078 Planning Schedule and Procedure for Public Speaking

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

1	S.22/0918/FUL
---	---------------

DCC.079 Thomas Keble School, Eastcombe, Stroud, Gloucestershire S.22/0918/FUL

The Planning Officer introduced the application and explained that the application was for the secondary school located within the settlement boundary for Bussage, it had been identified by the government re-building programme as requiring substantial work. She showed the plans for the site and highlighted the following:

- The buildings that were due to be demolished,
- The proposed buildings' proximity to residential properties,
- The site was within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- The construction of the new building would begin first and then the demolition of the main building would follow to help minimise the disruption to pupils.
- The south of the site contained protected open space which the new building would encroach on, an additional mini pitch was proposed on the eastern side of the site to mitigate the loss which Sport England were content with.
- Designed to blend in with the residential buildings surrounding the school to minimise impact on the AONB.

The Planning Officer explained the key concerns raised by residents and what had been done to alleviate them:

- Concerns raised from Stonecote Ridge regarding overbearing and the impact on privacy. A shadow analysis had been completed and confirmed that the building would not cause overshadowing. In addition, an obscure glazing condition was also recommended.
- Concerns raised regarding potential noise. Environmental Heath Officers had assessed the application and confirmed that subject to the conditions the proposal would not create an unacceptable level of noise.
- Concerns raised regarding the storage containers on the site, all but one of which had been re-positioned towards the eastern boundary.
- Concerns were raised regarding the access and its increased usage. This was an existing access and it was felt unreasonable to condition its usage.

Councillor Jockel spoke as a Ward Member for Chalford. He stated that he agreed with concept of the development and many of its aspects and therefore supported the development in its principal. He further informed the Committee that he would like to register his main objection with the application which was its positioning on the site. He then drew the Committee's attention to the following points:

- Had there been a proper community consultation, the design would have been moulded by a variety of views and would likely look different to the one proposed.

- They could now only comment on the aspects of the design as opposed to influencing the design itself.
- Residents felt that their concerns had been framed as standing in the way and holding up the project.
- The Members needed to consider additional bunds and fencing and possible internal space reconfiguration.
- Members should also look to maximise the embedded sustainability of the design.
- The planning of the travel and construction phase would need to be drafted and then monitored.
- They needed better provisions for cycle parking and encouragement for active travel such as electric vehicle charging.
- Could Members consider the ecological impact of the carbon and the construction materials and whether the use of local suppliers and supply chains could be conditioned.

Mr Morris-Wyatt, a Parish Councillor, spoke on behalf of Chalford Parish Council in favour of the application. He stated the following:

- Their written response was included as part of the reports pack.
- They shared the regrets with the poor consultation process however, they were supporting the project due to its importance to the community.
- They understood the reasons for the design and layout of the school regarding the protected spaces and AONB. However, they asked Councillors to do what they could to ameliorate the material impact on the surrounding residential houses.
- They were grateful for the requested Conditions 3, 5, 13 & 16 (pages 67-71 of the reports pack) however questioned whether these could be extended to include the Parish Councils within the consultation on discharge. This was due to the local knowledge of the areas. including knowledge of the narrow lanes and concerns with large delivery lorries causing congestion and potential accidents.
- He requested that Condition 5 be amended so as to not include peak school hours. The current condition allowed construction traffic between 8am-6pm.
- They shared concerns with the infrastructure surrounding the school and asked for increased:
 - Walking and cycling corridors
 - Wider pavements
 - Pedestrian crossings
 - Cycling routes
 - And 20mph zones if required.
- They further raised concerns with the pedestrian entrance to the school causing congestion to the nearby cul-de-sac, Stonecote Ridge, where pupils were dropped off instead of the main entrance.

Ms Exley, a Parish Councillor, spoke on behalf of Bisley with Lypiatt Parish Council in favour of the application. She raised the following key considerations to the Committee:

- They were aware of the large amount of time spent formulating the design for the building and they did not wish to slow the process down further by amending the design.
- The design of the layout and position of the new building was well thought out forming a central hub around the classrooms and additional spaces.
- There were many detailed drawings yet to be drawn up which would directly impact nearby residents, she asked for a condition to allow the Parish Councils to comment

on the detailed designs including choice of materials and the construction management plan.

- The majority of the current buildings were screened with mature trees, it would be essential to provide further planting to ensure these new buildings would also be screened.
- They recommended a crescent shaped bund to be planted to allow for extra screening and provide pupils with a shaded area to enjoy. This should be in place of the reseeded sports pitch and would allow for materials to be recycled and re-used on site.
- Planting ahead of the construction would allow time for the trees to establish.

Mr Leach, a local resident, spoke against the application. He asked the Committee to reject the application for the following reasons:

- The residents directly affected by the proposal were not opposed to the re-development of the school, they were objecting only to the size and location of the new building.
- During a Zoom meeting in April 2021, it was minuted that the public consultation would be held at the pre-planning application stage. These objections could have been avoided had the earlier consultation taken place.
- Many of the objections received referred to the omission of the community consultation which had not been addressed.
- The proposed building was overbearing, intrusive and would greatly infringe on residents' privacy, security and quality of life.
- Amending the plans to lower the floors in the building facing the western boundary and therefore the houses (from 3 storeys to 2) and increasing the floors on the building facing the southern boundary (from 2 storeys to 3) would reduce the impact on the residential houses.
- Students were already being dropped off into the residential cul-de-sac where the footpath entrance to the school resided, which had caused increased traffic. The proposed building had an entrance nearer to this footpath which would increase the traffic in an area unsuited to heavy traffic.
- There were a number of contradictions included within the planning statement.
- Statement 5.17 related to the public consultation. The residents dispute this statement. They had 1 weeks' notice of a public presentation event and 48 hours to make comments. This was not early, proportionate or effective consultation as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Compulsory and substantial trees planted between the proposed building and the residential dwellings would soften the impact.

Mr Shaw, The Head Teacher, Spoke in favour of the application. He asked the Committee to support the application for the following reasons:

- The current school buildings were constructed in the 1960's using the intergrid framing system which had since been given a 30 year life span. The buildings were now 60 years old.
- The Department for Education announced a school re-building programme in 2021 and a structural survey of the school found several of the school buildings in urgent need of replacement.
- Following that, the projects team entered into pre-application process with Stroud District Council (SDC) which resulted in an exemplary scheme.
- The project then progressed to the community information process which consisted of: a leaflet drop, an online survey and an in person public event held at the school.

- Officers have confirmed within the report that there would be no harm to neighbouring communities. Despite this it has been agreed to use obscure glazing on the upper floor windows.
- The new proposal would bring the following enhancements to the site:
 - A fresh, modern aesthetic.
 - Existing trees would be safeguarded, and new trees would be planted.
 - Biodiversity net gains would enhance habitats for protected species.
 - Sustainable features including air source heat pumps, electric vehicle charging and solar panels.
 - Improved drop off and parking arrangements.

The Planning Officer gave the following responses to questions asked:

- The pre-application discussion that took place prior to the formal submission of the application was an informal discussion. However residents may have thought this was a formal meeting and that their views were not being heard.
- SDC also had a statutory process to consult residents which had taken place correctly. A number of concerns were alleviated this way such as the storage containers' location and the addition of the obscure glazing.
- Condition 4 on page 68 of the reports pack related to the appearance of the containers which would need to be approved before the condition could be discharged.

Councillor Brown questioned whether there could be additional planting along the western boundary. The Planning Officer confirmed that often large trees which would provide the best screening tended to be overbearing in themselves to neighbouring properties.

Councillor Brown further queried the Parish Councils' requests to be consulted on both the construction management plan and the travel management plan. The Head of Development Management confirmed that they could consult with and share the plans with the Parish Councils once received. However, the Local Planning Authority would need to make the final decision within the statutory timeframe for discharge of conditions.

In response to Councillor Fenton, it was confirmed:

- that the application had been deemed as acceptable and therefore there were no requests to alter the proposal. Had the application been deemed unacceptable then further alteration requests would have been made.
- Sport England requested the additional mini pitch to mitigate the loss of the protected open space.

Councillor Brown raised concerns regarding bicycle parking on site. The Planning Officer explained that the site currently accommodated 20 bicycle parking spaces, this was proposed to increase to 50 spaces. Councillor Brown further questioned whether there would be any electric vehicle charging points to which the Planning Officer confirmed that they would be working closely with Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) Highways to ensure a satisfactory number but the figures were not available at that time.

The following responses from Officers were given to Members:

- GCC Highways were the technical experts and their views carried weight.
- The school was already an existing building therefore Officers could only assess the improvement the proposal brought as opposed to a new building which would need to meet different criteria.
- 688 Pupils attended the school.

- The largest distance between the proposed building and the neighbouring properties on the western boundary was 45m and the shortest distance was 38.5m.
- The pedestrian access to the site was an existing access, it also would be managed thorough the travel plan.

Councillor Brown proposed the Officer recommendation and The Chair, Councillor Baxendale seconded.

Councillor Schoemaker proposed an amendment to condition 5 and an additional condition to limit construction delivery traffic between the hours of 09:00 – 15:00 Monday to Friday. Councillor Fenton Seconded.

Councillor Fenton proposed a further amendment to Condition 22 to replace the mini sports pitch with additional planting on the western boundary. Councillor Schoemaker seconded.

The Head of Development Management informed the Committee that the loss of the sports pitch could potentially lead to an objection from Sport England.

The Locum Planning Lawyer advised that the Committee should debate and vote on the first amendment before debating the second amendment.

Councillor Brown debated whether it was too early to condition the construction traffic as there had not yet been a construction management plan drawn up.

After being put to a vote the first amendment was carried.

Councillor Fenton stated that residents had asked for greater screening between their houses and the proposed building. She further debated the alternative to pitch sports such as cycling and whether Sport England could be content with an increase drive from the school for cycling provisions.

Members debated whether the loss of the sports pitch would lead the whole application to fall through and whether the use of an informative would be better than an amendment to the condition.

Councillor Patrick debated the potential uses of the mini pitch and whether it could be narrowed to allow planting along the border of the boundary.

The Head of Development Management confirmed that should the amendment be approved; the Officer's would recommend deferral until such a point that Sport England could be consulted on the changes. This was echoed by the Locum Planning Lawyer

After being put to a vote the amendment was rejected with 3 votes for and 5 against.

Councillor Schoemaker proposed to add an informative to maximise the amount of planting on the western boundary as practically possible. Councillor Fenton seconded.

After being put to a vote the amendment was carried unanimously.

Councillor Patrick expressed her concerns with the developer's strict timescale. She further debated that they should have taken time earlier in the process to consult with the Parish and its communities.

After being put to a vote, the Motion was carried with 5 votes for, 1 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED To PERMIT the application subject to an amendment to Condition 5 removing the reference to construction related deliveries and an additional condition to restrict construction delivery traffic on site between 9am and 3pm Monday to Friday and adding an informative advising the applicant of the need to maximise the screening planting on the western boundary as is practically possible.

The meeting closed at 7.48 pm

Chair