

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

11TH MARCH 2020

Present:

Councillor Juliet Layton - Chair

Councillors -

Tony Berry
Patrick Coleman
Stephen Hirst
Roly Hughes
Nikki Ind

Sue Jepson
Julia Judd
Richard Keeling
Gary Selwyn
Clive Webster (from 10.05 a.m. -
apologies for lateness)

Substitutes:

Joe Harris Lisa Spivey

Apologies:

Claire Bloomer
Ray Brassington

Dilys Neill
Steve Trotter

PL.82 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor Webster declared an other interest in respect of application 19/04590/LBC, as he was the Council's appointed representative for the Cotswold Conservation Board.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

PL.83 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor Harris substituted for Councillor Brassington.

Councillor Spivey substituted for Councillor Neill.

PL.84 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee of 12th February 2020 be approved as a correct record.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 0, abstentions 2, absent 3.

PL.85 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair drew attention to the upcoming planning training for town and parish councils which would take place on 16th March 2020 from 10.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. and on 17th March 2020 from 6.00 p.m. to 9.00 p.m. at the Council Offices in Cirencester. She expressed that she hoped Members of the Committee would be able to attend.

PL.86 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No Public Questions had been submitted.

PL.87 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.88 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.89 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

It was noted that the details of the policies referred to in the compilation of the Schedule did not comprise a comprehensive list of the policies taken into account in the preparation of the reports.

RESOLVED that:

(a) where on this Schedule of Applications, development proposals in Conservation Areas and/or affecting Listed Buildings have been advertised - (in accordance with Section 73 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas) Regulations 1977) - but the period of the advertisement has not expired by the date of the Meeting then, if no further written representations raising new issues are received by the date of expiration of the advertisement, those applications shall be determined in accordance with the views of the Committee;

(b) where on this Schedule of Applications, the consultation period in respect of any proposals has not expired by the date of the Meeting then, if no further written representations raising new issues are received by the date of expiration of the consultation period, those applications shall be determined in accordance with the views of the Committee;

**(c) the applications in the Schedule be dealt with in accordance with the following resolutions:-
19/03261/FUL**

Change of use of barn to dwelling at Land and Barn West of Church Farm House, Naunton, GL54 3AJ -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site, outlined the proposals and reminded the Committee that the application had been deferred from the February 2020 Committee Meeting in order for the Applicant to provide more information regarding internal space and lighting requirements. The Case Officer displayed a site block plan, internal layout drawings, a Google virtual street view and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Agent was then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that whilst the key concerns of the Committee relating to internal space and lighting had been addressed within the Officer's report, he considered the fact the site was located outside of the village boundary and in close proximity to a five junction crossing, meant that the application should be reviewed carefully. The Ward Member then drew attention to the comments received from the Parish Council and local residents and highlighted that the existing internal structures within the barn would only reduce the internal space and requested that to best understand the site and its constraints, the Committee should approve a site visit to be undertaken at the site.

A Member questioned if the entrance proposed for the application was the original entrance for the site. In response the Case Officer confirmed the proposed access was through an existing access point through a field gate.

A Member commented that the benefit of converting an otherwise empty building to a small dwelling, of which he considered many more were required in the District, should be commended and supported. He added that as the application met the required minimum space standards, he could find no reason to refuse the application.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Various Members expressed their support for approval of the application and stated that the application presented an imaginative use for the building without which the building was likely to fall into disrepair. Those Members also commented that with regard to the concern raised by the Ward Member in relation to traffic; the addition of one dwelling at the site would not contribute to greater levels of transport accessing and leaving the site on a regular basis.

A Further Proposition, that the application be deferred to enable a Sites Inspection Briefing, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and commented that he was disappointed with the view of the Committee. He explained that he considered a site visit would help Members better understand his concerns and stated that the isolation of the site from the main village and the issue of the lack of light to the internal aspects of the property should be considered carefully when Members visited the site.

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 3, abstentions 0, absent 2.

19/02113/FUL**Formation of vehicular access with double gates and demolition of garden wall at Yew Tree Farm, The Street, Somerford Keynes, GL7 6DT -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and then displayed existing elevations, proposed block plan and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

There were no public speakers.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that the history of the site dated back to 2010 when the then owners of the property decided the entrance was too dangerous to use and they had then sought permission to move the entrance, which was approved by the Council. The Ward Member added that a Condition added to the permission at the time was that the dropped kerb would then be lifted, but this was not undertaken or followed up by the Council and was, in his view, a key reason why Highway Officers had raised no objection to the current application. He commented that the existing parking arrangement was not convenient to the residents of the property and he could therefore understand why the present application had been submitted to revert to the original access point. The Ward Member continued that Highway Officers had confirmed there had been no reported accidents at the site and could therefore not consider it to be a dangerous site, but explained that there was a limited view at the bend before the junction. He concluded that there were therefore strong reasons both for and against approval of the application.

In response to various questions from Members it was reported that the kerb height had not been raised since approval of the application in 2010; there were many examples of a similar style of access within the county and owing to the arrangement, a concern would always exist regarding relative safety of vehicles using the access route; the junction adjacent to the property had give way lines; until 2010 the now sought access was in use with no reported accidents; any temporary sports events which were linked to nearby venues would be subject to highway regulations and were therefore not relevant to Members' determination of this application; a similar access approach existed for the property on the opposite side of the junction to the application site; the recorded visibility of the requested access of 107 degrees was not considered acceptable for a newly-proposed access, but was considered to reflect the historical element of the original access route not needing to comply with modern standards; the application was required to be treated as a new application, despite the dropped kerb still remaining at the site; the application had been referred to the Committee owing to the property being a listed building and details to demonstrate suitable turning space for vehicles as being achievable within the site had not been requested.

A Member commented that given the application was required to be assessed as a new application and that it did not meet the standards for a new proposed access, she considered the application should be refused.

Another Member commented that he considered the application should be approved, given the application would revert back to the previous access, which had historically no issues.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

A different Member commented that given the Parish Council had previously objected to the closure of the original access, he considered an amendment should be added to the Proposition to approve the application, in relation to the Applicant being required to demonstrate suitable turning space for vehicles within the site.

This Amendment to the Proposition, was then duly Seconded.

The Team Leader, Development Management reminded the Committee that there was a need to ensure that the addition of conditions to any such permission would require the Committee to assess if the Applicant could comply with such conditions.

Other Members expressed the application should be considered solely on the proposals presented to the Committee and that they considered there was no requirement to add any amendments to the Proposition to approve the application.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. He explained that he considered it important that whatever the outcome of the Committee's decision, the Council should insist that walling to stop up the existing access should be re-built.

On being put to the vote, the Proposition to include an Amendment in relation to an additional condition requiring a demonstration by the Applicant that vehicle turning within the site was possible, was APPROVED. The record of voting in respect of the Amendment was - for 9, against 2, abstentions 2, absent 2.

Approved, subject to the inclusion of an additional Condition in relation to the Applicant demonstrating that vehicle turning at the site was possible.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 2, abstentions 1, absent 2.

19/02114/LBC

Formation of vehicular access with double gates and demolition of garden wall at Yew Tree Farm, The Street, Somerford Keynes, GL7 6DT -

Officers and Members had nothing further to add to their deliberations under the previous item.

The Ward Member explained that he had no further comment to make, other than to question if the old wall would be replaced to stop up the existing access. In response, Officers confirmed that there was no recommendation that considered that would be necessary, as the application required the Committee to solely consider the potential harm to the listed building at the site.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 1, abstentions 2, absent 2.

19/03585/FUL

Change of use of agricultural land for the siting of seven Shepherds Huts at Sheafhouse Farm, Draycott Road, Blockley, GL56 9DY -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and then displayed a site map, aerial photograph, site plan, hut drawings, waste tank details and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Ward Member, reading comments submitted by the Parish Council, an Objector and the Agent were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that she did not agree with the advice given by the Case Officer in relation to the application and considered the application did not comply with the relevant policies. She added that whilst she appreciated the needs of the Applicant to diversify their 100 acre farm and gym business, the addition of the shepherds huts would not enhance the AONB and would be comparable to seven touring caravans being placed at the site. The Ward Member continued that the original application for glamping pods would have been, in her view, less obtrusive on the landscape, and highlighted to the Committee that the site was visible from a nearby public footpath. The Ward Member then drew attention to the number of objections to the application, particularly in relation to noise. The Ward Member concluded that she considered a site visit would be the best option for the Committee to determine the application as the photographs suggested the site was flat, when in reality the site was a steep bank.

In response to various questions from Members it was reported that the Case Officer had viewed the site from various locations within the village but could not see the site itself; the Council held one official noise complaint for the site and 19 of the 23 objections made had made reference to noise; the Committee could add a noise condition to any permission granted if Members considered this was necessary; no concrete bases were proposed for the site with the exception of a gravelled hard-standing area for parking provision; permitted development rights had been removed by Officers prior to any permission being granted in relation to hard-standing and external lighting; the style of accommodation proposed for the site was determined by the Applicant and could be considered a subjective issue, though shepherds huts were considered suitable for the site given the District's historic association with sheep farming and the wool trade; if approved, the shepherds huts would be required to be removed for six months of the year which, in the view of Officers, would mitigate the visual impact of the development, though the details regarding where they would be stored was not required to be known by Officers; Officers had consulted the Environmental Health Officer in relation to setting noise limits and Officers considered this condition could be based upon the existing noise limits permitted for the use of the gym at the site; and Officers considered there were a number of mitigating factors to the application in relation to the small size of the proposed huts, the

requirement to determine a change of use for the land and the fact the huts would be removed for six months of the year, and the Council's Landscape Officer had raised no objection to the application.

A Member commented that he considered a landscape plan was critical to the application and, given the site was visible from a nearby public footpath, he considered the application should be refused.

A Proposition, that the application be deferred to enable a Sites Inspection Briefing to be undertaken, was duly Seconded.

Another Member commented that whilst in favour of the proposed huts, the limited economic benefit that would arise from approval of the application was a key reason why the application should be refused.

A different Member drew attention to the fact Sheafhouse Farm was listed as a strategic housing allocation within the Council's Local Plan and was therefore not as sensitive a site as had been portrayed.

A Further Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Various Members expressed their support for approval of the application and highlighted that rural tourism was vital to the success of the District and also that no objection had been raised by the Parish Council and the over 50 representations supporting the application.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and commented that whilst she had no issue with the diversification of farming within the District, she was concerned that approval of the application would spoil the AONB and that it was important the correct design was achieved for the site. She concluded that she hoped the Committee would support the Proposition in favour of a Sites Inspection Briefing.

Deferred, to enable a Sites Inspection Briefing to be undertaken to consider the impact on the character/appearance of the landscape and the AONB.

Record of Voting - for 7, against 6, abstentions 0, absent 2.

19/04590/LBC

Replacement of stolen lead roof coverings to former cell block in zinc at Cotswold Conservation Board, Old Prison, Fosseway, Northleach, GL54 3JH -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals. The Case Officer displayed a site map, aerial photograph and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

There were no public speakers.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was not present at the Meeting and had made no representations.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 2.

Notes:

(i) Additional Representations

Lists setting out details of additional representations received since the Schedule of planning applications had been prepared were considered in conjunction with the related planning applications.

(ii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

19/03261/FUL)	Kaye Roberts (Agent)
19/03585/FUL)	Mr. J Henderson
)	(Objector)
)	Wendy Hopkins (Agent)

Copies of the representations by the public speakers would be made available on the Council's Website in those instances where copies had been made available to the Council.

PL.90 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 1st April 2020

It was noted that Councillors Patrick Coleman, Stephen Hirst, Roly Hughes, Juliet Layton and Gary Selwyn would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

19/02005/FUL - Erection of dwelling house and associated ancillary development (revised scheme) Land To The Rear Of Albion Street, Albion Street, Stratton - to assess the access in terms of highway safety and ability of fire appliances to access the site and to assess the appropriateness of the scale and design of the proposed dwelling and garage.

PL.91 LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEES

1. Members for 15th April 2020

It was noted that Councillors Tony Berry, Patrick Coleman, Richard Keeling, Steve Trotter, and Clive Webster would represent the Committee at the Licensing Sub-Committee Meeting of 15th April 2020, if required.

PL.92 OTHER BUSINESS

The Committee wished to extend their thanks to Gloucestershire County Council Highways Officer Mr. Chris Mead for his attendance at the Committee's Meetings since May 2019 and for the assistance he had provided to the Committee during this time. Mr. Mead reported that he hoped the assistance provided to the Council would continue with a qualified Highways Officer in attendance at Meetings of the Committee in the future.

The Meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m., adjourned between 11.15 a.m. and 11.25 a.m., and closed at 12.05 p.m.

Chair

(END)