



TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 27th July 2022

To: Cllr. Joanne Raywood, Cllr. Simon Raywood, Cllr. Hilarie Bowman, Cllr. Rod Gurney, Mr Ryan Maggs and Mr Richard Carey

You are summoned to a meeting of the Planning Committee, to be held in the Court Room,
Tewkesbury Town Hall, on

Wednesday 27th July 2022 at 7.30 pm.

Members of the public and press are welcome to attend.

Debbie Hill
Town Clerk
21st July 2022

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome.**
- 2. To receive apologies for absence**
- 3. To receive declarations of interest**
- 4. To receive and consider requests for dispensations**
- 5. Public participation** *(to provide members of the public/press with the opportunity to comment on items on the agenda or raise items for future consideration. In accordance with Standing Orders this will not exceed 12 minutes in total and 3 minutes per person)*
- 6. To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 13th July 2022**
- 7. To receive updates on matters arising from the minutes – for information only**

8. **To note correspondence**
9. **T1 Lime: Pollard back to old pollard points by 3m. To maintain good tree health and longevity.**
Planning Application
10 Oldbury Road Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5NA
Ref. No: 22/00800/TCA
10. **Replacement of existing timber window units with UPVC double glazed units throughout the building.**
Planning Application
The Maltings Station Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5NN
Ref. No: 22/00532/FUL
11. **Demolition of existing rear conservatory. Erection of a first floor side extension, single storey front extension, single storey rear extension and alterations to the fenestration.**
Planning Application
21 Churchill Grove Newtown Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 8EL
Ref. No: 22/00613/FUL
12. **To increase the size of side dormer.**
Planning Application
11 Tretawn Gardens Newtown Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 8EF
Ref. No: 22/00529/FUL
13. **Erection of a rear extension**
Planning Application
Royal Hop Pole Hotel Church Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire
Ref. No: 20/00894/LBC
14. **Erection of a rear extension**
Planning Application
Royal Hop Pole Hotel Church Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire
Ref. No: 20/00893/FUL
15. **To note any additional applications on the Planning Portal which will expire before 17th August 2022 and agree further actions**
16. **To note any additional information on the Planning Portal regarding applications to which this committee has already responded, and agree further actions**



TEWKESBURY TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Wednesday 13th July 2022

Present: Cllrs. J Raywood, S Raywood, H Bowman, R Gurney, and Mr R Carey

MINUTES

- P.22/23.076 Welcome.**
The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. The meeting started at 7.30pm
- P.22/23.077 To receive apologies for absence**
Mr R Maggs (work commitment)
Cllr. S Raywood (will probably be late, due to work)
- P.22/23.078 To receive declarations of interest**
Cllr. S Raywood – DPI – employed by the Planning Inspectorate
- P.22/23.079 To receive and consider requests for dispensations**
None
- P.22/23.080 Public participation** *(to provide members of the public/press with the opportunity to comment on items on the agenda or raise items for future consideration. In accordance with Standing Orders this will not exceed 12 minutes in total and 3 minutes per person)*
None

RC arrived in the meeting at 7.33pm.
- P.22/23.081 To approve the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 29th June 2022**
Proposed by RG seconded by HB
It was resolved to **approve** the minutes
- P.22/23.082 To receive updates on matters arising from the minutes – for information only**
None that are not covered elsewhere on this agenda
- P.22/23.083 To note correspondence**
None

P.22/23.084 Residential Development (up to 235 dwellings), associated works, including infrastructure, open space and landscaping and pumping station. Construction of a new vehicular access from Mythe Road and demolition of existing structures.

Planning Application

Land East Of Mythe Road, Tewkesbury

Ref. No: 22/00610/OUT

Observations: The following response has been approved by the Full Council.

Objection, on the grounds that there is insufficient information to enable the Town Council to reach a conclusion.

- The applicant suggests that the SUDS and open spaces could either be managed by a management company or adopted by the local authority. The Town Council is concerned that, unless they are adopted by the local authority, there could be difficulties in ensuring clarity of responsibility in the future. It is really important to us to be assured of the appropriate ongoing maintenance of the SUDS in particular, to ensure that properties downhill and downstream of this development are protected from the possibility of flooding due to development on this site.
- One of the strategies for the management of surface water offered by the applicant is the use of permeable surfaces in the gardens. Unless it can be conditioned that subsequent developments in and modifications to those gardens, (for example, the laying down of paving and sealed surfaces,) do not adversely affect permeability, then this is not a realistic strategy at all.
- The Town Council considers that it is not appropriate for the recreational facilities to be privately managed either, because play facilities should be available to all children, regardless of where they live, whereas it has been known for privately-managed facilities to be exclusively for children who live on the development, plus their friends. An example of this has recently been publicised in the press.
- The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment suggests that the long term benefits to landscape features and green infrastructure combined with the improved PRow links would outweigh any long term, residual effects on the landscape character of the Site and surrounds or effects on visual amenity. The Town Council considers that, at this stage, when we don't know how large the houses will be, or how tall, it is difficult to know whether or not this opinion can be verified. There is concern that the view from vantage points within the town, such as the Abbey tower, which is a significant tourist draw, will be impaired by this development.
- The energy plan lacks strategies for the reduction of energy use and carbon emissions. The Town Council is dismayed that the developer has not made a commitment to, for example, the provision of electric car charging points, the incorporation of solar panels, the use of heat pumps, or grey water recycling.
- The Town Council is disappointed that the Planning Authority does not deem an Environmental Statement to be necessary for this application. It is also difficult for us to assess the potential impact on wildlife and flora in the area because the surveys that would give us this information have not been required at this stage. The Town Council regrets that the applicant does not seem to have anticipated forthcoming environmental legislation in the preparation of this application

- The necessity to fell at least three trees has been noted. TTC would want to see a significant net gain in biodiversity as a result of this development and wishes to know how this will realistically be achieved.
- We cannot find, within any of the documents provided, any consideration of the Mythe Railway Nature Reserve, which is very close to the site. Consideration must be given to whether or not this proposed development will have an impact on the wildlife within the nature reserve.
- The Town Council would expect this development to be in accordance with the latest Borough Plan (June 2022), but many of the reports provided cite the 2006 plan. The latest plan has been in circulation for long enough prior to adoption, along with its timetable for adoption, that the Town Council believes it should have been a prime consideration in the planning of this proposed development.
- The Town Council is concerned that the location of this site will encourage suburban sprawl to the north of the town that would overwhelm the identity of Tewkesbury as a small market town with a built environment that is rich in historical heritage.
- Paragraph 2.10 of the Travel Plan refers to 'Melksham'. This is clearly a copied and subsequently tweaked document and it raises the question for us of how much of this travel plan is based on data specific to Tewkesbury and how much to another town altogether. The proposed strategies to encourage active and sustainable travel are not obligatory on householders so cannot be cited as a strategy. In any case even if, initially, householders opt for active and/or sustainable transport, they are not obliged to encourage the same in future buyers of their property. However, the options for householders to manage without recourse to a car are so small in this location as to be almost negligible for most people. The available bus service merely provides the opportunity for a short shopping or social trip into Tewkesbury on a Monday only and it is understood that the local demand shopper bus has an uncertain future. Thus, the current service provision is totally unsuitable for commuters and secondary school pupils. The cost of providing a sufficiently comprehensive bus service to enable households to live at this location without a car is understood to be prohibitive.
- This application is for 235 houses but we do not know how big the houses will be and therefore we do not know how many car owners they will accommodate. Therefore, there is insufficient reliable data on which to base a robust transport assessment. There is already an issue with air quality where Mythe Road meets Bredon Road and the top end of the High Street. Traffic from this development is highly likely to exacerbate that, and indeed the Transport Assessment acknowledges that there will be increased queuing on the approaches to the Black Bear mini roundabout. There is already significant queuing here during peak times.
- The Transport Assessment suggests that there is plenty of provision for active modes of transport such as cycling and walking. This is simply not the case. The assessment does not seem to take account of the local terrain, the rivers and the floodplain. While there are a lot of footpaths located near the site, most of them lead away from local services and many of them are not accessible. Some of them are impassable during floods and no walking or cycling routes into town can avoid the A38 Mythe Road/A38 High Street/B4080 Bredon Road mini roundabout. This roundabout cannot easily and safely be negotiated by walkers and cyclists, particularly schoolchildren

and there is no nearby pedestrian crossing. The proposed development is half-way up a hill; in places there is a footpath on one side of the road only and the speed limit is 40mph at the entrance to the site. On the downhill side of the road, motorists will only just have reduced their speed from 50mph.

- Ascending the hill to the site will be a challenge to many cyclists, people carrying shopping, very young, elderly, or disabled walkers and also to users of mobility scooters.
- A safe crossing to the western side of the Mythe Road is a necessity, in order to create safe sustainable access to the Garden Centre and the Mythe Railway Nature Reserve.
- This development is likely to make the Mythe Road busier and visibility is already not good for people turning into the road from the garden centre. Just down the hill from the site, the Ledbury junction is known to local people as an accident 'black spot'.
- According to the transport assessment, the MSOA data indicates that 8% of commuters cycle in Tewkesbury. This does not take into account the fact that the terrain in the northern part of the area (within which this site is situated) is totally different from that in the southern part. The Mythe area is almost exclusively different from the rest of the MSOA, which is much flatter, more densely populated, and contains elements of a suitable network of routes for cycling on. A more detailed interrogation of the data will show that the 8% figure is largely due to the unusually high proportion of people who commute by cycle from Priors Park, which is at the other end of town. In the Town Council's opinion therefore, this statistic does not demonstrate that residents of this site are likely to commute by bicycle.
- With regard to local rail services, the local railway station is not realistically accessible from this site by active or sustainable travel means unless travellers have plenty of spare time. Car journeys to the station can also take a long time, especially at peak times, due to traffic congestion and this is exacerbated during times of flood. The commute time by rail to Cheltenham may only be 10 minutes but the journey from the Mythe to the railway station will take very much longer. In any case, not many trains currently stop at Ashchurch and it is not clear when, or by how much, this will improve.
- Construction traffic and delivery lorries will have to access the site from the north ie. not via the Mythe Bridge or through the town, because of weight restrictions. The Town Council is concerned by the statement in the waste strategy that promotes the idea of regular small deliveries of materials to site, on the grounds that damage during storage will be reduced. The benefit of this may well be outweighed by the additional fuel costs inherent in more frequent delivery journeys, not to mention the additional pollution and congestion that is caused by the increased number of vehicles on the road.

The Town Council recommends that much more substantive 'on the ground' research needs to be carried out by the applicant in order to demonstrate the suitability of this site for a housing development if, indeed, it can be considered suitable. Although the Town Council acknowledges that the Borough as a whole faces a shortfall in the supply of land to meet its future housing needs, development on this site would potentially create more problems than it would solve, and the people who already live in this parish would bear the brunt of those problems, with respect to a deterioration in air quality, and additional strains on road and drainage infrastructures that are already overstretched. That is a prospect which the Town Council cannot support.

P.22/23.085 Proposed two storey side and single storey rear extensions plus replacement doors and windows

Planning Application

12 Carrant Road Mitton Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 8AD

Ref. No: 22/00630/FUL

Observations:

No objection

SR arrived in the meeting at 7.48pm.

P.22/23.086 Proposed change of use of offices to a mixture of 9 no. one and two bedroom flats and studio apartments with conversion of outbuildings to provide two dwellings.

69-70 High Street Tewkesbury Gloucestershire GL20 5LE

Ref. No: 19/00686/FUL

Observations:

The Town Council thanks the applicant for providing the bat survey.

However, there is still considerable concern regarding the proposed provision of waste management on the site. The block plan would seem to indicate that the alleyway through which the wheelie bins would need to be dragged is not wide enough to accommodate them. In addition, there seems to be no provision for food waste bins. The town Council is concerned that this aspect of this proposal has still not been considered in sufficient detail to demonstrate that it will work.

The room which had previously been designated as a cycle store appears to have been absorbed into one of the ground floor flats. It is not clear what role this room now has and how it will now contribute to the vitality of the street scene in a more positive way than a cycle store would.

P.22/23.087 To note any additional applications on the Planning Portal which will expire before 27th July 2022 and agree further actions

None

P.22/23.088 To note any additional information on the Planning Portal regarding applications to which this committee has already responded, and agree further actions

None

P.22/23.089 To note the decisions made in June 2022, in respect of planning applications to Tewkesbury Borough Council

Noted

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.20pm

Chairman's signature

27th July 2022