



**Minutes of a meeting held remotely of Planning and Licensing Committee held on  
14 October 2020**

Councillors present:

Juliet Layton - Chair  
Patrick Coleman  
Stephen Hirst  
Nikki Ind  
Sue Jepson

Ray Brassington - Vice-Chair  
Julia Judd  
Richard Keeling  
Dilys Neill  
Gary Selwyn

Clive Webster

Officers present:

Development and Planning  
Enforcement Manager  
Legal Services Manager  
Democratic Services

Senior Case Officer  
Planning Case Officers  
Senior Conservation and Design Officer  
Gloucestershire Highways Development  
Manager

Observers:

Councillor Robin Hughes

PL.50 No apologies had been received.

PL.51 **Substitute Members**

There were no substitute Members.

PL.52 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Webster declared an other interest in respect of application 19/02248/FUL, as he knew and socialised with the Town Council Chair and Vice-Chair and was also a Town Councillor. His mother was also Chair of the Governors at St David's School.

Councillor Keeling declared an interest in respect of application 20/02175/FUL, as he socialised with the Applicant and his wife. He left the meeting while the application was being determined.

Councillor Neill declared an other interest in respect of application 20/02175/FUL, as the Applicant was her physiotherapist.

PL.53 **Minutes**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Meeting of the Committee held on 9 September 2020 be approved as a correct record.

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstention 1, absent 1.**

PL.54 **Chair's Announcements**

There were no announcements from the Chair.

PL.55 **Schedule of Applications**

**19/02248/FUL**

**Erection of 250 dwellings (to include 150 Market Housing and 100 Affordable Housing) with associated vehicular access, landscaping, drainage and public open space (phased development of 146 dwellings in phase 1, 92 dwellings in phase 2 and 12 dwellings in separate phases thereafter) at Land at Dunstall Farm, Fosseway, Moreton-in-Marsh.**

The Case Officer drew attention to additional information and then displayed a Local Plan map, aerial photograph (highlighting nearby Public Footpaths), character area plan, amended and superseded proposed frontages, affordable housing layout and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Committee Officer then read out comments on behalf of the Town Council and an Objector. The Agent was then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member who served on the Committee was then invited to address the Committee. He explained that the land had been allocated for housing following the Council's adoption of its current Local Plan in 2018 and that the decision that building should take place on the land was historic. He added that whilst there had been dissatisfaction with the designation of the site for building, the decision now required was how, what and when development should take place on the site. The Ward Member continued that any development needed to be in accordance with strategies of the County Council and facility providers and concluded that the District Council had allocated the site in good faith following assurances from the County Council that it could meet the required services following such development.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that one and a half storey properties would still feature a first floor with dormer windows; the height of most of the proposed dwellings was 8 metres which was consistent with the majority of properties of Fosseway Avenue; the current foul water system was estimated to deal with an additional 50 properties and the Applicant had therefore put forward mitigation plans; the site was within walking and cycling distance of the town centre and the distance to these facilities was not considered unacceptable; the plans complied with the requirement of the Local Plan regarding a mixture of shared ownership and

affordable rented properties and there was no requirement to provide socially rented homes; the management of the green spaces was expected to be a private management company as neither the District Council nor Town Council were able to, or had expressed an interest in, taking on the responsibility; the proposals met the current policy and national guidance requirements regarding climate change provision; the Council's Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Forward Planning had not commented on the application; previous discussion had taken place regarding the removal of the narrow footpath on the listed bridge on the A429, but this had not been pursued; the Case Officer had met with the County Council regarding the provision of a new school and the decision remained with the County Council as to whether they would invest into the existing school or build a new school as the costs were comparative; the current funding available to expand the existing school was required to be spent by 2021 and the County Council had confirmed that St David's School could not be expanded beyond its current expansion plan; Highway Officers were content that sufficient policies were in place to enable the proposals to be considered acceptable; the changes to the 801 bus service related to the provision of an additional service at 8.30am; the Council's Local Plan acknowledged that an increase in properties above the suggested 119 would be acceptable and no consultees had raised objection to the current proposal; it was expected by Officers that the application would be completed within five to seven years; Officers would have to undertake discussion with the Applicant if the Committee was minded to impose a condition in relation to an open space management scheme at the site; there were no other cycle routes to the town centre other than along the A429; the County Council education department recommendation had only requested a financial contribution; the requirement not to remove any affordable units would be included within the Section 106 agreement and would be an Officer decision in consultation with the Ward Member and there was already fencing at the boundary of the site provided by Network Rail but additional planting would also be included.

Various Members expressed that they could not support approval of the application as the surrounding infrastructure, particularly surrounding education, was not substantial enough to accept the increase from the development. They also commented that it clearly highlighted the issues of piecemeal development that had taken place in the town over the previous years.

A Proposition, that the application be deferred to enable the presentation of pre and primary school delivery strategies, was duly Seconded.

A Member commented that a deferral could result in time delays which could prove costly to the Council owing to the risk of appeal. She expressed that supported refusal of the application in relation to the size of development, lack of infrastructure and over development of the site.

A Further Proposition, that the application be refused, was not Seconded. The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and thanked the Case Officer for his work on the application and the Committee's consideration.

**Deferred, to enable the presentation of pre and primary school delivery strategies.**

**Record of Voting - for 8, against 1, abstention 2, absent 0.**

**20/02175/FUL**

**Erection of a two-storey rear extension, single-storey side and rear extensions, new dormer windows and alterations to dwellinghouse and erection of detached annexe at Northcote, Cold Aston, GL54 3BW.**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of the site and then displayed a site location map, aerial photographs, elevations, existing, approved and proposed plans, proposed outbuildings and site plan, a Google virtual street view and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Heritage Consultant was then invited to address the Committee on behalf of the Applicant.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that the Applicant had lived at the site for many years and who planned to continue to do so, given the proposals would enable continued occupation. He explained that the Applicant had been disappointed that the property had been considered a non-designated heritage asset and he urged the Committee to approve the application, highlighting the comments of the Heritage Consultant.

In response to various questions from Members it was reported that the length of time the Applicant had lived within the property was not a material planning consideration; the Conservation and Design Officer expressed concern regarding both the scale and the massing of the proposed timber extension, and whilst they had not objected to the previously approved extension, it was considered the current proposal would result in more extension than original dwellinghouse, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse; screening of the extension was not considered a suitable solution by Officers and the issue of the skirt abutting the end of a curtilage to the field related to large gazing in the AONB with no barrier.

Various Members supported the Officer recommendation of refusal and highlighted the conversations had had with the Applicant to achieve an acceptable compromise.

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

**Refused, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 7, against 3, abstention 0, interest declared 1, absent 0.**

**20/01582/FUL**

**Erection of single-storey side extension, insertion of two windows on the South facade, windows and doors to be painted cream at Grove Cottage, Hazleton, GL54 4EB.**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of the site and advised of a required amendment to the application report in relation to Section 8 (e) regarding the extension distance from the highway. The Case Officer then displayed a site location map, aerial photograph, elevations, floor plans, and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Chairman of the Parish Meeting, an Objector and the Agent were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. He explained that the proposals were not appropriate for the cottage as the location was in a conservation area and in the AONB. He added that the proposed extension would not enhance the property and would affect the neighbouring Grade 2 listed church. The Ward Member continued that the cottage had already had two substantial extensions which equated to more than 50% increase in size and that the intention to install windows over the churchyard suggested a lack of respect by the Applicants. He concluded that the property was already being used as a second home and that a previous application for a larger extension had already been withdrawn by the Applicant and urged the Committee to refuse the application.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that permitted development rights had been removed from the site; the difference in the ground floor plans had been in relation to an oil tank that had been retained owing to previous concerns regarding nearby trees; the proposed windows could be installed under permitted development rights so it would not be reasonable for these to be conditioned; the use of the cottage as a holiday home was not a material planning consideration; the wall would remain but a gate would be removed as part of the application; there would be a 0.1 metre overhand of the extension against the wall; there had been previous extensions at the property resulting in the cottage not being considered as a non-designated heritage asset but these extensions were considered to contribute to the conservation area and parking was already available on the opposite side of the road to the cottage.

A Member highlighted that comments made by Objectors in relation to large farm machinery already using the adjacent highway was already an issue and therefore the proposals would not contribute to this existing issue.

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

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again but advised he had no further comment to make.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of voting - for 8, against 2, abstentions 1, absent 0.**

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 Submissions

Public submissions were submitted and read to the Committee as follows:-

19/02248/FUL Council)	)	Cllr. Eileen Viviani (Town
	)	Jennifer Burton (Objector)
	)	Tom Stanley (Agent)
20/02175/FUL	)	Dr. Ruth Mullett (Agent)
20/01582/FUL	)	Cllr. Andy Scott (Parish Meeting)
	)	Claire Tongue (Objector)
	)	Andrew Pywell (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.56 Sites Inspection Briefings (Members for 7 October 2020)**

It was noted that Councillors Juliet Layton, Ray Brassington, Stephen Hirst, Sue Jepson and Clive Webster would represent the Committee at the virtual Sites Inspection Briefing, if required.

**PL.57 Licensing Sub-Committees (Members for 28 October 2020)**

It was noted that Councillors Juliet Layton, Sue Jepson, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill and Gary Selwyn would represent the Committee at the virtual Licensing Sub-Committee, if required.

**PL.58 Other Business**

There was no other business.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm, adjourned between 3.45 pm and 3.55 pm, and closed at 5.10 pm

Chair

(END)