

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD AT QUEDGELEY COMMUNITY CENTRE ON WEDNESDAY 20<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2026 AT 7.30PM**

**PRESENT** Cllr Powell, Cllr Wilcox, Cllr Smith, Cllr Mrs Williams, Cllr Williams Cllr Lee, Cllr Smith, Cllr Massey

**OFFICER PRESENT** Mrs Beverley Aldridge

<b>PD.011-26-27</b>	<p><b>a) Elect Chairman</b> Cllr Wilcox <b>PROPOSED</b> Cllr Powell take the Chair for the next term. Seconded Cllr Massey    Vote                      Unanimous                      <b>So resolved</b></p> <p><b>b) Elect Vice Chairman</b> Cllr Lee <b>PROPOSED</b> Cllr Wilcox as Vice Chair for the next term Seconded    Cllr Powell    Vote                      Unanimous                      <b>So resolved</b></p>					
<b>PD.012/26-27</b>	<p><b>Apologies</b> None received.</p>					
<b>PD.013/26-27</b>	<p><b>Declarations of Interest</b> None received</p>					
<b>PD.014/26-27</b>	<p><b>Adoption of the Minutes dated: Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> April 2026</b> Cllr Lee <b>PROPOSED</b> to adopt the above Minutes as a true and accurate record of the meeting. Seconded                      Cllr Hobbs    Vote                      Unanimous                      <b>So resolved</b></p>					
<b>PD.015/26-27</b>	<p><b>Applications for Determination Received Prior to the Meeting</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="418 1084 1477 1211"> <tr> <td data-bbox="418 1084 628 1211">P/004 26/00367/FUL</td> <td data-bbox="632 1084 940 1211">84 Saddlers Road</td> <td data-bbox="943 1084 1477 1211">Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side and rear extension.</td> </tr> </table> <ul data-bbox="418 1216 1477 2004" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification is sought regarding the provision of “off-road parking.” The application states that three parking spaces will be provided however, this appears inaccurate. The proposal is likely to result in a net loss of parking spaces and may create additional parking pressures and highway safety concerns in the surrounding area. The frontage of the property has been surfaced with gravel extending over the public footpath, resulting in a loss of public amenity. This appears contrary to Paragraphs 114 and 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which require developments to provide safe and suitable access for all users, and Policy INF1 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy, which seeks to ensure safe and efficient access and transport arrangements. The proposal also conflicts with JCS Policy SD4, which requires development to respond positively to its context and provide appropriate layout and movement arrangements.</li> <li>• The oil pipeline adjacent to the property lies within the relevant consultation/compliance zone. It should therefore be confirmed that the necessary technical advice has been obtained and, where required, the appropriate works consent secured prior to determination of the application. Failure to properly assess infrastructure constraints and safety implications would conflict with NPPF Paragraph 187, which requires planning decisions to ensure development is appropriate for its location taking into account risks arising from existing infrastructure and</li> </ul>			P/004 26/00367/FUL	84 Saddlers Road	Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side and rear extension.
P/004 26/00367/FUL	84 Saddlers Road	Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side and rear extension.				

	<p>land conditions. The proposal should also be assessed against JCS Policy SD14 relating to health and environmental quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the proposed dwelling is described as detached, the separation distance is minimal and would give the appearance of a terraced form of development. This would materially alter the character and appearance of the existing street scene and erode the established pattern of development in the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with NPPF Section 12, in particular Paragraph 135, which requires development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. It is also contrary to JCS Policy SD4, which requires development to respect site context, local character, scale, massing and spacing.</li> <li>• The property has already undergone extensive development. If permission is granted, the removal of the garage should be controlled by condition to ensure that sufficient private amenity space remains within the rear garden for a dwelling of this size. Overdevelopment of the site would adversely affect residential amenity and the quality of accommodation for future occupiers, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 135(f), which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The proposal also raises concerns under JCS Policies SD4 and SD14 relating to amenity, layout and environmental quality.</li> <li>• Provision should also be made for an appropriate bin storage area. The proposed extension does not adequately allow for waste and recycling bins to be stored to the rear of the property and moved conveniently to the frontage for collection. This would lead to poor visual appearance and practical servicing issues, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 135, which requires developments to function well and maintain a high standard of amenity. The omission also conflicts with JCS Policy SD4, which requires high quality and practical design solutions as part of well-planned development.</li> </ul>	
P/005 26/00401/FUL	38 Naas Lane	Variation of condition 1 on planning permission 24/00949/REM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological Report – JCS Policy SD9 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) The Ecological Report submitted in support of this application appears inaccurate, incomplete, and poorly prepared. The document contains duplicated text, interrupted sentences, and sections that do not make logical sense. This raises concerns regarding compliance with Joint Core Strategy Policy SD9 relating to biodiversity and ecological protection. A full, independently prepared and professionally reviewed ecological report should therefore be required before this application can be properly considered.</li> <li>• Reserved Matters Time Limit – Planning Procedure Compliance Condition 2 of the original outline planning permission required that any application for approval of reserved matters be submitted within three years of 30 January 2023. Based on the information available, the further reserved matters application submitted in March 2026 appears to fall outside that prescribed time limit. While previous reserved matters approvals may influence the commencement period for development, they do not extend the deadline for submitting a fresh reserved matters application. Furthermore, although the amendments are described within the application as “slight”, the scale and nature of the proposed changes appear more substantial. In particular, the increase in accommodation and associated impacts suggest that a new full planning application should be submitted instead.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in Bedrooms and Parking Concerns – JCS Policies INF1 and SD4 The proposal includes approximately a 50% increase in the number of bedrooms, which is likely to result in increased vehicle ownership and additional parking demand. It is not considered that sufficient off-road parking provision has been demonstrated, particularly as no dedicated visitor parking spaces appear to be included within the scheme. This raises concerns regarding potential overspill parking on the surrounding highway network and conflicts with the aims of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint Core Strategy Policy INF1 (Transport Network), and</li> <li>• Joint Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Design Requirements).</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• Surface Water Drainage and Soakaways Insufficient information has been provided regarding the proposed soakaway system. The application does not clearly demonstrate: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. who will be responsible for the ownership and long-term maintenance of the soakaways;</li> <li>2. how the system will be managed and funded; and</li> <li>3. what contingency measures are proposed should the soakaways fail.</li> </ol> A full surface water drainage management and maintenance plan should therefore be submitted, including details of the responsible management body and funding arrangements to comply with JCS policies INF2 (Flood Risk Management, SD3 (Sustainable Design &amp; Construction) and SD14 (health &amp; Environmental Quality). Consideration should also be given to directing all surface water to the existing sewer network instead of relying solely on soakaways. </li>   <li>• Parking Surface Material If permission is granted, a condition should be imposed requiring approval of the parking surface material. The use of loose stone could result in debris being carried onto the public highway, creating both highway safety and maintenance concerns. This will support the requirements of the Joint Core Strategy Policy SD4 relating to high quality and safe design standards.</li> </ul>
<b>PD.016/26-27</b>	<b>Traffic &amp; Transportation</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Parking on Church Drive continues to present an issue in relation to Section 72 and Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980 and is therefore considered to be a matter for the police. The issue will be reported to Gloucestershire Constabulary for their attention and any action deemed appropriate.</li> <li>b) The vehicle parking on tactile paving in Wendling Drive has been reported to the parking officer at Gloucestershire County Council and is being investigated.</li> <li>c) B4008 bridge, request update information in relation the use of the concrete barriers and traffic lights which prevent vehicles turning left when there is no need to do so due to the bridge being one way only.</li> <li>d) M5, Jkt 12 pot holes write to National Highways for update on when these will be filled.</li> <li>e) Following the Infrastructure Meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> Aril 2026 chase for an update on the Spatial Development Strategy position.</li> </ol>
<b>PD.017/26-27</b>	<b>Neighbourhood Priority Statement</b> Update – nothing further to report at this stage. Chase Gloucester City Council to formally designate Quedgeley for this purpose.
<b>PD.018/26-27</b>	<b>Correspondence</b> None received.

<b>PD.019/26-27</b>	<b>Business for Referral</b> Recommend to Full Council, Quedgeley wish to remain independent under the Local Council Review of Gloucester City Council.
<b>PD.020/26-27</b>	<b>Date of Next Meeting:</b> 17 <sup>th</sup> June 2026