

*Parish Council's comments in respect of application
no: 19/00880/REM*

19/00880/REM / reserved matters pursuant to outline permission 15/01376/OUT (Outline planning application for the erection of up to 9 dwellings and associated access). The Reserved Matters for which the application seeks are: appearance, layout, landscape and scale. The reserved matters application also seeks to discharge conditions 10 (Highways Scheme), 12 (Construction Logistics Plan), 14 (Ecological Enhancement and Landscape Management Plan), and 15 (Finished Floor Levels). / Land East of Bell Lane Poulton Gloucestershire. (Details and plans dated 2nd, 6th and 10th December 2019)

Although there was much local objection to this application, which was only approved on appeal, in the circumstances we find the variation in style of the properties attractive.

It is unfortunate that a decision has been taken to remove the dovecote to the southernmost property as this added to the character of the estate.

We are in agreement with restrictions on the construction of extensions, alterations to the roof, porches and other buildings on the site.

This will not permit the building of garages which would cause a deleterious infilling of the development.

There is anxiety within Bell Lane about the impact of light pollution.

Does the Planning Committee feel that the provision listed under paragraph 12 of the proposed conditions gives sufficient control over any environmental damage that could be caused?

Likewise is the committee confident that the hedgerow to the south of the site will be sufficiently retained?

If this is not the case the reserved matters should be refused.

In the appeal inspector's decision this hedge was clearly deemed to be critical in protecting the heritage asset, the Poulton Conservation Area to the south, screening it from the impact of the development.

We are very concerned that the inclusion of a retention pond is being considered for approval under the reserved matters of appearance and landscape.

This is putting the cart before the horse

The pond forms part of the drainage of the site and hence the reserved matters cannot be approved prior to approval for compliance with the drainage conditions.

If this happens, at the best, it could be seen as an error but, at the worst, a ploy to surreptitiously permit the presence of a pond.

We would contest that the attenuation pond forms no part of the existing approval and markedly deviates from the planning inspector's conditions specifically note six referring to oversized pipes.

Therefore as they stand these reserved matters cannot be approved.

*Parish Council's comments in respect of application
no: 19/01613/FUL*

19/01613/FUL Full planning application for the installation of an overland management strategy comprising an oversized pipe and detention basin to deliver more effective drainage attenuation / Land East of Bell Lane Poulton Gloucestershire (4th December 2019 - Non-technical Drainage Summary)

19/02171/COMPLY / Compliance with Conditions 6, 7 and 8 of Permission 15/01376/OUT - Outline planning application for the erection of up to 9 dwellings and associated access (appearance, layout, landscape and scale reserved for future consideration) / Land East Of Bell Lane Poulton Gloucestershire - (8th November 2019 – Non-technical Drainage Summary)

Flooding is a concern in Bell Lane, London Road, Ashbrook Lane and at the bridge over the A417 to where all the surface water runs. *Incidentally a property flooded at the Bell Lane / London Rd junction last night.*
The local lead flood authority has stated that “it is satisfied that the proposed surface water drainage scheme is suitable for the development.”

It does not go so far as to say that it will be effective in controlling flooding of the houses on the estate itself and to the north of the site.

The land drains for the large arable field above the development run through the site and will be disrupted by construction.

The drainage of this land may be impaired..

The impact on the land drains has not been sufficiently taken in to account and could cause flooding issues for the new and adjacent properties.

In October 2016 the LLFA said that the issues of the land drains will be dealt with at the detailed planning stage. We cannot see that this has been done.

In the application 19/01613 concerning the 0.23 hectares above the development we need to know to where surface water will run when the detention pond and pipe are full.

Will it overflow on to the lower new housing and/or to the neighbouring properties.

It is no exaggeration to say that water pours across this land during persistent rainfall. *Go and look at today*

The state this land can get in to was highlighted by the soakaway test carried out in January 2015 when no soakage was observed due to the waterlogged soil.

As the land waterlogs there is no absorption by the soil and the surface water run off increases above that allowed for, from 40% of rainfall to 100%.

The council is opposed to the inclusion of an attenuation pond on the estate which is mentioned in 19/02171/Comply.

This is contrary to the original planning application, approved on appeal, which specifically refers to the oversized pipes inside the boundary.

It clearly therefore does not comply with condition six of the appeal.

This states “development should not take place until a scheme for surface drainage including the strategy addressing how the overland flow drains to **oversized pipes** inside the boundary is addressed.”

The land was purchased for development in full knowledge of that fact.

An attenuation pond was not part of the appeal inspector’s condition.

Surely there comes a time when an agreement is an agreement.

The case officer has questioned what the perceived health and safety issue with regard to a pond might be.

It is drowning which is a real and not a perceived risk..

Children, visiting and resident, should be able to enjoy this open area in complete safety and without parents having any unnecessary concerns.

There is added risk during hours of darkness.

The maximum water depth of the pond is 1.3 metres.

The use of underground pipes importantly increases the recreational area available and would be safer.

Health and safety may not be a planning issue but any approval to install a basin is a planning responsibility and safety is an element of that.

To imply that the pond is safe as for most of the time it will be a dry grass lined impression is misleading.

If there is water in it, and it is intended to hold water, it is a risk.

As this land becomes impermeable during prolonged rainfall it will form a wet muddy depression and probably never be dry in winter.

The Council is opposed to this application in that:

Insufficient evidence has been given to show that the new arrangements will control flooding on and off the estate.

There has been a failure to understand all the local issues involved.

Hence the application **and** the compliance should be refused.

Installation of a pond is a safety risk and is a marked deviation from the oversized pipes consented to at the planning appeal.

It therefore does not **comply** with the conditions set at the appeal.

The drainage of the site must be considered as a whole and not in two parts.

CDC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING, 15 JANUARY 2020

19/01184/FUL, Land Parcel E419306 N212935, North of Midford House, Windrush

SUMMARY OF KEY OBJECTIONS

Introduction

- My name is Constance Mead. I live with my husband and two young children (aged 4 and 6) at Church Cottage, Church Lane, Windrush, about 60m from the site. I speak on behalf of a number of objectors. We ask the Committee to refuse planning permission.
- A number of technical/legal points have been made on our behalf in a letter to the Council from our solicitors, Forsters LLP, dated 6 January 2020, supported by independent Highways and Noise reports. We hope that the Members of the Committee will read that letter and those reports, as we are simply unable to summarise all of the important material considerations within the time allowed at the meeting. At the time of writing these notes Forsters LLP have received an acknowledgement but no substantive response from the Council to any of the material points they have raised.
- What is now being proposed is very different to the initial proposal, and has gone through countless changes over the last year, apparently in an attempt to satisfy conditions which by their competing nature cannot all be satisfied.
- The applicant has failed on four previous occasions to get permission to develop this site, including on appeal in 2015. The site has not changed since then. All that has changed is the applicant's suggestion now that he may employ an apprentice. This suggestion, which the objectors have always considered implausible (in view of the apparent lack of facilities required for employees; the small amount of space for one person, let alone two, to operate in; the lack of parking space on site for an employee as well as the applicant and safe space for deliveries/collections, etc), has now been completely undermined by the applicant's most recent noise report which, in response to concerns about the greater impact of two people working on the site, confirms that the proposed workshop is in fact for a 'one man operation'

1. Major error in Planning Officer's report: Apparent re-characterisation of the site since the last application was dismissed by Inspector's decision

- The Planning Officer ('PO') suggests that the boundary treatment has changed since the applicant's appeal was dismissed in 2015 and that as a result of this change, the site is no longer 'open countryside'. This is simply **not correct** as a matter of fact, and the objectors have serious concerns that the Committee may be misled by PO's report on this point (notwithstanding the amendments she has made to it since this was highlighted to her).
- PO has failed to take proper account of the factual history of the boundary treatments provided by Carla Pether, Southview, in her email to PO on 7 November 2019 (which has for some reason not been published on the Portal; further copy attached as

Appendix 1). A domestic hedge had **already** replaced the 'rural hedgerow' which was previously there, and was several feet high extending well above a new post-and-rail fence, by the time of the 2014 decision. It had grown even further by the time of the 2015 appeal decision.

- Please see attached Appendix 2 consisting of 4 photographs, including the out-of-date 2009 Google Street View relied upon by the PO at the 13 November 2019 committee meeting which shows the old 'rural hedgerow' on the boundary of Southview. These photos show that the boundary treatment changed by the time of the 2014 decision but has not changed since the Inspector's 2015 decision refusing permission.
- The site therefore remains 'open countryside'. CDC's Local Plan (at 6.2.6), states that open spaces '*can provide settings for buildings, variety in the street scene, vistas, and buffers between developed areas. Cotswold settlements derive much of their character from open spaces within the built-up area and it is important that they are protected from inappropriate development*'.

2. Visual and landscape impact: design, location, visibility, etc

- The site makes a significant contribution to the appearance of a holloway or sunken lane at this stretch of the lane, when approaching and leaving the village, with banks on each side and some stone walls, trees and hedges. It is a transitional green space, which helps to break up the built environment and forms an important linking element to the wider landscape. The latest plans (posted on the Planning Portal on Friday 10 January) show that it is now proposed to cut deeply and widely into the bank. This would radically change the appearance of the lane, and is very different to the proposal which the applicant's supporters have previously commented upon.
- A timber building with a metal sheet roof would be starkly different to the local stone vernacular in Windrush and would look prominently out of place. There is no other such building visible in Windrush.
- We understand that the relevant test under EN11 is that the development 'preserves and enhances the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area in terms of siting, scale, form, proportion, design, materials and the retention of positive features'. PO is wrong to suggest that the proposal satisfies this and that the design would not harm the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Please see our 15 May 2019 letter for a detailed response, which addresses this by reference to particular provisions in the Design Code.
- One example is that the Design Code is clear that the use of untreated timber boarding is appropriate in the context of new large commercial, industrial or agricultural buildings in '*less sensitive settings*', i.e. not buildings of the size proposed which are in the AONB and a Conservation Area, and located near listed buildings (the owner of the nearest listed building, Orchard Cottage, has very recently died, and was not able to comment in 2019).
- PO's Report is misleading where it suggests that only '*glimpses*' of the building would be seen either when entering or leaving the village. If an entrance over 5m

wide were to be created (as per the applicant's plans posted on the Planning Portal on Friday 10 January), the building would be clearly visible when travelling south.

3. 'Public benefit'

- PO has conceded that the proposed development would cause 'harm' to the Conservation Area, so that harm has to be outweighed by the 'public benefit'.
- The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's guidance defines 'public benefits' as anything which delivers economic, social or environmental objectives as described in the National Planning Policy Framework, but critically "they should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit".
- We would highlight the following:
 - The proposed development would create a private benefit to the applicant in the transfer of an existing business from a rented site to a site which he already owns. This is simply a business decision, involving the relocation of an existing business, and does not add to the local economy.
 - The applicant initially stated that he has an intention to take on an apprentice, but there is no proposed condition that he should do so. He could lawfully not employ an apprentice at all, without being in breach of any condition.
 - The alleged intention to take on an apprentice is unsupported by any evidence such as a Business Plan or proposed infrastructure for the facilities which are required by law on premises where there are employees (e.g. toilets, washbasins and rest area).
 - PO appears to have accepted without question the applicant's statement that it is only the saving of the rent which the business currently pays which would enable it to afford the cost of an apprentice. But the latest (publicly available) business accounts show that the retained earnings in the business are nearly £800,000, and it has just under £250,000 sitting in the bank. It is obvious that the business could readily afford an apprentice now.
 - It is obvious from the applicant's noise consultant's latest comments (posted on 9 January 2020) that he himself has informed the consultant that the workshop is to accommodate his '*one man operation*'.
 - We note that the PO's own comments on parking envisage the site accommodating the applicant's own vehicle plus (occasionally) a delivery vehicle, but are based on an assumption that there would be no vehicle belonging to an apprentice. (The applicant's own original statement, at para 7.3 of his D&A statement, that there would be two vehicles (his and an apprentice's) on site during daily working hours appears to have gone out of the window.)
- In summary, if (which she does not make clear) PO concluded that the applicant has provided '*clear and convincing justification*' of public benefit, as the applicant is required to do, she was wrong to do so.

4. Highways

- The objectors are very seriously concerned that this proposed development would create an 'accident waiting to happen' in the single-track lane which curves around a bend on a steep hill leading in/out of the village.
- In his response dated 7 January, the GCC Highways Officer has made the following recommendations:

'I am minded towards giving the [applicant] an opportunity to demonstrate [that] they can turn within the land in their ownership and the possibility of creating an informal passing place/ loading area on the crossover frontage to be of both suitable access and local benefit....'.

- Regarding his first recommendation about turning vehicles on the site, the applicant's own latest plans, posted on 10 January, showing the dimensions of cars and vans relative to the parking area on the site, already demonstrate that vehicles will not be able to turn within his land ownership and will be required either to reverse into the site or reverse out of the site onto the highway. This will not change, because the site is so small that cars will never be able to turn on it. Cars and vans would therefore be reversing several times a day into/out of the site on this very narrow lane.
- With regard to the recommendation about possibly cutting into the opposite bank (on the inside of the bend in the road, thus creating a blind corner), the Highways Officer may be tacitly acknowledging the deficiencies of the application, and in any event is not considering the application from an aesthetic or planning point of view. His suggestion of a possible informal passing place/loading area is not taking into account the detrimental impact of such changes on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the Cotswold AONB. Further consultation would need to be carried out not just with the public but also the Conservation Officer and the Tree Officer.
- The provision of a passing place or an increase in the width of the access in this location would require significant ground works due to the steep gradient of the bank. The ground works would be considered an engineering operation constituting operational development. Such significant ground works cannot possibly be considered as a minor amendment to the application as such changes are materially different. At the very least the Local Authority would need to re-advertise the application as such works should be included within the description of development. A change in the description of the development would require a further statutory consultation period including a revised advert to be published in the local newspaper, a revised site notice to be erected and further letters sent to the neighbouring properties. Alternatively the application should be withdrawn and resubmitted.
- Notwithstanding the above, the latest amendments proposed by SCP on behalf of the applicant give rise to further concerns, namely:
 - the impact upon the root systems of the trees;

- the exposure of the proposed workshop to even more visibility; and
 - the potential encroachment onto Pat and Mike Pretty's land (which the latest plans suggest would be the case).
- Glanvilles (the objectors' consultants) have considered the Highway Officer's latest comments and have informed the Council that their expert view remains that the proposed highways conditions cannot be met and that safe access cannot be achieved.
 - Even if safe access could be achieved, the applicant originally suggested that there would be two cars parked daily on the site (his own, and an apprentice's), and that delivery vans would block the lane for about 30 minutes at a time when delivering materials. As well as being dangerous, this would be an intolerable nuisance to anyone using the road which is the main access between the village and the A40.

5. Noise

- Windrush is an incredibly tranquil rural village where the predominant sounds are birdsong, nature and the clanking of the flagpole rope on the village church.
- The introduction of electronic joinery machinery noise on a daily basis (including Saturdays) would be intolerable, and would have a massive detrimental impact upon the daily lives and wellbeing of us and our children.
- The objectors have obtained a detailed report from an independent noise consultant, Aulos Acoustics, which has been published on the Portal and which was enclosed with Forsters LLP's letter dated 6 January 2020. The consultant expresses a firm conclusion that the applicant's noise report understates the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of local residents in an 'exceptionally quiet' village, and that the adverse impact would be greater than described.
- In particular, please note the following from that report:
 - the proposed building construction and design would not be capable of controlling initial sound emissions to the standard required to limit adverse impact;
 - such a workshop is equivalent to a vehicle workshop or metalworkers in terms of the sound levels and noise generated. These are among the high risk groups for hearing protection and noise control and should be considered in planning as high-risk for detrimental or adverse effects on residential properties and other sensitive uses;
 - the applicant's acoustic report downplays the peaceful conditions in the area, and overemphasises the impact of background noise from the A40;
 - the measured equipment noise in the applicant's acoustic report does not take into account wood types or cut depths which can cause gross variations in noise. The applicant's acoustic report also omits to mention the bandsaw/re-saw, which has the potential to be one of the loudest pieces of equipment;
 - the applicant's acoustic report does not take into account the possibility of an apprentice, which would result in higher activity and noise levels, as well as the risk of open doors and windows;

- there is a lack of substantive details and calculation in the applicant's acoustic report (including calculation of sound transfer, sound transmission or nominal sound insulation performance or any detail regarding mitigation measures) which leads to significant uncertainty. The mitigation measures described are generalised and non-specific; and
 - no layout has been provided showing the positioning of equipment within the Proposed Development. This can cause huge variations in noise, due to the proximity of equipment to walls/windows etc.
- In short, there are significant areas of uncertainty in the applicant's assessment that have not been addressed and his consultants' assessment is over-optimistic. Such uncertainty is not appropriate for a normal application for commercial units near suburban or urban residents, let alone in an exceptionally quiet area such as Windrush. The applicant's report does state that the impact assessment depends on context, but they do not discuss that context. As Aulos Acoustics' report makes clear, the context is of great significance in this case, and such a quiet and tranquil area is worthy of protection.
- Aulos Acoustics conclude that the fall in tranquillity perceptions and the expected impact assessment under BS4142 that would result from the proposed development indicate a high impact on the residents and residential property. As they state on page 11 ***"the impulsive, intermittent, tonal and other distinctive elements of joinery workshop noise would be expected to ensure a high degree of perceptibility and high impact. Significant adverse effects on the perceptions of the area as tranquil would result, with the attendant changes to relaxation, concentration and amenity. Residents would be expected to change behaviour to avoid sound and where it could not be avoided, to be disturbed or become annoyed, with the effects on well-being and health that result"***. The provision of such a change of use would remain in perpetuity leading, potentially, to the continual presence of a high noise impact use in what was previously an exceptionally quiet residential area.
- The objectors ask the Committee to read the Aulos Acoustics report dated 4 January 2020 alongside the applicant's acoustic report for further details.
- The applicant's consultants, Hepworth Acoustics (HA) commented on Aulos Acoustics' report on 9 January. In response to those comments, the objectors observe that there is still huge uncertainty associated with HA's noise report and HA have done little to alleviate this. Much of the submitted evidence in respect of the type of machinery, its location within the proposed workshop, the depths to which timber would be cut, and the lack of ventilation and external mechanical systems such as air conditioning and dust extraction, is based only upon the say-so and apparent intention of the applicant. Importantly, no plans or concrete evidence have been submitted by the applicant, and his stated intentions (upon which the HA report is based) would be impossible to condition or enforce.
- HA's solution to the lack of ventilation is: *'purge ventilation can be achieved periodically as required by simply switching off the machinery and opening doors for a period, during which quiet activity may be undertaken. For a small, essentially one-man operation such as is proposed, this would be entirely practicable.'* It is not clear whether opening the doors is supposed to 'purge' dust, heat, or both. Either

way, this is unacceptable, and would be contrary to the express condition proposed by the Council that doors and windows remain closed at all times.

- **To conclude**, given the uncertainty associated with the application, it is very likely that the conditions recommended by Neil Shellard cannot be met and/or will be breached. Too much depends on the intention and good nature of the applicant.
- We (the objectors) would be the ones who would have to ensure the conditions recommended by Neil Shellard are met. It is simply not fair to impose upon the objectors or indeed upon all other residents in the village the burdens of policing the applicant's use of industrial premises near their homes and of dealing with any nuisance caused. If planning permission were granted it would be incredibly difficult and costly to enforce changes retrospectively.

Conclusion

- It goes without saying that businesses such as the applicant's have an important place in the Cotswolds, but not on sites such as this. It would be far more suitable for such a business to be located in converted farm or estate buildings, for example the one occupied by the applicant at Sherborne for many years, or at Pinchpool Farm in Windrush which is very close to his home, or at one of the established employment sites identified in the Local Plan, rather than a small, constrained site in an exclusively residential area of a small and exceptionally quiet village.

Constance Mead
Church Cottage, Church Lane
Windrush OX18 4TT
13 January 2020

Appendix 1

Text of email sent by Carla Pether, Southview, to Alison Williams on 7 November 2019

Dear Ms Williams

RE: Planning application reference 19/01184/FUL – Land Parcel E419306 N212935 North of Midford House, Windrush, Gloucestershire, OX18 4TS

I write with regard to Item No 02 of the agenda which is due to be heard at the Planning Committee meeting on the 13th November 2019.

May I introduce myself as Carla Pether and my husband is Piers Pether. We have lived at Southview, Windrush since May 2012.

I would like to urgently bring to your attention an inaccuracy within your report. You have referred to our boundary treatment (Southview) which comprises a beech hedge to the north of the application site. You have stated that *'The character and appearance of the lane and Conservation Area has changed since the previous appeal. Notably the occupants of South View have updated their garden boundary treatments which run to the northern boundary of the application site and rather than a rural hedgerow this is now a formal maintained domestic hedge.'* This statement is incorrect.

I can confirm that in the summer of 2013, Piers and I erected a temporary 2 no. 6ft willow hurdles adjacent to Mr A Mustoe's land in order to fill a gap to prevent our daughter from going onto the road. In May 2014 we removed the leylandii trees that ran adjacent to the road and planted a young indigenous beech hedge.

Looking at the dates of the planning history, application 13/03424/FUL was refused on the 27.09.2013 when the willow hurdles were in place and application 14/03623/FUL was refused on the 17.10.2014 and dismissed at appeal on the 06.08.2015 when the young beech hedge and temporary willow hurdles were in place. We have dated photographic evidence to demonstrate this. Indeed, if you refer to the Design and Access statement attached to planning application reference 14/03623/FUL, you will clearly see from the photographs that the beech hedge and willow hurdles were in place. Therefore your statement that there was previously a rural hedge when considering the appeal is factually incorrect. Given that there has been no change in the character and appearance of the area (other than that our hedge has matured and the willow hurdles have been removed) I would also question the following statement in respect of the impact upon the AONB *'Due to the change in the character and appearance of the area since the appeal decision, it is considered that the proposal would not now result in an encroachment of development into the open countryside or have an adverse impact on the AONB in this village location'*. This statement is clearly contrary to the views of the Planning Inspectorate, as the beech hedge was in place at the time of the planning appeal and the planning application to which it relates.

In conclusion, this factual error is evidently a material consideration in the case, and needs to be brought to the attention of the Planning Committee by way of addendum to your report (and published on line) without delay, so that the Members of the Planning committee can take it into account.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Carla Pether

APPENDIX 2

NOTE: All of the following images have been seen and/or shown in the context of this application and are in the public domain

Image 1: Google Virtual Street View (last updated by Google in December 2009)



Comments:

- (1) An image similar to this, looking north and taken from a Street View shot which is 10 years old, was shown by the Planning Officer at the Planning and Licensing Committee meeting on 13 November 2019.
- (2) The Application Site, on the right of the image, is covered in foliage and an Ash tree can be seen in the middle, immediately alongside the lane.
- (3) A hedge can be seen on the top of the bank around the boundary of the garden of Southview, the property immediately to the north of the Application Site.

Image 2: taken from Applicant's Design and Access Statement of 12.08.2014 for 14/03623/FUL



Image 3: taken from Applicant's Design and Access Statement of 12.08.2014 for 14/03623/FUL



Comments:

- (1) Image 2 shows that the Application Site had been cleared since the December 2009 Street View image and an Ash tree has been felled, as per Planning Application 14/02319/TCONR (decision date 11 June 2014).
- (2) A post and rail fence with a beech hedge has already replaced the hedge around the boundary of Southview which appeared in the 2009 image. The beech hedge is visible above the rails along the boundary, as shown more clearly in Image 3.
- (3) A willow hurdle can be seen on the southern boundary in Image 2, which was temporarily put in place by the owners of Southview to prevent their young daughter from escaping through the fence/hedge.
- (4) The Planning Inspectorate's visit to the application Site was on 22 July 2015, a year after these images were taken, by which time the beech hedge had benefited from another year of growth (beech grows at about 30 and 60cm per annum). The decision refusing the Applicant's appeal was made on 6 August 2015.

Image 4: taken from the Highways report prepared for Objectors by Glanville in December 2019



Comments:

- (1) The stump of the felled Ash tree has now been overgrown with foliage, but the Application Site is otherwise unchanged since the August 2014 image.
- (2) The beech hedge around the boundary of Southview has thickened since 2014. The post and rail fence is still visible on the southern and western boundaries.

Parish Council's comments in respect of application

Eco House CDC Committee hearing 15th January 2020

no: 19/02239/FUL

- ★ This application has received tremendous positive feed back from within the parish since the meeting that the application was read out and discussed at due to its fabric first approach, green credentials, carbon neutral design and use of local natural materials. In fact it should be noted that the only negative comments came from a neighbour, who at the time was selling her property and has since completed and moved away from the parish. Thus all residents neighbouring this development are in support of this application.
- ★ We are surprised at the officers recommendations to turn this application down going on two more recent applications for open market houses outside of the village development boundaries that planning officers recommended for refusal under policy DS4 & that have subsequently been approved; one (Land to the East of the Kilkeney) a further half mile up the road from this application, that was approved in this room at Committee level and secondly (The Mount) that was approved by the Planning Inspectorate. Both of these under similar situations outside of the designated development boundaries but both approved on their own individual merits of how they will enhance our parish.
- ★ The application site will not effect the AONB in or around Andoversford. It will not be visible from any vantage point surrounding the village due to the mature trees and hedgerows to the East of the site and will only be slightly visible through the entrance when looking at the street scene due to the high stone walls fronting the road.
- ★ There will still be the large open expanses of grass lawns & garden land to the west of the site thus not changing any views through the woodland area from foot path K9 that runs to the west of the application site. This also still allows the site to retain a rural character due to this open and green nature which in our minds still positively contributes to the character and appearance of the AONB.
- ★ This statement is also backed by Senior Planning Officer, Miss Hannah Rose' report on the Kudos site.
- ★ The application site is well serviced with local amenities. A post office, two shops, a garage, large and busy industrial site along with three public houses, sports club/playing fields and a primary school all within walking distance. I myself live a further few hundred yards further out from the village to this site and my wife walks my daughter to the primary school daily, my two sons catch the regular service bus one to the cotswold academy (at Bourton On The Water) the other into Cheltenham and a daily basis from just outside of this application site at Garricks Head.
- ★ We can see no reason for refusal.