

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

11TH NOVEMBER 2015

Present:

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

Councillors -

Miss AML Beccle	JA Harris
AW Berry	M Harris
AR Brassington	Mrs. SL Jepson
Sue Coakley	Juliet Layton
Alison Coggins	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
RW Dutton	Tina Stevenson
David Fowles	

Observers:

Julian Beale (from 10.30 a.m.)	BS Dare (from 9.50 a.m. until
PCB Coleman (from 9.50 a.m. until	12.10 p.m.)
1.45 p.m.)	

PL.65 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor Miss AML Beccle declared an interest in respect of application CT.4203/2/K, because she had been a member of the leisure facility at the site. Councillor Miss Beccle subsequently left the Meeting while this item was being determined because she was acquainted with a person in the public gallery.

Councillor AR Brassington declared an interest in respect of application CT.2609/Y, because he had visited the site independently and had spoken to an Objector.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CT.4203/2/K, because he was acquainted with a previous owner and had been a member of leisure facility at the site.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CD.2288/R, because he was acquainted with the Applicant.

Councillor M Harris declared an interest in respect of application CT.4203/2/K, because he was acquainted with a previous owner and had been a member of the leisure facility at the site.

Councillor RL Hughes declared an interest in respect of applications CD.8481/G, because he was acquainted with a Brother of the Applicant.

Councillor RL Hughes declared an interest in respect of application CD.8481/F, because he was acquainted with a Brother of the Applicant.

Councillor Mrs. SL Jepson declared an interest in respect of application CD.2288/R, because she was acquainted with the Applicant.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.2288/R, because he was the Applicant. Councillor Stowe was not present at the Meeting.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations from Officers.

PL.66 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

No substitution arrangements had been put in place for this Meeting.

PL.67 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 15th October 2015 be approved as a correct record.

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

PL.68 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman reminded the Committee that, as in previous years, the Council would be observing two minutes' silence at 1.00 a.m., as a mark of respect for those who had served in World War One and subsequent conflicts. As a result, the Meeting would adjourn just before 11.00 a.m. As observing the silence was a personal choice, the Chairman suggested that anyone who did not wish to observe the silence should move to the foyer area outside the Council Chamber when the Meeting adjourned.

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Mrs. AL Steward of the Local Government Association, and Mr. S Wright of West Oxfordshire District Council, to the Meeting.

Councillor JA Harris took the opportunity to advise that he would be stepping down as a Member of the Committee at the close of the Meeting, and that he would be replaced by Councillor PCB Coleman. Councillor Harris thanked the Chairman for his leadership and for the courteous manner in which he conducted the Meetings. In response, the Chairman thanked Councillor Harris for his work as a Member of the Committee, and commented that his presence would be missed at future Meetings.

PL.69 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.70 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been submitted by Members.

PL.71 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.72 GAMBLING ACT 2005 - REVIEW OF THE STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The Committee was requested to consider a revised Statement of Principles in relation to the provisions of the Gambling Act 2005, and to make recommendations to the Council thereon.

Officers amplified various aspects of the circulated report, including in respect of the consultation undertaken in relation to the revised Statement of Principles and the options available to the Council to meet its obligations in relation to the protection of children and other vulnerable people from being harmed or exploited by gambling.

RECOMMENDED that the revised Statement of Principles relating to the Gambling Act 2005 be approved.

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

PL.73 LICENSING ACT 2003 - REVIEW OF THE STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

The Committee was requested to consider a revised Statement of Licensing Policy relating to the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003, and to make recommendations to the Council thereon.

Officers amplified aspects of the circulated report and responded to various questions from Members thereon. It was considered that the revised Statement of Licensing Policy should be amended, as follows:-

Paragraph 5.6 - by deletion of the words 'The Council encourages applicants for premises licences...' and their substitution by the words 'The Council requires applicants for premises licences...'

RECOMMENDED that the revised Statement of Licensing Policy relating to the Licensing Act 2003 be approved, as amended.

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

PL.74 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:-

CT.2609/Y

Erection of external racking at The Colt Car Company Ltd., Watermoor Road, Cirencester -

The Team Leader drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site and displayed photographs illustrating views of the racking on the site from various locations, including the gardens of two neighbouring residential properties.

It was reported that an error had been made in respect of public speaking on this application. As a result, in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, such decision would be subject to none of the people affected by the public speaking error contending that they had been prejudiced.

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

The Chairman referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing undertaken in relation to this application and invited those Members who had attended that Briefing to express their views. A majority of those Members contended that the photograph illustrating views of the racking from the two neighbouring residential properties were not representative of the views obtained from those properties at the Sites Inspection Briefing, and that there were alternative options for the location of the racking within the site. Some Members commented that an existing hedge afforded some mitigation, and one Member expressed the view that the addition of a roof and sides to the racking would further mitigate the appearance of the racking. Another Member commented that forklift trucks operating within the area could cause further noise for residents.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member contended that the racking was an unattractive monstrosity which would have an adverse impact on neighbouring residents, and that such impact would not be mitigated by the addition of a roof and sides. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that this area had previously been used for car parking, which had resulted in vehicles moving in the area twice a day. The Ward Member considered that the proposal would result in an increase in the number of vehicle movements if forklift trucks were in operation in the area and

that the loss of parking spaces within the site could increase the amount of on-street parking in adjacent residential streets. The Ward Member referred to the other options for locating the racking elsewhere within the site and concluded by suggesting that this application should be refused.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that a previous application for a storage building within this site had been approved; the racking element of that application had been removed in light of some third party objections, and a separate application seeking permission for the racking had been submitted; the Environmental Protection Officer had not raised any objections to this application, subject to various Conditions; and, in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, Officers could discuss the use of electric and/or LPG forklift trucks, and noise-attenuation bleepers, with the Environmental Protection Officer.

A number of Members noted that the Applicant Company provided local employment and that storage facilities within the site were constrained. However, those Members considered that the proposed site would not provide the best solution for the racking, due to its visual impact on the neighbouring properties.

A Proposition that this application be refused for reasons relating to the visual impact on neighbouring residential properties, was duly Seconded.

Refused, for reasons relating to the visual impact of the proposed racking on neighbouring residential properties.

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, for the reasons stated.

CD.2581/H

Outline application for residential development of up to 23 dwellings and associated works at land off Draycott Road, Blockley -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications, including a legal opinion submitted on behalf of the Blockley Environmental Action Group. The Chairman allowed a period of 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 existing residential developments in the vicinity of the site; existing vegetation along the boundary with Blockley Brook; an indicative layout; density; access; the Development Boundary for the village as identified in the emerging Local Plan; and the Parish Council's Conservation Area review appraisal. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views of the site from various locations.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member contended that this application had caused

considerable heartache, both in the village and in neighbouring villages, which would be affected by the proposed development. The Ward Member explained that the site was one of the main gateways to the village and was situated on a narrow road connecting Blockley to Draycott and Aston Magna. The Ward Member contended that, as the site was not within walking distance of the village centre, residents of the proposed development would rely on their cars, which would cause problems along the road and with parking in the village centre. The Ward Member suggested that such residents could also decide to travel to Moreton-in-Marsh, again along narrow, hazardous roads. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that this site was located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and that the proposal was contrary to Local Plan Policy 7, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Policy 11, and emerging Local Plan Policy EN1. The Ward Member considered that the Action Group had put together a comprehensive document stating the reasons why it did not support this application. The Ward Member also referred to the conclusions in the legal opinion obtained by the Group, and to the planning history relating to the site. The Ward Member contended that there were a number of 'brown field' sites within a few miles of the village, and other settlements, which could accommodate developments of the size proposed, and that a development comprising twenty-three units constituted a 'major' development for the village. The Ward Member referred to the views expressed by residents in respect of development for the village, and the economic benefits accrued from tourists, and concluded by reiterating that, while the village was not saying 'no' to any development, it considered this proposal to be unsuitable for a site within the AONB.

A Proposal that consideration of this application be deferred, was duly Seconded.

Deferred to enable a thorough assessment of the legal opinion submitted on behalf of the Blockley Environmental Action Group.

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

CD.9514

Erection of a 23.0m high lattice tower with 6 antennas and 2 dishes; installation of 6 equipment cabinets, ancillary development within 2.2m high fencing and new access track at land adjacent to Nashs Barn, Park Lane, Sevenhampton -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed a period of time for the Committee to read those representations which had been circulated at the Meeting.

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

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that the proposal was part of the Mobile Infrastructure Project (MIP) which was being funded by the Government. The Ward Member reminded the Committee of the aims of the MIP and of the site selection process that had been undertaken by the Applicant, and concluded by expressing his view that the economic benefits of the proposal could outweigh any landscape impact.

Note:

At this juncture, Councillor RL Hughes, having vacated the Chair at the start of the consideration of this item, left the Meeting. Councillor SG Hirst took the Chair for this item.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that eighteen sites had been considered by the Applicant; a further eight sites had been suggested by the Parish Council and/or Objectors, and those sites had been assessed but considered to be unsuitable for the proposed development; and a wind turbine on the site had been permitted previously.

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 proposal on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 2, abstentions 1, did not vote 1, absent 1.

Note:

At this juncture, Councillor Hughes re-joined the Meeting and assumed the Chair again.

CD.0411/S

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 13 two-bedroom apartments; provision of communal facilities, landscaping and car parking at Stow Agricultural Services, Lower Swell Road, Stow-on-the-Wold -

The Team Leader drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed a period of 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 outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the proposed layout and elevations; car parking; access; the footprint of the proposed building; and floor plans. The Team Leader displayed photographs illustrating views into the site from various vantage points, across the site, of an adjacent building and existing buildings on the site, and from the garden of an adjacent residential property and the relationship between the proposed building and the lower garden of that property.

A Member of the Town Council 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 expressed his support for the Officer Recommendation and for the comments made by the Town Councillor. The Ward Member also congratulated the Team Leader on the evaluation of her report which he considered to be beyond the normal level of acceptance. The Ward Member asked Members if they could recall the last application for Change of Use from residential to business and expressed his view that, once an application for a Change of Use from business to residential had been approved, it would be

irreversible in practice. The Ward Member referred to other, recent applications for similar developments in the town and contended that it did not require further housing of this type. The Ward Member further contended that the town was in danger of being converted to a 'geriatric dormitory', with occasional estate agent and antique shops. He stated that this application had given the Committee an opportunity to maintain the economic and social balance of the town and he concluded by expressing support for the Officer Recommendation.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that final agreement of the proposed contribution towards off-site affordable housing was still awaited; in view of the foregoing, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, such decision would be subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the financial contribution; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, it would not be reasonable to restrict the use of the building to provide accommodation for the elderly on the ground floor and affordable housing on the first floor as the sharing of a building and facilities in such a way could prove to be too onerous for both the developer and the housing providers; this site was not protected by employment land policies in the existing Local Plan; minimal weight could be afforded to emerging Local Plan policies; in determining this application, the Committee should consider both the economic and social benefits that would accrue from the development; in the opinion of Officers, whilst regrettable, the loss of this area of employment land was considered to be outweighed by the social benefits of providing housing; Officers had negotiated with the Applicant and this proposal, as submitted, represented the 'bottom line' for the proposal to be viable for the Applicant; the County Highways Officer had not raised any objections in relation to the suggested parking provision within this site, given its proximity to the town centre, the opportunity for residents and visitors to use 'local' facilities, its proximity to areas where on-street parking occurred, and because the age restriction on occupation was perceived to indicate a lower level of car ownership amongst potential residents; the previous business on this site had relocated to other premises in Longborough approximately two years previously; and evidence of demand for employment land in this area had not been required as part of the assessment of this application because the site was not protected by Local Plan employment land policies.

A Member stated that the number of people working from home was increasing. A second Member contended that the UK had an ageing population which would increase demand on health and social care in the future and would require the provision of more homes for older people. Another Member commented that this site should be used for other purposes as, in his view, there was already a sufficient number of 'retirement' properties in the town. Other Members expressed support for the Officer Recommendation, because the site was not protected for employment use, and a Proposition that this application be refused was duly Seconded.

Refused, as recommended.

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

CT.4203/2/K**Redevelopment to provide the erection of a 64 bed care home, 8 care suites, 34 assisted living units, ancillary accommodation and associated works at Stratton Place, 42 Gloucester Road, Stratton -**

The Team Leader drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Team Leader suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, extra Conditions relating to render should be attached to any Decision Notice, and any such decision should be subject to Conditions to be specified by the Environmental Protection Officer. The Chairman allowed a period of 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, which was outside the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but within the Development Boundary for Cirencester, drawing attention to the area of protected open space; the proposed layout; and its proximity to existing residential properties. The Team Leader displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views of the interior and exterior of the existing building, and views into and across the site. The Team Leader also drew attention to an illustration of the finished scheme, as proposed and a three-dimensional diagram illustrating the relationship of the proposed development to existing neighbouring properties.

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

Note:

A Member of the Town Council and an Objector, who had previously registered to speak on this item, were not present at the Meeting for this item.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member expressed the view that the proposals constituted a large development on a constrained site but suggested that the footprint would be almost the same as the footprint of the existing building and that, overall, the height would also be the same. The Ward Member also expressed the view that a good quality built development would be required on this site if the proposal was to be a commercial success. The Ward Member commented that the provision of residential home accommodation did not count towards the Council's housing land supply, and expressed concern that comments were still awaited from the Environmental Protection Officer. The Ward Member referred to the Landscape Management Plan and expressed his view that the Committee should be able to determine this application without the need for a Sites Inspection Briefing. The Ward Member considered that, on balance, the proposal constituted a reasonable use of this site and concluded by reiterating his view that this would be a difficult construction site.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the original building on this site had been put forward for consideration for listing by the Secretary of State, who had not considered it to be of sufficient national importance to warrant listing; notwithstanding that, the building was considered to be of local importance as a non-designated heritage asset, which was a material consideration in the determination of this application; if the Committee was

minded to approve this application, as recommended, a record of the building would be made for posterity prior to its demolition; in the opinion of Officers, much of the historical significance of the building had already been eroded through the implementation of previous planning permissions, and many of the important interior features had been lost; the remaining façade was considered to be of merit; in its determination of this application, the Committee should consider the significance of the loss of the building against the public benefit that would accrue from the proposed development; in the view of Officers, such public benefit would outweigh the remaining heritage value of the building; the best way to ensure a development was undertaken was to respond to economic circumstances to provide an appropriate scheme for development, Government policy and market forces; the site was not in a Conservation Area and there were limited public views of the dereliction; as the site was within a Development Boundary, the Committee could consider any development that accorded with the Council's policies; there were no current policy objections to the proposed development; the accessible roof garden of the proposed building would be approximately 43 metres away from the windows of, and 23 metres away from the boundary of, the nearest residential property; if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, a Condition requiring a record to be made of the historic building would be attached to any Decision Notice, but the issue of the sale of the façade was outside planning control; in considering the restoration of a building, account had to be taken of the financial viability of such restoration and, in the opinion of Officers, this would be a costly building to restore; the heritage interest was limited to the front elevation; account had been taken of the structural condition of the building in the assessment of this application, as well as the benefits that would accrue from the proposed development and the opportunity to restore the site for a longer term use; some of the other permissions, which had not been implemented, were still extant; it was not considered that the current proposals would have any adverse impact on the protected trees on this site; the relevant planning history had been referred to in the circulated report; if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, the assisted living units would count towards the Council's housing land supply; and, while the proposed building would be visible from surrounding residential properties, those properties would retain adequate amounts of privacy.

A Member commented that the Town Council had reluctantly supported this application, and that it would be ill-advised to try and hide any connection with the previous owners. While expressing concern over the height of the proposed building, some Members considered that this application had some merit and it was noted that it could add a total of thirty-four units to the Council's housing land supply. It was further considered that the site was in need of development and that this proposal represented a real opportunity to achieve a development with some merit for the town. One Member contended that the proposal would constitute over-development of the site and another expressed the view that the building would become more derelict and that the original proposal would re-appear at some point in the future.

A Proposition that this application be approved as recommended, subject to extra Conditions, was duly Seconded.

The Head of Planning was authorised to approve, as recommended, subject to extra Conditions relating to render and to Conditions to be suggested by the Environmental Protection Officer.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 3, abstentions 0, interest declared 1, absent 0.

CD.2288/R

Demolition of derelict and defective glass houses and sheds; construction of 1 no. 4 bedroomed 1.5 storey detached house with garage at Harbourlow, Broadway Road, Mickleton -

The Case Officer drew the Committee's attention to some errors in the first section of the circulated report relating to the size of the land parcel and distances to other properties. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the layout of the proposed house; its location within the site; the context of the site; and its proximity to other sites which had been subject of recent planning applications. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views into the site, and views of the access and existing buildings.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

CD.8481/G

Erection of general purpose building for use as agricultural lairage and associated fodder storage at The Old Quarry, Fosseyway, Broadwell -

The Team Leader drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed a period of 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 outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its proximity to the Fosseyway and the locations of existing and proposed buildings. The Team Leader displayed photographs illustrating views of the existing buildings from various vantage points.

An Objector 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 explained that his comments would also relate to the subsequent application on this Schedule (CD.8481/F below referred). The Ward Member expressed concern over the potential impact of this and the subsequent proposal, and two further applications which were not yet ready for determination. The Ward Member expressed the view that all four applications were inter-related and suggested that consideration of this, and the subsequent application, should be deferred in order that all four applications could be considered at the same time. The Ward Member expressed his view that this site, which was located in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, was important to the village and to the whole District. The Ward Member stated that the site comprised approximately one acre and stated that it had been in the same ownership since 1998. The Ward Member reminded the Committee of the recent planning history relating to

this site, including five applications which had been submitted during the current year. The Ward Member questioned why the Applicant was seeking further development on the site if the amount of stock handled was not going to be increased and he expressed his view that the proposal constituted a functional, ugly building which would be located in a prominent position in close proximity to the Fosseway. The Ward Member also expressed concern that, if the amount of stock handled did increase, there would be a requirement for larger vehicles to visit the site. The Ward Member reiterated his contention that it would be unwise for the Committee to determine this, and the subsequent, applications in isolation given the knowledge of the two further applications on this site and suggested that it might be advantageous for consideration of both current applications to be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that the Committee was required to consider each application on its merits.

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 context of the site and the impact of the proposal on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

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

CD.8481/F

Retrospective application of an agricultural muck store at The Old Quarry, Fosseway, Broadwell -

The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site. The Team Leader displayed an aerial photograph of the site, together with photographs illustrating views into, through and from within the site.

An Objector 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 reiterated his view that, however they were handled, this application, the previous application (CD.8481/G), and the two further applications he had referred to in his earlier comments, were inter-related.

Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the context of the site and the impact of the proposal on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

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

Further representations were reported in respect of applications CD.2581/H and CT.4203/2/K.

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

Councillor Julian Beale was invited to speak on applications CD.8481/G and CD.8481/F.

Councillor PCB Coleman was invited to speak on application CT.4203/2/K.

Councillor BS Dare was invited to speak on application CD.0411/S.

(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>CT.2609/Y</u>)	Councillor S Tarr (Town Council)
)	Mr. J Peacock (Objector)
<u>CD.2581/H</u>)	Councillor P Craig (Parish Council)
)	Mr. M Reid (Objector)
)	Mr. R Bellamy (Applicant)
<u>CD.9514</u>)	Councillor G Day (Parish Council)
)	Mr. P Ross (Objector)
)	Mr. R Jackson (Supporter)
)	Mr. S Shamash (Applicant)
<u>CD.0411/S</u>)	Councillor A White (Town Council)
)	Miss L Mathewson (Agent)
<u>CT.4203/2/K</u>)	Mr. J Drew (Supporter)
)	Mr. G Wakefield (Agent)
<u>CD.8481/G</u>)	Mr. G Mitchell (Objector)
)	Mrs. M Holt (Agent)
<u>CD.8481/F</u>)	Mr. G Mitchell (Objector)
)	Mrs. M Holt (Agent)

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.

PL.75 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 2nd December 2015

It was noted that Councillors Miss AML Beccle, AW Berry, RL Hughes, M Harris and Mrs. SL Jepson would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on 2nd December 2015.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

15/00786/FUL - Change of Use from agricultural use to car park, providing 333 spaces; associated landscaping, lighting and fencing; new access road from A429 and new pedestrian access route to station at land adjacent to The Tavern Public

House, Station Road, Kemble - to assess the impact of this proposal on the surrounding area.

Note:

All Members of the Committee were invited to attend the above-mentioned advance Sites Inspection Briefing as an approved duty because it was considered to have substantial economic benefits and landscape impacts.

15/01376/OUT - outline planning application for the erection of up to 11 dwellings (including 5 affordable units) and associated access (appearance, layout, landscape and scale reserved for future consideration) at land east of Bell Lane, Poulton - to assess the impact of the proposed development on the character of Bell Lane, setting of the Conservation Area, landscape, highway safety, residential amenity and drainage and to observe the site's levels, biodiversity and arboricultural features.

Note:

All Members of the Committee were invited to attend the above-mentioned advance Sites Inspection Briefing as an approved duty for the reasons stated.

15/03099/FUL - erection of 64 bed care home (use class C2) together with associated vehicular access, parking and landscaping at land adjacent to Fosseyway Garden Centre, Stow Road, Moreton-in-Marsh - to assess the impact of the proposed development on the setting of Moreton-in-Marsh, the impact on the landscape and scenic beauty of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the appropriateness of the proposed design and drainage implications.

P.76 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 10.55 a.m. and 11.02 a.m., and again between 12.55 p.m. and 1.15 p.m., and closed at 1.55 p.m.

Chairman

(END)