



# STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices • Ebley Mill • Ebley Wharf • Stroud • GL5 4UB

Tel: (01453) 754 351/754 321

www.stroud.gov.uk

Email: democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 13 December 2022

6.00 - 7.12 pm

Council Chamber

### Minutes

#### Membership

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

Councillor Helen Fenton

Councillor Martin Brown

Councillor Doina Cornell

#### \* Councillor Victoria Gray

Councillor Lindsey Green

Councillor Haydn Jones

\*Absent

#### Councillor Helen Fenton (Vice Chair in Chair)

\* Councillor Jenny Miles

\* Councillor Loraine Patrick

\* Councillor Nigel Prenter

Councillor Mark Ryder

\* Councillor Lucas Schoemaker

#### Officers in Attendance

Principal Planning Lawyer, One Legal

Head of Development Management

Development Team Manager

Principal Accountant

Senior Democratic Services & Elections

Officer

Principal Planning Officer

#### DCC.089     Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Baxendale, Gray, Miles, Patrick, Prenter and Schoemaker.

As Councillor Baxendale had provided his apologies for the meeting Councillor Fenton proceeded as Vice Chair in the Chair for the meeting.

#### DCC.090     Declarations of Interest

There were none.

#### DCC.091     Minutes

The Chair advised that the Development Team Manager had requested an amendment to the minutes. They requested that at Minute number DCC.088 on the second set of bullet points, the third bullet point which starts "The Fit for the Future (FFF) Team" be substituted for:

*"Officers are looking to integrate older cases into the new system. Officers have already implemented a last touch date to sort dormant cases by date of last action. Officers are working with the Fit for the Future (FFF) team on new workload reporting tools to manage both new and historic cases."* The Development Team Manager advised this was because

he felt the minutes had committed the Fit for the Future team to something unintentionally and wanted to provide a more accurate record.

On being put to the vote the amendment was agreed.

**RESOLVED That the Minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2022 including the amendment outlined above were approved as a correct record.**

**DCC.092 Planning Schedule and Procedure for Public Speaking**

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

1	S.22/1503/HHOLD
---	-----------------

**DCC.093 68 Thrupp Lane, Thrupp, Stroud, Gloucestershire, S.22/1503/HHOLD**

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the application on behalf of the Assistant Planning Officer. The following points were highlighted:

- The application sought permission for the erection of a 2<sup>nd</sup> storey extension and detached garage and car port.
- The property sat within a large sloping plot and was deemed to be of no significant architectural merit.
- There were listed buildings within 50m of the site.
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> Storey extension would increase the ridge height by approximately 3.2m from 4.3m to 7.5m.
- A single storey element with a height proposed of approximately 5.4m.
- The distance between the gable end of the 2-storey element of the property at number 70 with the gable end of the 2 storey element of number 68 was approximately 8m.
- The roof design of the proposed detached garage at the front of the plot had been amended to lessen the impact so that it would sit down below the road level and hedge.

Councillor Aldam, Ward Councillor, was unable to attend the meeting and asked for a statement to be read on her behalf. The statement highlighted the following:

- There were oversights and errors within the application itself including the exclusion of the extension to the former Coach House at number 62 and the extent of the land owned by the Former Coach House from the map provided with the report.
- That restrictions had been placed on the planning permission for the neighbouring property which aligned to objections received for No.68 however similar restrictions had not been put in place.
- The proposal had been amended to drop the house down by 300mm however it was asked whether this small amount would make any difference on the loss of light and privacy which had been the subject of a number of objections.
- Asked why the Coach House and Coach House extension had been omitted from the statement of "being overlooked", given that the proposed northern second floor of No.68 would look into the Coach House.
- Loss of light would be a major issue in the winter for the Coach House.
- An unacceptable degree of being overlooked and loss of privacy for No.75.
- The site was overdeveloped, in accordance both with the feeling of the lane, and in its pushing yet another property out of reach for many people to afford.

- The development was out of keeping with the current dwelling, being oversized and overambitious, and not in keeping with the lane's topography.
- The current plan showed the garage to be much closer to the lane than all the other houses on that side of the lane. Therefore, the parking arrangements would be out of character with the rest of the area.

Mr Harris, a Parish Councillor from Brimscombe and Thrupp Parish Council spoke against the application. He asked the Committee to reject the application and highlighted the following points:

- The concerns raised by Councillor Aldam's statement regarding the inaccuracies of the application.
- The proposed development dominated the existing neighbours in particular the Coach House.
- The impact on the extension to the Coach House had not been considered adequately.
- The existing footprint of the property would largely be removed and therefore the proposal should have made a more imaginative use of the topography of the site to deliver additional space but without overlooking existing properties.
- Minor amendments had been made to the application, but no material changes had been made.

Mr Finan, local resident, spoke against the application and asked the Committee to reject the application for the following reasons:

- They had already observed a loss of light to the Coach House extension from October onwards due to the topography.
- The extreme loss of privacy was unwelcome and unnecessary and could be prevented if the property was dropped a further 3 to 4 metres.
- There had been 4 revisions to the application but the proposal had only been reduced by 30cm which was inadequate.
- They had received no consultation from the applicant.

Mr Reddaway, local resident, also spoke in opposition of the application and provided further information regarding the loss of light to ground floor of the Coach House at No. 62 Thrupp Lane:

- The map produced with the report did not identify the coach house and omitted the single storey extension to the south.
- There were 4 areas of glazing in the west facing front of the extension.
- The planning officers report stated that a materially detrimental level of overshadowing and loss of light would not be experienced however there was no reference to the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines and it was felt that the proposed increase in height of the property would substantially affect the levels of light for the Coach House and the shadow cast.

Mr Keyte, spoke on behalf of the applicant and highlighted the following points:

- There had been 19 representations referred to in the Officer's report however these had mainly been submitted by the 3 neighbouring properties to the north of the site. No objection had been received from the closest neighbour at No. 70.
- The first floor of the proposed dwelling was lower and shorter than first submitted.
- A permanent privacy screen would be attached to the side of the rear balcony and the garage had a hipped roof instead of one with end gables.
- The Planning Officer had concluded that the proposals were acceptable and in accordance with the development plan.

- The addition of an entire additional storey on top of the existing bungalow up to and beyond the height proposed in the current planning application would be permitted development and therefore the heights in the proposal were already deemed to be appropriate at a national level.

In response to questions from Councillor Brown the Principal Planning Officer confirmed the following:

- Loss of light wouldn't be a material consideration for No. 70 and as there were no windows proposed at either gable end elevation there would be no loss of privacy.
- The proposed balcony included a privacy screen which was proposed to be conditioned.
- There may be a degree of overshadowing for the for the Coach House however it would not warrant refusal of the application.
- There were 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows proposed which could result in obscure views on neighbouring properties
- Additional stories could be added to the property pursuant to the provisions of the General permitted Development Order without the need for a formal planning application, which was a material consideration.
- The proposed property was not within the direct building line of the Coach House.

The Head of Development Management advised the Committee that they would need to consider whether it was an unreasonable level of impact that would warrant refusal. The planning officer had come to the conclusion that there wasn't significant impact to warrant refusal.

In response to Councillor Jones the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the plot size was considered large enough to accommodate the increase in footprint from 70m<sup>2</sup> to 110m<sup>2</sup>.

Councillor Brown asked whether the proposal would meet the requirements of Local Plan Policy HC8, paragraph 4. It was confirmed that the property proposed to have a high level of insulation and double glazing which was a building regulation requirement but that there was no specific policy adopted by Stroud District Council that encouraged the use of renewable energy.

Councillor Cornell made reference to the conditions placed on the neighbouring property according to Councillor Aldam's statement. The Principal Planning Officer advised that the neighbouring property had applied for extensions, loft conversion and widening of the access. She confirmed that there were no restrictions regarding the height of the proposal and the conditions included were regarding the materials to be used to widen the access in order to protect the visual amenity of the area.

In response to a question regarding permitted development it was confirmed that the application wouldn't fall within permitted development as the footprint had been amended slightly however permitted development would allow a 2<sup>nd</sup> storey up to 3.5m higher than the ridgeline of the original bungalow.

Councillor Jones proposed the Officer recommendation and Councillor Ryder seconded.

Councillor Ryder stated that the voices of the residents and Parish were significant however, he did not know how the Council would be able to defend an appeal using current policy.

Councillor Jones stated that designs were often subjective, and he believed that the proposal was not overbearing enough to warrant refusal.

Councillor Brown echoed Councillor Ryders comments and advised that it was hard to find any planning grounds to refuse it although he wanted to.

Councillor Cornell advised that she was conflicted as she could see the potential impact but also understood the need for people to have the ability to extend and improve their homes.

On being put to the vote the Motion was carried with the Chair using their casting vote.

**RESOLVED To permit the application.**

**DCC.094      Development Control Committee Revenue Estimates - Revised 2022/23 and Original 2023/24**

The Principal Accountant introduced the report and highlighted the significant variances which included:

- 3.3 detailed the £115k increase to Pay Inflation.
- Fees and Charges Growth budget had been increased by £3k, this was explained in 3.4 of the report and a full list of these could be found at appendix A.
- The Proposed Budget Adjustments had also increased by £8k due to Service Budget re-profiling.

Councillor Cornell raised a query with how the budgets were set out for the coming year given the many uncertainties around inflation, costs and income. The Head of Development Management explained that they had to amend the forecast during this financial year due to lower than expected income. The planning fees were set by Central Government and rumoured to increase in 2023/24 however income from planning applications would always be difficult to predict and therefore budgets may need to be adjusted accordingly.

Councillor Green proposed and Councillor Brown seconded.

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

**RECOMMENDED  
TO STRATEGY**

**AND RESOURCES That the:**

- a) Revised Development Control Committee revenue budget for 2022/23 and original 2023/24 revenue budget were approved.
- b) Fees and Charges list as shown at Appendix A was approved.

**DCC.095      Budget Monitoring Report Q2 2022/23**

The Principal Accountant introduced the report and explained that the Monitoring Position for Q2 showed a projected net revenue overspend of £237k which was detailed in table 1. He provided further detail on the variances which included:

- £193k related to a lowered revised forecast of planning application fee income as a result of the cost of living crisis.

- £27k salary overspend due to additional resources required to support the Planning Team.
- £17k spent on fees such as: consultant fees, Building Preservation Notice claim payment and general data protection regulation compensation (GDPR) payment.

In response to Councillor Green, the Development Team Manager confirmed that the overspend in relation to the Enforcement Team was a result of agency staff. This was due to a high demand for the service coupled with higher than usual staff turnover. This was expected to reduce as more staff were recruited.

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

The meeting closed at 7.12 pm

Chair