

Copy Minutes

Planning & Licensing Committee

Wednesday 13 March 2024

23/02101/FUL

Land and Properties at Berkeley Close

South Cerney Glos GL7 5UN

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/March2024

Members stated that Cirencester was a 'net importer' of employees, and that traffic implications existed. They also urged that if any issues existed as a result of the proposals, that residents report these to environmental health.

RESOLVED: That the Planning Committee DELEGATES AUTHORITY to the Interim Head of Planning Services in consultation with the Chair of Planning and Licensing Committee to determine this application subject to:

- a) the completion of a UU prior to the Decision Notice being issued, which secures a financial contribution sufficient to enable the local highway authority to progress and implement the parking restrictions described in this report, and which also secures the submission of (and the opportunity to determine) an RMA for the additional landscaping described in this report;
- b) agreement of a satisfactory scheme for controlling noise emitted from the development, if such a scheme has not already been agreed prior to the Planning Committee meeting;
- c) the suggested draft conditions set out in this report;
- d) delegated authority being given to the Interim Head of Planning Services to amend and/or add to the suggested draft conditions prior to the Decision Notice being issued, where such amendments would be legally sound and would not deviate significantly from the purpose of the draft conditions;
- e) expiry of the necessary additional public consultation exercise;
- f) careful consideration being given to any further representations received in response to that additional public consultation exercise; and
- g) referring the application back to the Planning Committee if any new or altered material considerations arise before the grant of reserved matters approval which, in the view of the Interim Head of Planning Services, may have the effect of altering the resolution.

Voting Record

8 for, 1 against, 1 abstention, 1 Absent/did not vote

For	Against	Abstain
Andrew Maclean	Dilys Neill	Gary Selwyn
Daryl Corps		
David Fowles		
Ian Watson		
Julia Judd		
Mark Harris		
Michael Vann		
Ray Brassington		

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/March2024

The Case Officer introduced the application, highlighting the design of the houses and apartments. The application was for the demolition of 56 no. existing REEMA non-traditional residential units and 21 lock up garages, stopping up of existing highway and the erection of 84 no. new residential units, the retention and refurbishment of 2 existing residential units. It also included an associated new proposed adopted highway, access drives, open space, external works and landscaping at Land and Properties at Berkeley Close, South Cerney Gloucestershire GL7 5UN.

Public speakers

An Objector, Nigel Bailey addressed the Committee, highlighting the loss of green space.

Councillor Philip Nicholas, from South Cerney addressed the Committee, also highlighting the loss of green space .

A representative of the applicant, Millie Nicholls, (employed by Bromford Housing) addressed the Committee. They explained that there would be additional housing and improved accommodation resulting from the proposal.

The Ward Member, Councillor Layton addressed the Committee supporting the application. Councillor Layton explained that the application fits in with the corporate strategy of additional affordable housing, and explained that it was deferred to the Committee solely due to the areas of land shown on page 107 being owned by the Council.

Member Questions

Members asked what REEMA was. It was explained that this was reinforced prefabricated concrete housing.

Members discussed biodiversity net gain, making reference to the mandatory requirement which had recently been introduced. The Case Officer explained that the biodiversity officer had no objections to the application, and that biodiversity net gain was not mandatory at the time the application was submitted.

Members asked officers about the loss of green space, and whether the Case Officer felt that the development was suitable in light of this.

The Case Officer stated that in their view, the improvement in the environmental credentials of the housing, the play areas provided and the highway crossing near the junction of Broadway Lane and High Street, which on balance overrode the loss of green space, but it was ultimately up to Members to decide for themselves.

Members asked whether it would have been possible to refurbish the existing houses, which were not in good condition, to improve the environmental credentials. The Case Officer stated that two were being refurbished but that they were not privy to such discussions in terms of how this would be done.

Members asked what would happen to the four houses that were in private ownership. The Case Officer explained that they would remain the same.

Members asked if any agreements were in place in regard to the Council's ownership of the footpaths. The Case Officer stated that the footpath only became apparent whilst the

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/March2024

unilateral undertaking was being drafted. However, and this was not a material planning consideration, and would be a matter for the Council's Assets team.

Members discussed the South Cerney Neighbourhood Development Plan, POLICY SC10 of which designated the area as a local green space, development of which would be supported only in specific circumstances. Officers noted that the green space allocated was believed to not be greatly utilised.

Members asked what the tenure for affordable housing was. The Case Officer explained that the application was for a mix of social and shared ownership.

Member Comments

Councillor Andrew Maclean proposed refusing the application. Councillor Maclean commended the houses, stating they were great quality houses, and energy efficiency. However, parking concerns and the contradiction with Policy SC10 of the Neighbourhood Development plan led them to propose refusing it.

Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal, agreeing with Councillor Maclean's statements and stating that the applicant should have done more to engage with the Town and Parish Council and the Objector.

Some members disagreed, stating that they felt that the much improved quality of housing overrode these concerns.

The Interim Development Management Manager drew the committee's attention to the lack of quality of the open space, and suggested that the Committee may wish to defer the item in order to allow the applicant to engage with community concerns.

After hearing this, the proposer and seconder of the proposal both agreed that they wished to change their proposal to deferring the application instead.

Some Members disagreed, stating that this would slow down the process.

RESOLVED: That the Planning and Licensing Committee agree to defer the application for a period of up to 6 months to explore the possibility of green space retention.

Voting Record

For 6, Against 4, abstention 0, 1 absent/ did not vote

For	Against	Abstain
Andrew Maclean	Dilys Neill	
Daryl Corps	Gary Selwyn	
David Fowles	Mark Harris	
Ian Watson	Ray Brassington	
Julia Judd		
Michael Vann		