

CD. 2581/H Parish Council Representation

BLOCKLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Statement to Planning Committee at CDC on 9.11.15

Ref Application : 15/01020/OUT

The Case Officers Report and the applicants last verbal statement comment on BPC's support for sites of up to 5. This is disingenuous – BPC's statistically relevant survey this year indicated support for sites of up to 15. This is just one of many facts ignored in supporting this application.

Indeed, one of the sites not initially included in the SHLAA, was promoted for inclusion through community involvement – a site for 16 on CDC's figures. This is a clear example that appropriate development, in the appropriate location, demonstrating good planning practice, will be accepted.

We are not a 'nimby' village just because we oppose this application. BPC, local organisations and the community in general have made significant representations demonstrating logical opposition to all aspects of this proposal. Our views, the opinions of our experts, local organisations and the 83% of residents opposed to this application are at least as relevant & important as the case presented for approval.

In terms of numbers it should be noted that existing permissions and LPR 18 identify sites for 39 dwellings in Blockley – excluding this site. For info there are also, within our Ward Members patch, at least 17 dwellings permitted from 'windfall' decisions.

We believe that good planning policy and practice should lead development – whatever the pressures. Development boundaries should be drawn to provide for appropriate locations. They should

not slavishly follow 'availability' and try to put square pegs into round holes in a quest purely driven by numbers.

We consider that a sensible development boundary could well prove to be acceptable and deliverable. Experience has shown that once development status has been indicated delivery will follow.

It is our opinion that this site has been given preference purely because it is available. We do not believe that full consideration has been given to its appropriateness.

Our opinions and objections across the complete range of planning issues have been ignored or simply dismissed.

Residents of Blockley – volunteers, have freely given their time with few resources and have done everything they possibly can to make an informed case across all aspects of this application.

The fact is that Officers have made up their minds – but officers do not make the decision.

We therefore are asking you to redress the balance, to give our position full credit and consideration. We are sure you appreciate that this matters to our community.

We understand the pressures – but – you have way in excess of your 5 year requirement.

If you share any of the concerns demonstrably supported by 83% of Blockley we ask you committee members today to give us the benefit of rejecting this application.

CS 2581111 - Objector's Representations

Statement to CDC Planning Committee on behalf of Blockley Environmental Action Group in respect of the application for up to 23 dwellings ref : 15/01020/OUT

From: Robert Willott, 9th December 2015

Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you for taking extra time to consider the objections to this planning application.

I first came to Blockley in 1992 and have been active in a range of village initiatives. I recently retired as Chairman of Blockley Heritage Society and I am now its Vice President. In 2010 I wrote the book "Rebuilding Blockley" which described how older houses in the village have been adapted to contemporary needs. **Over the years Blockley has mainly grown by conversions and small scale infill. Clearly that is the best way to preserve social cohesion and a manageable use of resources.**

You have already read or heard a **considerable weight of cogent objections** raising concerns ranging from traffic to flood risks, and I would like to comment further on just two particular aspects.

The first is the location of the proposed development within an **Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty**. Government policy states that **planning permission should be refused** for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances.

The site is adjacent to **Blockley Brook**, an asset that lies at the heart of the valley and whose resources have been **central to the evolution of Blockley's unique heritage, its architecture, its industry, its landscape and its outstanding natural beauty.**

It also forms a natural boundary between Blockley's built heritage and the undeveloped rural countryside to the East.

Without Blockley Brook, the village would not have been able to **support the Bishop's palace** or be the first to **create electricity** for street lighting. And without Blockley Brook, the village would never have been able to create the **power to drive 13 water mills** and become a **centre for silk throwing.**

Land belonging to one of those former mills - the Good Intent - directly abuts the proposed site.

Even the Heritage Assessment commissioned by Cala Homes acknowledges the **significance of the Brook** in the construction of over 100 Listed Buildings “the architecture, associations and cohesion of which – in the author’s own words - are key to the historical importance of the village”.

Today it is still possible to follow the route of the Brook through Blockley and see how it has powered the social and industrial life of the village.

But the development of a housing estate adjacent to the Brook, passing close by two of the former mills, will obstruct the view of the water course in its historic setting. And it will severely impair any appreciation of the scale and significance of the Brook as a local heritage asset flowing through this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Equally important, it will encroach upon the undeveloped natural habitat on the Eastern side of the Brook and create a precedent for infilling towards Draycott.

Finally, may I turn to the archaeological significance of the site.

Your Case Officer’s submission¹ refers to the County Archaeologist’s report that the site revealed the likely remains of a **Roman settlement**. In the view of the County Archaeologist, the site has the potential to make a substantial contribution to our understanding of the archaeology of the region.

This advice begs much greater attention than it has been given so far. **Surely further investigative work should be carried out BEFORE this planning application is determined?** [I would also recommend that an additional opinion is sought from Professor Christopher Dyerⁱⁱ who is well versed in the history and archaeology of this area.]

** Time elapsed here*

In conclusion, I find it difficult to conceive how it would be possible to have full regard to a duty to conserve this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, with all its social and archaeological heritage, while at the same time approving the proposed development.

Our Member of Parliament, who well understands the special character of Blockley and its environment, would appear to share this view as he too has submitted an objection to the scheme, an almost unprecedented intervention.

ⁱⁱ Christopher Dyer, Emeritus Professor of History, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH. Contact Details: Tel: +44 (0)116 252 2765; Email: cd50@le.ac.uk. *Past Research Interests:* The economic and social history of medieval England, which includes the management of landed estates, agrarian history, peasant mentality and rebellion, standards of living (including diet and housing), consumers and consumption, relations between town and country, the role of towns, especially of smaller towns, the conditions and attitudes of wage earners, poverty, the origins of capitalism, landscape history, rural depopulation, and money and commerce. Much of this research has been focussed on the west midland region (Gloucestershire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire and Worcestershire) but has also included the East Midlands, East Anglia and Yorkshire. *Current Research Interests:* The main project is to complete work on 'Peasant farming 1200-1540' which is being funded by the Leverhulme Trust. This is intended to make a new assessment of the types of farming practised by peasants, and to evaluate their role in the economy. In addition publication of various projects in landscape history such as surveys of Admington, Compton Scorpion, Westcote and Bretford in Warwickshire. *Publications (recent):* "A Country Merchant: 1495-1520". *Trading and Farming at the End of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2012)

CD.9514 - Parish Council Representation

SYNOPSIS OF COMMENTS MADE ON 9 DECEMBER 2015 BY GORDON DAY ON BEHALF OF SEVENHAMPTON PARISH COUNCIL CONCERNING APPLICATION NO. CD.9514

Since the Committee's meeting on 11 November, the Applicant has announced that it has abandoned this project. However, it has not withdrawn the application which therefore remains before you.

In the light thereof, the Parish Council has resolved to oppose this application.

Policy INF 10 of the proposed Local Plan, although not yet formally adopted, in my submission represents best practice. It states that where developments such as this are likely to have a negative impact upon the environment, it must be demonstrated that all technically feasible alternatives have been found to be unviable or unfeasible and that there are no alternative suitable locations.

The negative environmental impact is fully described in the paper previously circulated to Committee members by Mrs Allen and acknowledged by the Cotswold Conservation Board (see page 144 of your papers).

To this I would add only two observations.

First, when in 2008 an application was submitted for the erection of a 15 metre wind turbine close to the site of the proposed mast, the environmental impact was judged to be such that permission was only granted when its height was reduced to 9 metres. The height of the proposed mast is 23 metres.

Secondly, at a meeting with the Parish Council on 16 September the Applicant's representative promised to submit details of the anticipated noise levels of both the cooling units and the wind through the lattice work of the mast. No such appraisal has been submitted.

Objectors have put forward eight alternative sites. Of these no more than three or four have allegedly been evaluated by the Applicant, the others stated to have been outside their area of search or there being no time to evaluate the same (see page 151 of your papers).

No attempt has been made to evaluate alternative technologies which are or will shortly become available. I refer you to Cllr. Cook's paper which has been circulated to members of the Committee.

Following the abandonment of the project, the balance referred to at page 148 of your papers between the conservation of the environment and the social and economic benefits becomes somewhat academic.

The Parish Council therefore asks you to reject this application. If another developer wishes to revive the proposal at a later date, let them put in a fresh application following proper consultation with all interested parties which, unlike the present application, can be properly evaluated in the light of the then current technologies.

Thank you.

CD. 9514 - Objector's Representations

Intro

I speak for over 30 local residents who live on this hill and throughout the valley. We support the need to improve coverage but do not believe this is the right solution

AONB

A 23m high urbanised structure obscured by 8m high farm buildings speaks for itself in terms of the harm this would have on an AONB and we ask you to consider your statutory duty to conserve the natural beauty of our landscape

Screens

The NPPF States A need to keep the numbers of masts to a minimum and that they are sympathetically designed and camouflaged

The current local plan requires assurance there isn't a less conspicuous alternative location

The emerging local plan also states this requirement in addition to an assurance there isn't a technically feasible alternative solution

The planning report implies the current plan holds little weight. This contradicts statements of 11th November. In the previous agenda item you are advised the emerging plan is 'a relevant material consideration that must be taken into account'

In this case ;

- None of the technically feasible alternatives have been considered .
- Suitable less conspicuous sites, put forward by us , have not been considered despite meeting **all** the requirements stipulated
- And No attempt has been made to sympathetically design. We're led to believe this is due to load bearing requirements of 4 operators yet now it's potentially open to just one

Harm

In order to keep the number of masts to a minimum the benefits of this case need to be assured

- Technical alternatives have superseded the need for this application
- The proposed coverage duplicates a significant part of the area already covered and misses areas that need it
- And You are now considering this simply as a 'just in case ' scenario leaving use open to anyone without the ~~need to justify their benefits~~ ^{control over the}

Benefits

We therefore ask you to refuse this application on the planning grounds that ;

1. The level of harm , which is significant and can be reduced, outweighs questionable benefits which can be achieved without it
2. The use of a less conspicuous alternative locations and the use of technically feasible alternative solutions have not been ruled out
3. No effort has been made to reduce the level of harm through sensitive design

Reasons for refusal

Finally we ask why would you subject an AONB to any harm when the benefits can be achieved without doing so

Close

Thank you on behalf of us all Claire Allen

CD.9514 - Applicant's Representations

Planning Application Ref: 15/03546/FUL

Erection of a 23.0 m high lattice tower with 6 antennas and two dishes, installation of 6 equipment cabinets, ancillary development within 2.2 m high fencing and new access track

Land Adjacent to Nashs Barn, Park Lane, Sevenhampton, Gloucestershire GL54 5XH

Statement made by Saleem Shamash BSc (Hons) FRICS MRTPI, Arqiva - National Town Planning Manager

Cotswold District Council Planning Committee 9 December 2015

Mr Chairman, Members - Good Morning

If you had granted planning permission on 11 November, we probably could have completed this installation by the end of March 2016, the closing date for the Government's Mobile Infrastructure Project. I did not refer to this last time, to avoid making you feel under pressure.

I regret therefore that even if you approve today, the mast will not be built with central Government funds. However, the Government still hopes for a planning permission to leave options open for the future.

To be left in the customs hall when the ship has sailed is unfortunate, especially as we had hoped to build 7 sites in your area to cover tens of square kilometres with 4G superfast wireless broadband. And as someone who by co-incidence lives outside Cirencester I know what a difference that would have made.

In the event this was the only site that progressed to a planning application. This reflects the truly difficult challenges in finding sites that meet all the complex operational criteria and balance those against the very real environmental sensitivities.

Indeed, compared to the 35 metre mast permitted at Miserden and the 30 metre mast that the Chedworth residents were upset we could not progress, 23 metres is about as good as it gets.

But even if it is right that we only offered a Ford and not a Rolls Royce, we can no longer even supply a bicycle.

This is a shame, because where communities have grasped the opportunity, from April next year:

- Their families, friends and visitors, along with local businesses will all benefit and prosper from the best wireless connectivity
- Children and students will be able to access online educational resources whether on the school bus, in the garden or in their bedrooms
- First responders on call will no longer be chained to the fixed lines in their homes
- An ambulance can be called promptly to help a walker with a heart attack
- And the connected ECG machine on board will be able to transmit life- saving data to the on call cardiology unit
- And whatever the future brings by way of new devices and applications they will be in a position to benefit

Instead, I regret that there has been a misplaced belief in future alternative technologies. These are still experimental in rural areas and will be a very poor cousin to what was on offer through this project.

There has also been a misguided notion that we could develop a lower mast in a different location that serves more people - well one would have more luck finding the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

So I repeat what I said last time, after 30 years the solution is bound to raise some localised issues. These have all been comprehensively addressed by your Planning Officer, who has made a clear recommendation for approval and I request you grant planning permission accordingly.

Thank you

W, 0479/J - Parish Council Representation

Full Application for the Demolition of existing garages and forecourt and the development of 7 dwellings at Granbrook Lane Garage, Mickleton, Chipping Campden Gloucestershire for Mr Robin Coldicote - Three minute presentation against the proposal on behalf of Mickleton Parish Council

In CDC's draft *Local Plan (May 2013)*: it was stated that :-

- Up to 80 dwellings were indicated as a reasonable amount of development for Mickleton to accommodate up to the year 2031. Since this time planning consents have been given for over 250 houses; that is more than 300% more than envisaged in the original Draft Local Plan for Mickleton.

In January 2014 Mickleton Parish Council at the request of CDC Planning Department undertook, along with local residents, a site assessment exercise on Site MK4 as part of the SHLAA. MK4 being the site subject to today's planning application.

As a Parish Council we undertook this exercise seriously and in good faith which took considerable time, and involved many in the village. It was clear to us that the southern part of the proposed site lies within an "Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty" (AONB). Our final judgements, having assessed the site were:-

Development of the "southern field" of the MK4 site would result in building within the AONB of Mickleton. This has the potential to be damaging to local wildlife through the loss of habitat, and would also result in the erosion of the beautiful countryside in and around Mickleton. The loss of any AONB will ultimately damage the tourist industry with many British and foreign visitors coming to the village to stay in the Three Ways House Hotel. The countryside around Mickleton is our main attraction supporting this industry, and the Three Ways House Hotel is a major contributor to the village of Mickleton's economy.

We noted that if the northern part only of the site was developed, (which we accepted would be reasonable.)

Our first priority as a village would be for this to be developed for one/two bed housing suitable for first time buyers or for older people looking to downsize.

In summary Mickleton Parish Council ask the CDC planning committee to reject this application on the following grounds:-

Firstly - to allow this approval to proceed as envisaged sets a dangerous precedent for other planning applications within the AONB in Mickleton and more widely in the Cotswolds, and as such has a damaging effect on our village, and our developing tourist industries.

Secondly - CDC having asked the Parish Council to undertake a careful site assessment exercise of this site, the Planning Committee now should respect the outcomes from this exercise and the wishes of local residents.

Thirdly - the proposed development of 7 houses makes ^{1,146}no attempt to address the local and national needs for affordable houses which is a priority of government.

Fourthly - the loss of the field part of this site removes valuable agricultural land for future generations.

Fifthly - As Mickleton is now to have over 300% more housing than originally envisaged by CDC's original Draft Local Plan, to reject this application as it stands and to ask for it to be resubmitted with less housing, including affordable housing, and not within the AONB seems entirely reasonable.

Chris Morecroft OBE
Chairman
Mickleton Parish Council

CS.0479/J Objector's Representations

I am speaking on behalf of the residents, living adjacent to the proposed development, to which we are all opposed.

SHLAA:

- In the SHLAA, 80 houses were proposed in Mickleton.
- The Council has already passed over 240 houses in Mickleton.
- These developments already provide a range of 1-5 bedroom houses.
- Therefore the housing needs of Mickleton have already been met and exceeded.

AONB:

- AONB is defined as an area designated to conserve and enhance; this proposed development will go against those principles, and will have a detrimental effect on both the landscape and environment.
- Proposed development has plots which encroach onto AONB.
- The size, height and density of the proposed housing, will not enhance the environment, nor blend in with existing dwellings.
- To protect AONB, the NPPF has stated that any developments should encourage effective use of land, eg brownfield sites which the garage obviously is, but then this has been extended into the green field/agricultural land to the rear of the brownfield site.

WILDLIFE and NATURAL HABITAT:

- Development will affect many species and their habitats; frequently see frogs, newts and hedgehogs, whilst bats are regularly observed going into the existing building on the greenfield site.

INFRASTRUCTURE and SCHOOL:

- Local Primary School is already FULL ! How will this be extended to meet the need of those additional families coming into the village, via the already committed development of 240 houses.
- The road system in and around Mickleton is ineffective and insufficient to meet the needs of additional traffic.
- The centre of the village is effectively single file opposite the Three Ways and outside NISA, due to parking and the number of heavy lorries using the route to the metal recycling plant.
- There are little to no employment opportunities within the village and the new residents will be travelling to Stratford, and Evesham, along already congested pot-holed roads.
- The road problem is made worse by the recent developments in Long Marston, and Lower Quinton areas.

These additional houses are not needed to meet the existing Local Development Plan, nor the future stock of housing. Whilst the demolition of the existing garage would improve the look of the area, this is far outweighed by the impact of encroachment onto greenfield site and AONB.

I urge the Planning Committee to reject this proposed development. Thank you.

Applicant's Representation CT.8347/1/A

Proposed Annex at 24 Chester Crescent, Cirencester, Glos

PRESENTATION FOR MEETING ON 9th DECEMBER 2015

We have lived in or near Chester Street for 30 years and have a good knowledge of how the site has looked over the last 200 years. We are passionate about preserving the heritage of Chester Street and Chester Crescent and that is why we live here. We are merely custodians and "legacy" means making it better for the next generation, which is why I have fully involved my 17 year old son in the design process. The aim is to:

1. Tidy up a messy area of Chester Street

The existing site consists of the remains of an old stable (in poor condition), an asbestos garage (which is unstable), an old shed and eight large unsightly leylandii trees. The proposal is to replace all of this with a simple reconstruction of the original stable, which can provide ancillary accommodation or a garden room. The community have shown their support for tidying up this part of Chester Street. They have also given positive feedback to the proposed design.

2. Provide ancillary accommodation for guests, including my elderly father.

The overall size of the annex is small and the facilities kept basic as anyone staying in the annex would rely upon the main house for cooked meals, washing clothes and the sitting room. In the annex we need the facility of a toilet/shower and a sink, in order for guests, including my father, to be accommodated through the night.

My father has had two major strokes and has carers popping into his house twice a day. This is costing about £15,000 a year. As his needs and the costs increase, we will want to accommodate him, in a way that gives him some independence, though relying upon the main house for most of his domestic needs. That means that my father can live with his family and remain part of society, rather than going into an unaffordable care home. Not least, this annex would give him a measure of independence, while still being close to support.

3. Restore this part of Chester Street back to its' Victorian look

Compare photos of Chester Street in 1905 and 2005 and see little difference.

24 Chester Crescent was built around 1912, but the site was developed previously to this, which included several working buildings, including a large stable building forming an L shape, on the site of the proposed annex. The proposed design is simple, functional and the 'public' elevations are designed to be in keeping with the character of Chester Street, which is in a conservation area. The proposal is for the annex to reflect the Victorian proportions of Chester Street, whilst being appropriately dwarfed by its surrounding buildings. We would like to salvage the best of the original rough dressed Cotswold stone. We were pleased that the conservation officer recognised the appropriateness of our Cotswold stone and slate design at the pre-planning stage back in March. The simple design is based on studying many converted stables and outbuildings throughout our side of Cirencester. For example, at both ends of Chester Street, there are similar buildings to that proposed.

Town Council Representation

Item No 07:15/01348/FUL - 24 Chester Crescent, Cirencester

CT.8347/1/A

- 1. View of Cirencester Town Council - Objection:** The building is not in keeping with the street scene.
- The proposal is for the demolition of an existing barn, garage and shed that are in a poor state of repair and the erection of a single storey guest/granny annex. But the annex is too high and the fully glazed door is out of keeping with the street scene as is the small high-level window.
- Planning officials state that they are satisfied that the form and materials of the building would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the conservation area, that the proposal would be in compliance with Cotswold District Local Plan Policy 15 and Section 12 of the NPPF. Secondly, that there is map evidence which shows that a larger stable building was previously located in the same position as the proposed annex, that between 1875 & 1902 a large structure was built on the application site and the adjacent houses were also built between these two dates.
- 4. BUT that is not the issue here.** The issue is with the design of the annex that comprises a simple, shed-like utilitarian structure that bears no relation in appearance, materials or design to its forebears. It is not a "traditional" structure, whose design is in keeping with its surroundings in the sense that this term would normally be used, and neither does it fully convey its claimed intended use as an annex to support elderly and disabled living. It is, to reflect the planning officer's own remarks, an "unremarkable outbuilding" with stone on the two exposed elevations and brick to the rear. Moreover, the Chester Street side elevation is marred by a fully glazed door and small high-level grey powder-coated aluminium window; similarly, the Chester Crescent elevation is a blank end wall - both out of keeping with the street view. The only relief is the inward-facing garden elevation two thirds of which is accounted for by two sets of sliding patio doors and a window to what must be a bedroom area, noting that this is not separate from but is an extension of the open space living area. Additionally, this design layout must call into question the real purpose of the annex - whether it is genuinely living accommodation to support an elderly living with disabilities or if there is an entirely different and undisclosed intended use.

5. Recommendation: the Planning Committee is invited to **Refuse** this planning application; there are **no** grounds for approval with conditions.

Stuart Tarr
Lead Member for Planning
Cirencester Town Council
9th December 2015

Chairman, Members, we have heard many arguments this morning in defence of the AONB, but this application is ~~not~~ not concerned with the AONB, but with the built environment and its impact on a valuable and historic conservation area in Cirencester* [Then 5 above]

* Time elapsed here

J A Crew, resident of Hoo Lane

I speak on behalf of some of the residents in Hoo Lane.

The planning committee will have already read the detailed objections on file. Hoo Lane is a residential part of Chipping Campden and is the start of the Cotswold Way, allowing many walkers access to the public bridleway alongside the proposed development.

The proposed development is in very close proximity to the properties in Hoo Lane. The old poultry unit was a constant source of Noise from the Fans, Awful Smells and a constant infestation of Flies, especially in the summer. It was impossible to sleep with a window open when these infestations of flies occurred.

Already we have to put up with daily deliveries and collections to and from Wheatcroft's Mail Order Unit including the occasional heavy lorry. The prospect of HGV's and other large vehicles serving the new poultry unit does not bare thinking about. There are young Children living in Hoo Lane, to say nothing of the ramblers who also use the lane. There is no pathway, verges will be eroded and an accident is just waiting to happen.

Hoo Lane and the Cotswold Way Bridleway are not suitable for these heavy goods vehicles as the tarmac covering, especially at the upper reaches is wafer thin. 2 years ago one of these vehicles crushed the underground water drain in Hoo Lane causing waste water to constantly flow down the lane eroding the sides of the metalled surface. This lasted well over a year until it was repaired. There is no tarmac at all above High Brake.

The access for HGV vehicles along Back ends is also wholly unsuitable.

Should any effluent seep from the poultry unit it can only flow into the stream where it could be carried right through the centre of the Town.

Had the applicant been less selfish and a little more sympathetic to the plight of his near neighbours, in placing the building further up the field, it would have had much less impact on the properties in Hoo Lane. There is, therefore, an opportunity to site this new structure closer to existing farm buildings away from residential homes with the potential for access from Kingcombe Lane, thus alleviating many of the issues already raised.

This application is for a building 5.6 times the footprint of the old, namely over 16,000 square feet! High velocity fans will exit at the eastern end of the building in line of site of 3 properties in Hoo Lane.

A building this large is an Industrial Scale Development, far more than just a farm building.

I consider it important that the committee make a site visit to evaluate the ramifications and impact on the environment before considering to refuse or approve this application.

I, together with many other residents of Hoo lane consider this application should be refused.