



# 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

14 June 2022

6.00 - 6.53 pm

Council Chamber

### Minutes

#### Membership

#### **Councillor Martin Baxendale (Chair)**

Councillor Chris Brine  
 Councillor Martin Brown  
 Councillor Jenny Miles  
 Councillor Jason Bullingham  
 Councillor Haydn Jones

\*= Absent

#### **Councillor Helen Fenton (Vice-Chair)**

Councillor Loraine Patrick  
 Councillor Mark Ryder  
 Councillor Ashley Smith  
 \* Councillor Victoria Gray  
 \* Councillor Lucas Schoemaker

\*  
\*  
\*

#### Officers in Attendance

Head of Development Management  
 Principal Planning Lawyer, One Legal

Majors & Environment Team Manager

#### DCC.060 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bullingham, Gray, Jones Smith, and Schoemaker.

#### DCC.061 Declarations of Interest

There were none.

#### DCC.062 Minutes

It was agreed to remove an error on page 3 of the reports pack where it listed the other members in attendance of which there were none.

**RESOLVED That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 May 2022 were approved as a correct record.**

#### DCC.063 Planning Schedule and Procedure for Public Speaking

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

1	S.21/2814/DISCON	2	S.21/2815/REM	3	S.21/1523/VAR
---	------------------	---	---------------	---	---------------

**DCC.064 Parcel H13, H14 & H15 Land West of Stonehouse, Grove Lane, Westend, Stonehouse S.21/2814/DISCON**

The Majors and Environment Team Manager introduced the application and explained that it was for the discharge of a condition for part of the land west of Stonehouse. It included parcels H13, H14, H15 and also part of the public open space and sports pitches. He showed the Committee the plans for the site and highlighted the main spine road, the 3 residential areas and the secondary roads. He further explained that the proposed designs allowed for a green character throughout the parcels which became more abundant around the north edge of the development. The public open space proposal had changed to include only 1 changing facility building.

Councillor Brine proposed and Councillor Patrick seconded.

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

**RESOLVED To PERMIT the application.**

**DCC.065 Phase 4B Land West of Stonehouse, Great Oldbury Drive, Great Oldbury, Gloucestershire S.21/2815/REM**

The Majors and Environment Team Manager introduced the application and explained that it was a reserved matters application for one of the areas discussed in Agenda item 4.1, the application was solely for the primary infrastructure. He showed the Committee the plans for the road and highlighted the cycle route and the where the nearest bus provisions would be.

In response to Councillor Browns question the Majors and Environment Team Manager explained that Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) Highways had commented that they were happy with the design with regards to safety. However, GCC were seeking more detail which should be part of the section 38 adoption process and thus, did not relate to the planning application. That was the reason why a deferral was not deemed necessary.

In response to a further question on the subject the Principal Planning Lawyer explained that the section 38 issues would be included in an agreement between GCC Highways and the developer. That agreement would specify what conditions and works GCC Highways would like to see completed as part of the highway construction and they would need to be completed by the developer prior to adoption of the highway by GCC.

Councillor Ryder proposed and Councillor Patrick seconded.

Councillor Ryder expressed his disappointment that the cycle path did not meet up with the bridleway as seen on the sites panel.

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

**RESOLVED To PERMIT the application**

**DCC.066**    **Land at, Pike Lane, Nailsworth, Gloucestershire S.21/1523/VAR**

The Majors and Environment Team Manager introduced the application and explained that it was for 17 dwellings across 2 sites. The proposal was granted outline permission in 2015 and the details were further approved in 2017. This application was to vary some of the details approved previously. The Majors and Environment Team Manager showed the plans for the site against the original plans and summarised the differences which included:

**Plot 1**

- Small increase to the height of the building
- The way they had constructed the end wall had been changed
- The Chimneys had been removed
- Additional space provided on ground floor

**Plot 8**

- Additional floor in the roof space which would make the building 2.5m taller than original plan
- Slight change to the treatment of elevation
- Internal alterations

Ms Norman, Parish Councillor, spoke on behalf of the Nailsworth Parish Council against the application. She asked the committee to refuse the application for the following reasons:

- The application was opposed by over 1000 people and later won by appeal.
- The development was given permission due to the design quality and cohesion which these proposed variations would degrade.
- Increasing the height would make the development more inappropriate within the setting.
- It was made apparent at a consultation for the revised local plan that the approval of the original application was regretted. Whilst this could not be changed, it was still possible to resist further changes that would further impact the site.
- The Nailsworth Design Statement was a material consideration. Policy 59 stated that Newmarket Valley should be preserved in a natural state. The development would undermine that and the new proposed changes would make it more intrusive.
- There was nothing in the Officers report to show that the changes would improve the design only make it worse such as "The loss of the chimney is a shame".
- Permission would not be given now for this site due to the new local plan so why allow a worse design to increase developer profits.

Mr Cobham, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He asked the Committee to support the application for the following reasons:

- Due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, work on site had been delayed. During that period, the designs were re-evaluated and the following improvements made.
- The updates did not undermine the bespoke and high quality approach seen across the development, whilst maintaining the use of the natural stone, natural roofing materials and aluminium windows.
- The amendments to the design of block 1 had resulted in a design that was more in keeping with the surrounding housing and the removal of the chimney was guided by the sustainability approach in order to achieve greater air tightness. They had also removed any wood burners as they did not comply with their zero carbon commitment.
- Following feedback from Officers the overall height of plot 8 was reduced.

- The plot was positioned away from other dwellings but still situated within the collective which included buildings varying in scale and several properties greater in height than the application proposed.
- Newlands homes had committed to delivering the site with zero carbon which would include greater insulation, solar panels, air source heat pumps and electric car charging.
- This site could be a flagship for high quality design and improving levels of sustainability within the district.

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

- It was believed that with the proposed changes, plot 8 would not be the largest dwelling on the site however it would be the tallest if all the dwellings were compared on a level surface.
- The outline application, originally refused by Stroud District Council (SDC), was for 17 dwellings, open space and an orchard with no further details. After being granted at the appeal the detail came to SDC at a later date and was approved.
- The oak tree was not to provide screening from the properties therefore would not be affected by the seasons.

Councillor Patrick questioned whether there were any windows on the side of the property on plot 8 which would be facing and potentially impacting the property behind it. It was confirmed that there was 1 window and 1 door proposed.

Councillor Brown questioned whether this new proposal for plot 8 would affect the views for the properties behind it. It was agreed that this would be the case. Councillor Brown further questioned whether they could make separate decisions for both plots. The Majors and Environment Team Manager stated that this would be possible however it would be easier to either approve or refuse the changes as a whole.

Councillor Brine Proposed to refuse the application, Councillor Patrick seconded.

Councillor Ryder expressed concerns that plot 8 seemed to be overdeveloped, with such a beautiful site, the proposals would be detrimental to the site.

Councillor Brine echoed Councillor Ryders concerns that the changes were too much, the design, size and height of the building had been changed completely and were too far from the original design.

Councillor Patrick stated that the proposal for plot 8 was too tall and it was unfortunate that it was submitted alongside the changes to plot 1.

The Chair echoed the concerns of the Committee and agreed that it did not improve the look of the development and did not fit in with the rest of the development. He further expressed that the Committee did not have any issues with plot 1 however felt that plot 8 would have a harmful effect on the rest of the development due to the proposed mass and height of the building. It was not felt that the changes proposed were in order to improve the look of the building but in order to achieve better views for the purchaser.

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

**RESOLVED To REFUSE the application.**

**DCC.067**    **Future determination of applications relating to Outline Planning Permission S.14/0810/OUT - Land West of Stonehouse**

The Chair introduced the report and explained that this was an outcome of the first meeting of the Development Management Advisory Panel (D-MAP). He explained that all of the reserved matters applications which related to S.14/0810/OUT would automatically come to the Development Control Committee for approval. However, the majority of these were now minor issues and it was felt that it was no longer required to be approved by the whole Committee. He further explained that Officers would make the final decisions with the caveat that should an application arise that Officers and the Chair feel required the Committees approval, then they can decide to put it forward for the Committee.

Councillor Brine expressed his support for this proposal.

Councillor Brown expressed concerns with landscaping and biodiversity issues which surrounded the site but otherwise expressed support for the proposal.

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

**RESOLVED That all future applications related to outline planning permission S.14/0810/OUT be determined under the officer scheme of delegation unless called-into committee under the current application call in procedure as set out in the Constitution.**

The meeting closed at 6.53 pm

Chair