

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**9<sup>th</sup> September 2015**

**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 8 - 15**

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

9<sup>th</sup> September 2015

**ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS ON SCHEDULE ITEMS**

Item	Ref No.	Content
01	15/01048/FUL CT.1479/R	<b>Case Officer</b> - There is an error on page 32 of the Schedule, as the ridge height of the proposed Unit 3 should be shown as <u>approx. 9.0 metres</u> , rather than 7.0 metres. The correct height is given on page 6 of the Schedule within the description of the proposals.
04	15/02733/FUL CT.7047/P	<p><b>One Additional Letter of Objection has been received - Raising the following points -</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The changes proposed would increase the harm to the landscape, resulting in increased suburbanisation of what was until a few years ago a field in the AONB</li> <li>• The mobile home on the adjacent site is already clearly visible from public vantage points, more mobile homes will add to that harm</li> <li>• When the current temporary consent was granted planning committee members stated that it would be appropriate to re-visit the need for a gypsy site at the end of that period</li> <li>• The assurances provided were reluctantly accepted but our fears at the time have been confirmed by actual events</li> <li>• The applicant has not complied with the conditions imposed causing serious harm to the AONB and the Cotswold Way</li> <li>• These changes to that which was approved are too significant to be permitted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Letter from Councillor Parsons</b> – Please see attached.</p> <p><b>Officer Appraisal</b> - Following the publication of the revised 'Planning policy for traveller sites' last week, it is recommended that this application be deferred.</p> <p>This is to allow Officers the opportunity to fully consider the implications of the revised national policy with regard to this proposal. The application will be reported back to Planning Committee at a later date.</p> <p><b>Amended Recommendation - DEFER</b></p>
05	15/01923/FUL CT.8358/B	<b>Revised Drainage Condition</b> – 'Before the development is brought into use, the drainage strategy as set out within the Flood Risk Assessment incorporating Drainage Strategy reference number J-4944-CFM-V1 and dated 17.07.2015 shall be completed within two weeks of the site's completion / connection to the solar farm to the grid' . The drainage strategy shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details for the operational lifespan of the development and until all equipment and associated structures have been removed'.

		<p><b>Historic England – Please see attached.</b></p> <p><b>The recommendation on page 121 of the schedule is therefore amended to PERMIT.</b></p> <p><b>Revised condition to replace the Arboricultural Method Statement condition on page 140 -</b></p> <p>The works shall be completed in accordance with the arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan in the report numbered 150908-1.1-CSF-AMS-CH produced by Treework Environmental Practice dated 08.09.2015. All of the provisions shall be implemented in full according to any timescales laid out in the method statement unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To safeguard the retained/protected tree/s in accordance with Cotswold District Local Plan Policies 10 and 45.</p> <p><b>Additional Third Party Representation – Please see attached</b></p>
06	15/02757/FUL CT.7528/J	<b>Statement by Applicant – Please see attached.</b>
07	15/01982/FUL CT.3694/U	<p><b>Two new Third Party Representations –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would welcome a site visit from the Committee to view the proposals.</li> <li>• The existing building is out of character for the area and too large for the site.</li> <li>• The existing building has already devalued our property and others around it.</li> <li>• The extension is not necessary for the number of people residing at the house and would overlook our property.</li> <li>• Primary concern is with the proximity of the extension to our dwelling.</li> <li>• The amenity and open nature we currently enjoy will be destroyed by this development.</li> <li>• We would welcome a site visit from the Committee.</li> </ul>
08	15/02608/FUL CT.4669/S	<p><b>Case Officer -</b> i) The applicant's agent has stated that "if the committee were minded to approve the scheme but had concerns regarding the boarding to the gable (north elevation) we would be prepared to construct this elevation in natural stone";</p> <p>ii) The Ward Member (Cllr Berry) has requested that the attached drawing is made available for the Committee's consideration and comparison, which shows the front (north) elevation of the garage orientated as currently proposed (but constructed in stonework) and, in the lower image, as previously approved.</p>



# COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCILLOR NICHOLAS PARSONS M.B.E.  
Deputy Leader of the Council  
Cabinet Member for Forward Planning  
Ermin Ward

Planning Committee  
Cotswold District Council  
Trinity Road  
Cirencester  
Gloucestershire  
GL7 1PX

7<sup>th</sup> September 2015

Dear Committee Members

**Planning and Licencing Committee - 9 September 2015**  
**Item No. 4 - 15/02733/FULL**

I have asked for this application to be determined by the Committee because the site lies within the AONB adjacent to the Cotswold Way, and has been acknowledged by the Planning Inspectorate to be a sensitive site. What is proposed in this application is likely to cause further harm to the AONB.

Members will recall the words of the Inspector when dealing with the adjacent site:

"I have found the establishment of a residential home and its ancillary structures causes considerable harm to the AONB and this attracts great weight."

It is, in fact, arguable that the Southern site, which was the subject of the Inspector's determination, is less exposed to public view than the present application site.

Although the Officer Report covering this application refers to "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" issued by DCLG in 2012, DCLG has issued a new replacement "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" in August 2015. I wish to draw Members' attention to Policy H (Determining Planning Applications to Traveller Sites) and, in particular, to paragraph 27 on page 7, where it makes clear that the AONB is given greater protection, even if the Local Authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date 5-year supply of deliverable sites. The footnote to that paragraph 27 states:

"There is no presumption that a temporary grant of Planning Permission should be granted permanently."

These detailed changes in policy should be examined against the overarching aim of the new Planning Policy which is set out at paragraph 3:

"The Government's overarching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers, while respecting the interests of the settled community."

The Parish Council has made a very sensible and measured submission to the Committee, and I support both their argument and their objection to this application.

10 Hem 04.  
15/02733/FUL  
PT/70/510.

The issue to be decided by the Committee is clear. Members must ask themselves, what, if any, harm is caused by the proposed development. The report explains the changes in detail and concludes that:

- the extent of the enlargement of the site and
- the significant increase in the footprint for the mobile homes, represent:
  - a further incursion into the open countryside within the AONB, and
  - create demonstrable harm to the landscape character.

The present application is, therefore, contrary to planning policy relating to the ANOB. The breach of the Conditions noted by the Enforcement Officer are not 'de minimis' and are all capable of being remedied.

I support the Officer recommendation to refuse this application.

Yours sincerely

  
**Nicholas Parsons**

11

HEM 04  
15/02/33/FUL  
07/01/710



Historic England

SOUTH WEST OFFICE

Ms Helen Donnelly  
Cotswold District Council  
Directorate of Development & Heritage  
Trinity Road  
CIRENCESTER  
Gloucestershire  
GL7 1PX

Direct Dial: 0117 975 0732

Our ref: P00463445

7 September 2015

Dear Ms Donnelly

**Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications Direction 2015 &  
T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015  
LAND PARCEL EAST OF WITPIT LANE, PRESTON, GLOUCESTERSHIRE  
Application No 15/01923/FUL**

We have received amended proposals for the above scheme. We do not wish to comment in detail, but offer the following general observations.

**Historic England Advice**

Following previous advice from Historic England, Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners have updated their Heritage Impact Assessment to include a wider zone of assessment which includes the Ampney St Peter Conservation Area. This information and the photographs provided shows that there will be no inter-visibility between this Conservation Area and the site in question, therefore Historic England agrees that the impact on Heritage Assets within our statutory remit will be extremely limited.

**Recommendation**

We would urge you to address the above issues, and recommend that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice. It is not necessary for us to be consulted again.

Yours sincerely

**Jacqueline Martinez**

Assistant Inspector of Historic Buildings & Areas  
E-mail: [Jacqueline.martinez@HistoricEngland.org.uk](mailto:Jacqueline.martinez@HistoricEngland.org.uk)



29 QUEEN SQUARE BRISTOL BS1 4ND

Telephone 0117 975 1308  
[HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://HistoricEngland.org.uk)

Item 05.  
15/01923/FUL  
CT.0359/B.



Historic England is subject to the Freedom of Information Act, 2000 (FOIA) and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). All information held by the organisation will be accessible in response to an information request, unless one of the exemptions in the FOIA or EIR applies.

**Lesley-Jane Weaver**

---

**Subject:** FW: Planning application for photovoltaic solar panels east of Preston Glos

---

**From:** Morwenna le Fleming

**Sent:** 06 September 2015 19:03

**To:** Democratic

**Subject:** Planning application for photovoltaic solar panels east of Preston Glos

Comments re the application.

1. In the event of the application succeeding and as users of the bridleway BPR13/2 can the bridleway be re routed so that it goes east of the panels .It could then re join the existing track south of the development which links it to St.Augustines Farm lane.  
: This section of the bridleway falls short of BHS recommendation but is just about adequate providing it is maintained.

2 . Whilst the site is being developed can we be assured that there will be an alternative exercise facility for the horses. The present bridleway is the only route out of the village which isn't a main road and obviously the bridleway will be unusable whilst the work is in progress.

3. It might be possible to gain access to Driffield by using the other bridge . This would mean going via Foxleaze lane and asking the relevant landowners for temporary permission to travel across their land.

In the interest of public safety and the safety of the horses perhaps the council could be made aware of these comments.

With thanks M I Le Fleming



Item No. 06 – 15/02757/FUL

As you can see from the site plan the plot of the new house is considerable especially when compared to neighbouring properties at Sudeley Drive and extends to approximately third of an acre, the permitted dwelling is modest in size and sympathetic in appearance as are the extensions which form this application with substantial amenity space around the new dwelling maintained. Great effort has been made to ensure the scale, appearance and distances of the extensions adhere to local planning policies, this has been achieved following careful and considerable consultation with CDC planning department and by strictly following the Planning Portal guidelines.

Whereas we understand that people have a right to object we would like to take this opportunity to address this, in particular the residents of 31 Sudeley Drive who have objected to our extension but are currently building a substantial rear extension to their own property (to which we made no objection) and which will have a higher overall ridge height than the extension we have requested and will leave their property with much reduced amenity space to what is already a small plot, we therefore find it difficult to understand why our proposals are considered to be overdevelopment when our plot will have remaining amenity space in excess of 9 times of that remaining at 31 Sudeley Drive.

Similarly 29 Sudeley Drive has also undergone significant extension with the erection of single storey front extension and first floor side/rear extension and extension into the loft area. Also the property known as Lorna Doone adjacent to Ham Cottage, was until recently a flat roof single storey dwelling and has been redeveloped and has tripled in volume, is unsympathetic in appearance and now dominates Ham Cottage, again we made no objection to this.

It is our hope that our family home is sustainable and as such has been designed to make use of sustainable energy and harvests the elements, therefore minimising its carbon footprint, this is reflected in the installation of a pellet boiler, rainwater harvester and the use of water butts. As mentioned previously careful consideration to design, distances and scales, existing and permitted landscaping scheme and the use of locally sourced materials such as Cotswold stone and oak will ensure the appearance of the extensions are sympathetic to the surrounding environment and harmonious with the house therefore preserving its appearance in line with CDCs planning policy. We therefore hope that you will permit this amendment as recommended for permit by senior planning officer, Helen Donnelly.

Many thanks, Martin and Heather Gill.

14  
Item 06.  
15/02757/FUL.  
CT-7523/J.



# PROPOSED DOUBLE GARAGE, PEAR TREE COTTAGE, KEMBLE

This drawing is copyright of CLARK & MASLIN Ltd and may not be copied or reproduced without permission.  
 Figure dimensions are to be taken in preference to scaled dimensions.  
 Large scale drawings to have preference to small scale drawings.  
 Dimensions for fixed-in items are to be checked on site prior to manufacture.



NORTH ELEVATION A



NORTH ELEVATION B

Item 08  
 1502608/FUL  
 CT. 468915

PRELIMINARY

Client: MR P. DOUGLL			
Project: PROPOSED DOUBLE GARAGE, PEAR TREE COTTAGE, 169 EWEN ROAD, KEMBLE			
Description: PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION VARIATIONS A & B			
Scale: 1:50	Proj. No: A1	Sheet: GB	Date: FEB '15
Drawing No: 4080/52	Rev: -		

15/02608/FUL