

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

10<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2015

Present:

Councillor RL Hughes - Chairman  
Councillor SG Hirst - Vice-Chairman

Councillors -

Miss AML Beccle	David Fowles
AW Berry	JA Harris
AR Brassington	Mrs. SL Jepson
Sue Coakley	Ms JM Layton
Miss AJ Coggins	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
RW Dutton	Mrs. TL Stevenson

Substitutes:

PCB Coleman

Observers:

T Cheung (from 9.35 a.m. until 10.50 a.m.)	Mrs. JC Forde (until 2.30 p.m.)
BS Dare (until 10.45 a.m.)	NJW Parsons (from 10.30 a.m. until 12.50 p.m.)

Apologies:

M Harris

PL.5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor Miss AJ Coggins declared an interest in respect of application CD.4545/Y because, in her capacity as a Member of Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council, she had previously been involved with the development of this site.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in application CD.3670/H, because he was a friend of the Agent, and he left the Meeting while that item was being considered.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in application CT.4203/2/L, because he was acquainted with the Applicant, and he left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CT.2255/Y, because he had previously been a Trustee and Chairman of Brewery Arts.

Councillor JA Harris declared an interest in respect of application CT.2255/Y, because he had previously met the Applicants and discussed the proposed development in his capacity as one of the former Ward Members.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.5903/F, because he was related to the Applicants. Councillor Stowe was not present at the Meeting.

(2) Officer Declarations

The Head of Legal and Property Services declared an interest in respect of application CT.2255/Y, because she was the Head of the Service with responsibility for buildings in the Council's ownership.

PL.6 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor PCB Coleman substituted for Councillor M Harris.

PL.7 MINUTES

**RESOLVED that:**

**(a) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2015 be approved as a correct record;**

**Record of Voting - for 3, against 0, abstentions 9, absent 0, did not vote 3.**

**(b) the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2015 be approved as a correct record;**

**Record of Voting - for 3, against 0, abstentions 12, absent 0.**

**(c) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2015 be approved as a correct record;**

**Record of Voting - for 7, against 0, abstentions 5, absent 0, did not vote 3.**

**(d) subject to the names of the Proposer and Seconder of the Proposition to elect Councillor RL Hughes as Chairman of the Committee being amended to 'Councillor Ms JM Layton' and 'Councillor Sue Coakley' respectively, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning and Licensing Committee held on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2015 be approved as a correct record.**

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

PL.8 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman congratulated 'new' and 'returning' Members on their recent election, welcomed them to the Meeting and expressed the hope that they would find it interesting and enjoyable.

The Licensing Induction Session, which had been referred to in the 'Member 2015 - Induction Programme', would take place in the Council Chamber, Trinity Road, Cirencester on Monday 29<sup>th</sup> June 2015 at 11.00 a.m., or at the close of the

Meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee (Licensing Act 2003 Matters) which was scheduled to be held on that date, whichever was the later.

The August 2015 Meeting of the Planning and Licensing Committee, previously scheduled to be held on Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> August 2015, had been postponed and would now be held a week later on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> August 2015. This was in order to accommodate a seven-day Planning Inquiry which was due to be held in the Council Chamber, Trinity Road, Cirencester with effect from Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> August 2015.

PL.9 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.10 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been submitted by Members.

PL.11 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.12 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:-**

**CD.1320/L****Demolition of former care home and a redevelopment of site with 21 dwellings including garages and associated infrastructure at Ashton House, Union Street, Stow-on-the-Wold -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the proposed layout; design; elevations; and an artist's impression of the scheme in context.

A Member of the Town Council, an Objector and a representative of the Applicant were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing in relation to this application, which had been undertaken by the Committee on Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2015. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that this was not a 'green field' site as it had previously been used for residential purposes. The Ward Member explained that the Applicant had originally proposed twenty-six units but had subsequently reduced that number to twenty-one which, he contended, would help to address the concerns expressed by the Town Council in relation to density. The Ward Member considered that the proposed access along Union Street could present a problem but expressed the view that it could be managed, subject to the agreement of all the parties involved. The Ward Member suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, consideration be given to the use of timber for the proposed 'car barns' and to the use of natural stone rather than reconstituted stone. The Ward Member was sympathetic towards the views expressed by the Town Council and Objectors but pointed out that this proposal would meet approximately 15% of the Council's Strategic Housing target, and he concluded by expressing support for the Officer Recommendation.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that Officers were not aware of any proposals to redevelop the adjacent fire station site; each application should be considered on its merits; the site had been owned by Gloucestershire County Council; it was not a public amenity space; the eastern section of the site, which was grassed, was the only exposed section which contributed to the hill fort around the town and, as such, the site was a non-designated heritage asset; there was sufficient space on the site to accommodate storage for refuse bins; the response from Thames Water was a standard response; if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, the suggested Condition would be included in any Decision Notice and the Applicant would require permission from Thames Water under a separate procedure to connect to the drainage system, which would then address any issues relating to capacity; the suggested approach in respect of drainage was the correct one to take in terms of current best practice; the suggested drainage Condition would address the issue of water run-off from this site; 'car barns' were considered to be appropriate in this location, given the nature of the site, and timber was considered to be an appropriate material for such barns; in assessing the impact of traffic movements from the proposed development, Officers had taken account of the existing use of the site, which was also close to various facilities and services in the town, to which residents could walk, if they wished;

the Applicant had indicated that they wished the development to proceed as proposed, including units 1 and 2 and, in the opinion of Officers, it would be difficult for the Council to sustain an objection in that respect; as the site was not a Scheduled Ancient Monument and the County Archaeologist had not sought to register it as such, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, it would need to consider if the potential archaeological harm was outweighed by the public benefits that would accrue from the development; in the opinion of Officers, there would be a minimal uplift in vehicle movements from the proposed development over and above the number caused by the established use; the issue of providing pedestrian/cycle accesses to the town from various points within the proposed development could be raised with the Applicant; and the County Council had determined that this site was surplus to its requirements.

Some Members expressed support for this application. Those Members had welcomed the reduction in numbers from twenty-six to twenty-one units and the amendments to the design and size of the units. In response to a suggestion that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, natural stone should be used for construction of the units rather than artificial stone, it was reported that Officers might be able to negotiate an element of natural stone on the more-publicly visible areas but not throughout the development.

A Proposition that this application be approved as recommended subject to negotiations over the use of natural stone in the construction of some units, was duly Seconded. On being put to the vote, that Proposition was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 3, against 9, abstentions 3, absent 0.

Other Members, while supporting this application in principle, expressed concern over a number of issues including the loss of a care home; archaeology; materials; drainage; and traffic movements. Those Members considered that an improved development could be achieved. In response it was reported that, if the Committee was minded to refuse this application, Members would need to state clearly what harm would be caused and if they considered such harm would outweigh any benefits that would accrue from the development. Officers reiterated that the drainage issues had been tested at appeal on numerous occasions and that consistent legal advice had supported the suggested approach. The Committee would need to weigh up the archaeological issues following consideration of the evidence submitted and it was suggested that, if the Committee had concerns over issues including the inclusion of specific units, archaeology and materials, consideration could be given to deferring this application for further negotiations in those respects.

A Proposition, that this application be refused for reasons relating to archaeology, highways, design and layout was subsequently withdrawn and a further Proposition, that this application be deferred for further negotiations, was duly Seconded.

**Deferred for further negotiations, including in relation to archaeology; materials; highways; and the deletion of car barn C1 and unit 2.**

**Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

**CD.4545/Y****Demolition of existing buildings and erection of food store with associated parking, landscaping and ancillary works (Reserved Matters details relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and compliance with Conditions 16 (Landscaping and Ecological Management Plan) and 18 (surface water drainage scheme) of development granted under permission 13/01971/OUT) at Fossey Farm, Stow Road, Moreton-in-Marsh -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the proposed layout; elevations; and resiting of an existing bus stop. The Case Officer also displayed photographs illustrating views into the site from various vantage points and views of the existing bus stop.

An adjacent Ward Member was invited to address the Committee. The Member referred to the continued opposition from the operators of an existing supermarket in the town; population growth within the town; and the need for facilities to be directed towards the eastern side of the town where services and shopping facilities were required to serve new developments. The Member contended that this proposal would have a bigger impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty than the outline application, and that it would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring hospital, due to the proposed location of the service road and yard. The Member referred to an objection from Gloucestershire Care Services relating to the impact of the proposal on the adjacent hospital and concurred that noise from delivery vehicles could be disruptive to patient care and recuperation. The Member expressed concern over the access arrangements and expressed the view that there was sufficient space to allow for the road to be widened to provide safe access to this site, the adjacent hospital and the existing petrol station. The Member concluded by reminding the Committee to take account of the input on behalf of the existing supermarket.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and stated that she concurred with the views expressed by the Town Council and the Member representing an adjacent Ward. The Ward Member considered the main issues to be access to and egress from this site and the location of an existing bus stop. The Ward Member expressed the view that the Applicant's traffic audit was not appropriate for the demography of the area and that a safe pedestrian access to the hospital should be provided. The Ward Member expressed concern over the loss of mature trees which, she suggested, would help to screen the supermarket building to a degree; and expressed support for the proposed design of the building. The Ward Member reiterated her concerns in relation to traffic impact and the potential for disturbance caused to the adjacent hospital by delivery vehicles and concluded by suggesting that further traffic audits should be conducted within the site.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the potential occupier(s) of the building was not a material planning consideration; Conditions relating to the operating hours for construction and delivery vehicles, had been attached to the outline planning application but not in respect of the opening hours of the supermarket; the principle of development on this site had been established

by the outline planning permission; the purpose of this application was to consider issues relating to appearance, scale, landscaping, layout and access; in determining this application, the Committee should consider what impact the specific layout of the service road and yard would have on the adjacent hospital; the Council's Engineer considered the proposed drainage arrangements to be appropriate for this site; there would be sufficient room in the service yard for delivery vehicles to turn without the need to reverse; the orientation of the proposed store was based on the needs of the retailer and was considered to be appropriate in the context of the site; there would be pedestrian access to the supermarket, and pedestrian crossing facilities would be installed on the main highway, the access and within the site; the existing bus stop on the northern approach to the site was proposed for relocation and it was not considered necessary to divert bus services through the site; and the question over pedestrian access between this site and the adjacent hospital would be an issue for the future operator and landowners to address.

It was considered that issues relating to the environmental impact and arrangements for vehicle movements within the service yard had been addressed. However, a Member expressed concern that it was likely that the future operator of the supermarket could seek to vary the delivery hours to accord with current supermarket trends. A number of Members expressed support for this application and a Proposition that it be approved as recommended was duly Seconded. In response to a further question from a Member, it was reported that any relocation of the service road and yard would have an impact on the proposed drainage scheme and that a redesign of the entire scheme would be required to address the issue.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for ,11, against 0, abstentions 3, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

**CD.5903/F**

**Outline planning all matters reserved for one dwelling at Birchfield, Broad Marston Road, Mickleton -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that it was unlikely that this site would be able to accommodate any further development and a Proposition that this application be approved as recommended was duly Seconded.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

**CT.8950/D****Erection of an agricultural worker's dwelling at Clay Meadow, Cirencester Road, South Cerney -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the proximity of the site to the Development Boundary for the village; the relevant planning history; an independent agricultural planning appraisal; elevations; design; and the footprint of the proposed building. The Case Officer also displayed an aerial photograph of the site.

An Objector, the Agent and the Applicant were invited to address the Committee.

A Member who served on the Committee, and had referred this application to the Committee for determination, was invited to address the Committee. The Member amplified aspects of her reasons for referring this application to the Committee for determination, and reminded the Committee that the enterprise was an alpaca stud. The Member contended that an agricultural worker should be able to afford the dwelling should the business fail and expressed the view that the agricultural need had been proven in the independent appraisal but not the need for tourist accommodation. The Member expressed support for agricultural diversification but commented that no benefit from tourism would accrue to the local community as a result of this application as tourists would be catered for on-site. The Ward Member contended that the proposal constituted a large dwelling and concluded by stating that, while she applauded the provision of facilities for disabled visitors, she did not consider it appropriate in this location.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that each application should be determined on its merits; in the opinion of Officers, the agricultural need for a dwelling had been proven in respect of this application the alpaca stud could finance that dwelling; the in-house bed and breakfast facility was considered to be the most cost-effective way for the Applicant to provide such a facility on this occasion; in the event that the dwelling was marketed in the future, the suggested occupancy Condition required that it be marketed to an agricultural worker in the first instance; in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, the suggested Conditions would remain in perpetuity, although the Applicant could submit an application seeking removal of any of those Conditions in the future; it was proposed that en-suite facilities be provided in respect of the 'family' room; the primary reason for submission of the application was to achieve accommodation for an agricultural worker; and the proposed bed and breakfast element was associated with the alpaca enterprise and accorded with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Some Members expressed support for this application, and a Proposition that it be approved, as recommended, was duly Seconded.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 12, against 1, abstentions 2, absent 0.**

**CT.6991/Z**



**Outline planning application for residential re-development consisting of 20 units and associated works, and the provision of equivalent replacement stable facilities and riding arena (access, layout and scale to be determined) at Ullenwood Court, Ullenwood -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Green Belt, and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its proximity to the Cotswold Way path; layout; scale; landscaping; and the footprints of the proposed buildings. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and a video animation of the proposed development.

A Supporter and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that this application involved a number of issues, including in relation to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; the green belt; the five-year housing land supply; and prior approval. The Ward Member congratulated the Officer on a clear and logical analysis of the relevant issues and stated that he agreed with her recommendation. The Applicant had addressed the concerns raised by the Parish Council and the Ward Member welcomed the Applicant's guarantee relating to the continued equestrian use at this site. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the proposal involved the sinking of the new houses into the ground and reiterated his support for the Officer recommendation, including the additional Conditions, a traditional design and the Section 106 Agreement funding. The Ward Member concluded by seeking clarification of Gloucestershire County Council's view on the 'ring fencing' of the financial contribution in respect of education.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the existing buildings on this site had proved to be suitable for conversion; the current application would result in 958 fewer vehicle movements than the existing use; and, in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, Officers would amend the wording of the suggested Conditions, if appropriate, to ensure that the proposed equestrian facilities were no less than the current provision.

It was considered that this application should be approved as it suggested few residential units, while continuing the equestrian use at the site with no gap in such provision and the maintenance of access thereto throughout the period of development. In response to a further question from a Member, it was reported that the proposed stables would be situated twenty metres away from the proposed residential units and that prospective purchasers of those units would be aware of the existence of the stables. Another Member reminded the Committee that this proposal would result in the loss of an area of employment land in the District.

It was considered that any reserved matters application(s) in relation to this development should be referred to the Committee for determination and a Proposition that this application be approved, as recommended, was duly Seconded.

**The Head of Planning was authorised to specify additional Conditions and to approve as recommended, subject to satisfactory negotiations in relation to the off-site affordable housing contribution and the prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement relating to contributions in respect of affordable housing, education and the transfer of land to a private management company.**

**Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

**CT.7615/K**

**Reserved Matters application pursuant to Outline Planning application 12/00528/OUT for the layout, appearance, scale and landscaping of 61 residential dwellings together with associated infrastructure, including revised levels to the A361 at Old Station Site, Burford Road, Lechlade -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the layout; the proximity of the site to a private lake and footpath, the A361, existing residential developments a Grade II Listed farm complex and electricity sub-station; the dispersal of the affordable housing units across the site; materials; boundary treatments; design; elevations; and the proposed street scene. The Case Officer also displayed photographs illustrating views of the site from various vantage points; across the site; the access; and works to remove the road bridge over the former railway.

One of the Ward Members, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member welcomed the improvements which had been negotiated, including in relation to landscaping; materials; and boundary treatments. The Ward Member expressed support for the proposed restoration of the natural ground levels within the site which she considered would help with the water table and ensure that the ridge heights of the proposed units were comparable to those of existing residential units in the vicinity.

A Proposition that this application be approved, as recommended, was duly Seconded.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 14, against 0, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

**CT.9067****Erection of three dwellings including associated landscaping and other works at Fayrecourt, Milton Street, Fairford -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and displayed an aerial photograph and photographs illustrating views of Fayrecourt, a non-designated heritage asset, and its surrounding gardens; views into the site from various vantage points; and views of the street scene, access, existing Cotswold stone boundary wall and trees.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and expressed the view that this was an historic and socially important, non-designated heritage site, because of its links to the sinking of the Titanic. The Ward Member commented that access to, and egress from, the site could be difficult and concluded by suggesting that consideration of this application be deferred in order to allow time for the further investigation of the historic and social importance issues.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that as the proposal represented a small development, it would not be appropriate to seek to impose similar drainage conditions as had been imposed on larger developments; the Council's Drainage Engineer and Thames Water were satisfied that the suggested drainage conditions would be appropriate at this site; the site was in the Conservation Area; although Fayrecourt was not a Listed Building, it was considered to be a non-designated heritage asset of local importance; in that context, an assessment of its significance should be made in light of its links to the sinking of the Titanic; this section of the A417 was considered to have similar characteristics to a residential street in this location; and, if this application was approved as recommended, the access to the site would be widened in the direction of the existing drystone wall which would enable two vehicles to pass and improve views for emerging vehicles.

A Proposition that this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, was duly Seconded and it was considered that all Members of the Committee be invited to attend that Sites Inspection Briefing because of the potential wider historical importance of the site, which would be subject of further investigation.

**(a) Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the impact of the proposals on the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Buildings in the vicinity, and the suitability of the access;**

**(b) all Members of the Committee be invited to attend this Sites Inspection Briefing as an approved duty.**

**Record of Voting - for 11, against 2, abstentions 1, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

**CD.3670/H****Erection of new detached dwelling at Buttress House, Queen Street, Chedworth -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the extent of the Conservation Area. The Case Officer also displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of Buttress House and views along Queen Street.

A Supporter and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and stated that she had met the Applicants and listened to their proposals, and had read the detailed application and supporting documentation. The Ward Member considered that the Applicants had gone to considerable lengths in order to adapt their application in order to ensure that it harmonised with, and was sympathetic to, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that this site was already a small, working vineyard which was, in her opinion, screened from the highway, and she commented that the proposal aimed to protect and enhance that privacy and seclusion. The Ward Member contended that the application consistently commented on and responded to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the village Conservation Area, including through the establishment of long-term landscape plans to enhance the setting of the proposed new house to strengthen the character of its landscape context. The Ward Member expressed the view that the proposal demonstrated a sensitive approach and would be an example of exemplary architecture in terms of its low carbon credentials and use of largely locally-sourced materials. The Ward Member considered that the proposed development would provide a unit of accommodation which would be fully accessible to the elderly and physically impaired, which would in turn enable older generations to live in the village and potentially remain in their own home for longer than they might be able to in a property with a more traditional layout. The Ward Member suggested that this application should be supported as homes for the elderly were in short supply and the proposal would respond to all the elements for sustainable houses for the area in the future. The Ward Member contended that the proposal would enhance the semi-agricultural landscape of the area, as well as representing the best in thoughtful, contemporary design which would, in her opinion, ensure that Chedworth moved on as a place where people would wish to continue to live and work in the future. The Ward Member concluded by stating that, in her view, the many benefits that would accrue from the proposed development would outweigh any potential harm to the landscape and would represent a Cotswold dwelling that was in keeping with its surroundings, and she urged the Committee to support this application.

A Proposition that this application be approved, was duly Seconded. In response it was suggested that the Committee should consider the landscape impact of the proposal before Members considered granting permission. A Member commented that while in isolation this proposal represented a fabulous design and a positive step towards a sustainable development, it was contrary to policies relating to development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the open

countryside and notice was given of a further Proposition, that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing. In view of this, the original Proposition was withdrawn.

The further Proposition, that this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, was duly Seconded and it was considered that all Members of the Committee should be invited to attend that Sites Inspection Briefing because the proposal was contrary to policy.

**(a) Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the impact of the proposed development on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Conservation Area;**

**(b) all Members of the Committee be invited to attend this Sites Inspection Briefing as an approved duty.**

**Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 1, interest declared 1, absent 0.**

PL.13 DURATION OF MEETING

Attention was drawn to Council Procedure Rule 9, and a vote was taken as to whether the Meeting should continue.

**RESOLVED that the Meeting be continued.**

**Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

PL.14 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS (CONTINUED)

**RESOLVED that the remaining applications be dealt with in accordance with Minute PL.12 above.**

**CT.2165/Y**

**Proposed external swimming pool with pavilion at Birch House, Ampney Crucis -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its location within the Conservation Area and proximity to public rights of way. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views through the site from various locations.

A Member of the Parish Council and an Objector were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. In response to a question from the Ward Member, it was reported that, as the original proposal for a slack pitch roof and hip gable had been considered to be out of keeping and incongruous, a more-steeply pitched gable had been sought as that was considered to be more in keeping with, and provide

an 'arts and crafts flavour' to, the locality. The Ward Member expressed concern over the height and scale of the proposed buildings in relation to the remainder of the site. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the site was in an open and exposed location within the village and he expressed concern over elements of unauthorised development within the site. The Ward Member concluded by suggesting that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that this site was situated approximately three metres from a paddock adjacent to the residential curtilage of the Objector's property.

A Proposition that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, was duly Seconded.

**Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the impact of the proposals on the Conservation Area, the neighbouring property and views from the nearby bridleway.**

**Record of Voting - for 13, against 1, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

**CT.4203/2/L**

**Variation of Conditions 3 (scheme of landscaping), 9 (design and details), and 11 ( drainage works) in respect of application 10/03705/FUL (Change of Use and extension of existing leisure facility to provide a care home with 60 bedrooms and ancillary accommodation at Le Spa, 42 Gloucester Road, Cirencester -**

The Team Leader drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting. The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site and displayed an aerial photograph of the site, as well as photographs illustrating views of, and into the site, from various locations, and views of protected trees within the site.

The Ward Member, who was serving on the Committee as a Substitute Member, was invited to address the Committee and commented that the correct address for this site should now be 'Stratton Place' and not 'Le Spa'. The Ward Member welcomed the continuing attention to this site by the Team Leader and expressed concern over the current condition of the site. The Ward Member contended that the way forward for the future of this site was unlikely to be the scheme which was the subject of the extant permission and that, in his opinion, the non-designated heritage asset was unlikely to survive. The Ward Member concluded by expressing support for the Officer Recommendation.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the situation at this site was complicated, due in part to the financial situation in respect of the former health and leisure centre; efforts to protect the non-designated heritage asset building had not been entirely successful; ownership of the site had changed and there was an expectation that it would now be brought back into use; English Heritage had reviewed the status of the main building on the site and decided that it was not of listable quality, and so the Council had no powers to

require its protection; the National Planning Policy Framework sought to promote economic development, and to ensure that there were no unreasonable obstacles to such development being brought forward but could not require that development occurred; and the original building, which dated back to the early nineteenth century, had been restored following fire damage and had been adapted for different uses since that time.

It was considered that this site represented an important space and that it was in everyone's interests for the development to be completed, and a Proposition that this application be approved as recommended, was duly Seconded.

**The Head of Planning was authorised to approve, as recommended, subject to no objections being raised by the Environment Agency and/or the Council's Drainage Engineer.**

**Record of Voting - for 12, against 0, abstentions 1, interest declared 1, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

**CT.2255/Y**

**Variation of Condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission ref. 14/00270/FUL (Change of Use of building to youth hostel with associated external alterations) to amend elevational design at The Niccol Centre, Cricklade Street, Cirencester -**

The Team Leader drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications.

A Member expressed the view that this proposal would enhance the appearance of the building, and a Proposition that this application be approved as recommended, was duly Seconded.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 14, against 0, abstentions 1, absent 0.**

**CT.2547/X**

**Replacement external ATM, removal of railings and stone steps and new internal ATM with associative works at HSBC, 2 Market Place, Cirencester -**

The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which allowed the consideration of harm against public benefits.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and expressed the view that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh any potential harm.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that removal of the railings would enable the space to be widened, which would facilitate access by disabled people; and that the proposals did not include reinstatement of the window sill.

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

**Approved.**

**Record of Voting - for 14, against 0, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer Recommendation because a majority of the Committee considered that the public benefits that would accrue from the proposal outweighed any potential harm.

**CT.2547/W**

**Replacement external ATM and associated works at HSBC, 2 Market Place, Cirencester -**

A Member referred to the decision relating to application CT.2547/X above and a Proposition that this application be approved, was duly Seconded.

**Approved.**

**Record of Voting - for 14, against 0, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer Recommendation because a majority of the Committee considered that the public benefits that would accrue from the proposal outweighed any potential harm.

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.

Further representations were reported in respect of applications CT.6991/Z and CT.9067.

(ii) Ward Members not on the Committee - Invited to Speak

Councillor BS Dare was invited to speak on application CD.1320/L.

Councillor Mrs. JC Forde was invited to speak on application CD.3670/H.

Councillor NJW Parsons was invited to speak on application CT.6991/Z.



(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>CD.1320/L</u>	)	Councillor AM White (Town Council)
	)	Mrs. M Cowley (Objector)
	)	Mrs. E Evans (on behalf of the Applicant)
	)	
<u>CD.4545/Y</u>	)	Councillor M Lucas (Town Council)
	)	Mr. Halstead (Agent)
	)	
<u>CT.8950/D</u>	)	Mr. Firth (Objector)
	)	Mr. T Keron (Agent)/
	)	Mrs. H Kendall Smith (Applicant)
	)	
<u>CT.6991/Z</u>	)	Mrs. M Farragher (Supporter)
	)	Mr. S Firkins (Agent)
	)	
<u>CT.9067</u>	)	Mr. A Robinson (Agent)
	)	
<u>CD.3670/H</u>	)	Mr. I Robertson (Supporter)
	)	Mr. A Pywell (Agent)
	)	
<u>CT.2165/Y</u>	)	Councillor SJ Holt (Parish Council)
	)	Mrs. H Crisp (Objector)

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

P.15 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015

It was noted that Councillors JA Harris, M Harris, SG Hirst, RL Hughes and Ms JM Layton would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

It was noted that advance Sites Inspection Briefings would take place on Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> July 2015 in respect of the following applications:-

15/00419/OUT - 90 dwellings, Aston Road, Chipping Campden - to assess the impact of the proposed development on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the adjacent settlement;

15/00708/OUT - 76 dwellings, The Leasows, Dyers Lane, Chipping Campden - to assess the impact of the proposed development on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the adjacent settlement;

15/01020/OUT - 33 dwellings, land off Draycott Road, Blockley - to assess the impact of the proposed development on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the adjacent settlement;

15/01718/OUT - erection of a Doctors' Surgery with associated parking (including additional parking for the town) at land adjacent to Tall Trees, Stow-on-the-Wold - to assess the likely impact of the proposed development on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area, on the character or appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the setting of the town and the protected trees;

15/01809/FUL - erection of a primary health care centre, 5 residential units and associated infrastructure, parking and landscaping - Land Parcel at Stow Fair site, between Maugersbury Road and A436, Maugersbury Road, Stow-on-the-Wold - to assess the likely impact of the proposed development on the setting of the adjacent conservation area, on the character or appearance of the AONB, the setting of the town and the protected trees.

Note:

It was considered to be appropriate for all Members of the Committee to attend these advance Sites Inspection Briefings on this occasion, as an approved duty, because of their potential impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

P.16 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 11.30 a.m. and 11.40 a.m., and again between 1.00 p.m. and 1.25 p.m., and closed at 3.05 p.m.

Chairman

(END)