

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

15th January 2020

ADDITIONAL PAGES UPDATE

DISTRIBUTED AT THE COMMITTEE MEETING

AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Additional Representations on Schedule Items

Pages 24 - 26

Item	Ref No	Content
01	19/00880/REM	<p>Additional third party objection received:</p> <p>Commenter Type: Objection Comments Comment Reasons: - Design – Other - Privacy light and noise</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Re: 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) relating to appearance, layout, landscape and scale, and discharge of 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</p> <p>We have signed up to the CDC Planning Portal to receive updates to this Planning Application. We have only today (14th January 2020) received the automatic email notification from you that relevant new documents were posted to the Portal in December 2019, hence the lateness of this objection.</p> <p>Our concern about the heights of the houses on this site have not been addressed.</p> <p>It is obvious from Document 18-04-P11 (Site Plan Ridge Levels) that the new houses will dominate the existing houses.</p> <p>This site is elevated, sitting several metres above Bell Lane itself at the front and rising even further to the East, several metres above the houses opposite to the West and above the houses adjacent to the site to the North, which were built on lower ground.</p> <p>If the ridges are as high as indicated in Document 18-04-P11, these new houses will not only dominate the skyline to the East, they will overlook the properties to the West, as well as overlook and overshadow our property,</p>

		<p>to the North. We were assured that these new houses would fit in. They will not. The effect will be urban and will look completely out of place in a rural Cotswold lane.</p> <p>On 14th January 2020, the Appeal Inspector has once again stressed the importance of the rural nature of Bell Lane in Appeal Decision APP/F1610/W/19/3233857. The Appeal Inspector stated in para 5 that Bell Lane has: "...a distinctly rural character". It is essential, therefore, to avoid unnecessary urbanisation in this distinctly rural lane.</p> <p>For this reason, we object to this application. We trust that you will take our comments into account when reaching your decision and urge you to reject this application.</p>
04	19/01184/FUL	<p>Additional third party objection received:</p> <p>I am writing to strongly oppose the latest amendments to the above application which were posted on the Planning Portal on 10/01/20 and the misleading way in which some of them have been presented.</p> <p>There are 3 areas of concern, namely</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The extension of the geogrid and the potential effect on the Root Protection Area of the ash tree (T.6) as originally identified on Crawshaw's TPP dated 11/07/19 2) The dramatic increase in the width of the proposed access splay 3) The failure to demonstrate that vehicles will be able to turn within the site and the effect that will have on road safety. <p>Regarding 1), Included in the Tree Officer's response form dated 29/05/19 there were a number of recommendations including the requirement to leave a 1.5 m buffer zone away from the boundaries. This was addressed by Crawshaw's TPP dated 11/07/19, drawing no. 19144, which has been the basis of the site plan until the latest Ground Floor Plan which was posted on the portal on 10/01/20. This shows a considerable increase in the extent of the geogrid right up to the Northern and Eastern boundaries WITH NO BUFFER ZONE which means it will cover a much larger area of the Root Protection Area for tree T.6 than previously accepted by the Tree Officer. This is totally unacceptable as it does not conform to the Tree Officer's requirements and must have a detrimental effect on this protected tree.</p> <p>Regarding 2), The Ground Floor Plans posted on the portal on 10/01/20 show a considerable increase in the width of the proposed access splay. CONFUSINGLY this is designated as drawing 212578-10 which is exactly the same number as the drawing dated 04/07/19 which is included as page 20 of your Report to Members. Clearly there is no similarity between the two drawings and Members should surely have been supplied with the latest drawing and this change should have been highlighted.</p> <p>The newly proposed splay will have a devastating impact on the roadside banking and destroy the existing visual experience of this approach to the village and makes a mockery of all the photographs supplied by the applicant. The Planning Authority has an obligation to protect such features within the AONB and Windrush Conservation Area and not permit them to be destroyed for personal gain. Such a major change to the plans must surely require further general public consultation.</p> <p>Regarding 3), The GCC Highways Report dated 08/11/19 recommended a condition requiring vehicles to be able to access/egress the site in forward</p>

		<p>gear. This was reiterated as recently as Chris Mead's email dated 07/01/20 which includes the following statement " I am minded to give the applicant an opportunity to DEMONSTRATE that they can turn within the land in their ownership" The latest Forward Visibility Splay drawings by SCP, dated 10/01/20 and posted on the portal on 10/01/20 CLEARLY SHOW that this cannot be achieved and that vehicles would have to access the site in reverse in order to egress in a forward gear (or vice versa) as there is insufficient room for them to turn (even on the extended and unacceptable geogrid). This failure to meet the requirements of GCC Highways is a major safety issue for general highway users which must be addressed.</p> <p>For the above reasons I believe that these latest amendments fail to comply with various planning requirements and that in conjunction with the many other errors/omissions in the applicant's information (as previously highlighted to you) and the reasons why previous, similar applications have been refused, including on appeal, you must now advise Members to REFUSE permission.</p>
--	--	---

