

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

9<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2015

Present:

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

Councillors -

Miss AML Beccle	David Fowles
AW Berry	M Harris
AR Brassington	Mrs. SL Jepson
Sue Coakley	Juliet Layton
Alison Coggins	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
PCB Coleman (from 9.35 a.m.)	Tina Stevenson
RW Dutton	

Observers:

Mark F Annett (from 10.30 a.m.)	JA Harris (from 10.50 a.m. until 1.10 p.m.)
---------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

PL.77 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor David Fowles declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.2288/S, because he was a Consultant to a Company owned by the Applicant, and he left the Meeting while this item was being determined.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CT.8347/1/A, because he had spoken to the Applicant outside the Council Chamber, and he left the Meeting while this item was being considered.

Councillor M Harris declared an interest in respect of application CT.8347/1/A, because he was acquainted with the Applicant, and he left the Meeting while this item was being considered.

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

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

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

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations from Officers.

PL.78 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

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

PL.79 MINUTES

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2015 be approved as a correct record.**

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

PL.80 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed Councillor PCB Coleman to his first Meeting as a Member of the Committee.

PL.81 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.82 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been submitted by Members.

PL.83 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.84 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.2581/H**

**Outline Application for residential development for 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. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to a recent Road Traffic Order which had reduced the speed limit to 20 mph along Draycott Road from the existing 30 mph signs to the centre of the village; access; and an indicative layout. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views of the site from various locations and views from within the site, including towards The Dell and Blockley Brook.

A Member of the Parish Council, an Objector 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 reminded the Committee that 83% of the residents of the village had objected to this application because they had considered that it would have an adverse impact on the site, which was in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Ward Member referred to an Appeal Decision in 1992 when the Planning Inspector had dismissed an appeal against the refusal of permission for a single dwelling on this site, and contended that those reasons were still relevant as, in her opinion, the potential for harm to the AONB outweighed any benefits that could accrue from the proposed development. The Ward Member also referred to an article she had read recently in a national magazine which had stated that the local council and residents were best placed to know the harm that building in the AONB could have. The Ward Member contended that the Parish Council, the Blockley Environmental Action Group and local residents had demonstrated the harm that this development would cause in their submissions to the Council, and that they believed in the heritage of the village which they intended to protect at all costs. The Ward Member considered there to be sufficient policy reasons to justify refusal of this application and she commended the Parish Council and local residents on their submissions to the Council. The Ward Member expressed the view that the 2014 Housing Needs Survey did not support the housing need for the village as detailed in the circulated report and she reminded the Committee that the Council currently had a housing land supply of 8.85 years. The Ward Member explained that the village accepted that some development was needed but that it should not be on this site, nor on any other site within the village on the scale currently being proposed. The Ward Member expressed the view that Blockley was a thriving village which offered so much to the heritage of the Cotswolds, and she asked the Committee to be bold in refusing this application on policy grounds, thereby respecting the wishes of the Parish Council and residents who were seeking to protect the AONB surrounding the village. The Ward Member concluded by referring to a revised Conservation Area Statement, which had been submitted to the Council by the Parish Council and was awaiting consideration of

adoption, and she commented that this current site had been included in that Statement.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the existing access to this site was on a bend and the proposed access would be some 50-60 metres away from that access, within a national speed limit zone; the 1992 appeal had been determined under policies which had been relevant at that time and had been dismissed for reasons relating to impact on the AONB; this application had been assessed in accordance with current policies, including its impact on the Council's supply of housing land and had been deemed by Officers to be acceptable; the Parish Council had submitted a document which would be taken into account by the Council in its review of the Blockley Conservation Area Statement but that document did not have any statutory weight; the current application did not propose to carry out any works to Blockley Brook; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, a Condition would be attached to any Decision Notice to ensure that no buildings were situated within a distance of 30 metres of the Brook; there was currently no public access to the Brook in this location; site MK14A had been identified as a 'late availability' site within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA); the County Archaeologist considered that this site to be of low importance; the site had a 'strong' definition as it was enclosed by substantial landscaping on its eastern boundary; the issue of any adverse impact of the development on Blockley Brook was not sufficient to justify refusing this application; there were no proposals to seek public access to the Brook or a link through to the centre of the village; Thames Water had a duty to connect the development to the mains supply; the developer would be required to meet any costs associated with the diversion of the water course; a development comprising twenty-four units had been built in the village in 2002 and, since 2011, permission had been granted for three further dwellings which had not yet been built; and the County Council was seeking visibility of up to 90 metres in the vicinity of the proposed access to this site.

Some Members considered that, on balance, this application should be approved as recommended. Those Members congratulated the Parish Council, the Action Group and local residents on their submissions to the Council, but they pointed out that planning decisions were driven by housing numbers and land supply; they had been assured that the area would not be open to further development to the east of this site; and they considered that it would not have any adverse impact on the heritage of the area.

Other Members considered that this application should be refused. Those Members also congratulated the Parish Council, the Action Group and local residents on their submissions to the Council, and contended that the proposal would constitute a 'major' development for the village, which should be allowed to expand 'organically' as had happened in the past; it would have an adverse impact on archaeology and ecology; the site was in the AONB; the existing highway network was 'inadequate'; the housing need in the village was not as had been suggested in the circulated report; and an alternative development site was available in the village. Another Member considered that there had been a slow pace of development in the village since 2005; this proposal constituted a 'major' development, which would have an adverse impact on the village; and while there were alternatives to building on land in the AONB, there was a need for occasional 'exceptions'.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and contended that Blockley Brook was an important part of the heritage of the village. The Ward Member reiterated her support for the local community, and concluded by stating that the village could support an alternative proposal in the right location and of a more appropriate scale.

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

**The Head of Planning and Strategic Housing was authorised to approve as recommended, subject to the prior completion of a Legal Agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing and financial contributions towards education and to Blockley Parish Council.**

**Record of Voting - for 7 (including the Chairman's Casting Vote); against 6, abstentions 2, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

Note:

An equality of votes was cast in respect of the Proposition, and the Chairman was invited to consider using his Casting Vote. The Chairman exercised such Vote in favour of the Proposition to approve this application, in accordance with the Officer Recommendation.

#### **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 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.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the layout, and landscaping. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the site from various vantage points.

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

The Chairman referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing undertaken in respect of this application and invited those Members who had attended that Briefing to express their views. A number of Members referred to other masts, electricity pylons and a wind turbine, which were visible in the area, and commented that this application was not therefore unprecedented. The Members noted that the mast would be partly screened by an existing barn; would bring benefits to the locality; and could be dismantled in the future if it became surplus to requirements.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that an Objector lived in close proximity to the mast and had expressed concern over its proposed location. The Ward Member explained that this site was the Applicant's preferred

location for a mast and that four providers had signed-up to use it, whereas he was only aware of one provider with alternative technology. The Ward Member noted that no objections had been received from the standard consultees and contended that improved mobile telephone coverage was needed. The Ward Member noted that the application would now miss the deadline for funding from the Government but expressed the view that a further tranche of such funding might become available in the future and he concluded by expressing his view that the disadvantages of the proposal were outweighed by the associated benefits.

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 if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, development should be commenced within a period of three years but the Committee could specify a shorter period if there was justification to do so; the application should be determined on its merits and in line with current policies and guidelines; the Council's Environmental Health Officer had not raised any objections to this application in respect of the potential for noise disturbance; Officers considered a mast to be the most appropriate method of addressing the current situation in respect of mobile telephone coverage; if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, a Condition requiring the mast to be dismantled in the future if it became surplus to requirements could be attached to any Decision Notice; funding sources often changed during the consideration of an application and, on this occasion, the Applicant's belief was that a further tranche of Government funding might be made available at some time in the future; the proposed mast was considered to be appropriate in this location, given its proximity to an existing barn; the Applicant had assessed eighteen sites within the search area, together with a further eight sites that had been suggested by objectors, and had justified why those sites were not considered to be appropriate for this development; the adjacent barn was not within the application site; and the Council could not change an application from a 'full' one to an 'outline' one.

A number of Members considered that there was a need to improve Broadband and mobile telephone coverage across the District; it was essential to achieve access to services; and that it was unfortunate that the current funding deadline had been missed. They complimented the Objector on the quality of her submissions, but expressed support for the proposed development.

Some Members, while expressing support for the application, suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, development should be commenced within a period of two years. Other Members contended that the application should be refused. Those Members considered there to be a lack of support for the proposal within the local community; that in the view of the Minister for Culture and the Digital Economy, the issue of future Government funding was uncertain; they were not satisfied that the full potential of all of the alternative sites suggested had been explored; and that this was the 'wrong' scheme on the 'wrong' site.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 4, abstentions 1, absent 1.**

Note:

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

**CD.8481/F**

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

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the boundary of the site and its proximity to the Conservation Area. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views along the Fosse Way, and into and through the site. The Case Officer also reported responses to the various questions that had been submitted by the Parish Council.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee and had been unable to attend the Meeting, had submitted comments and a copy of those comments had been included with the extra representations which had been circulated to the Committee and made available to members of the public.

The Chairman referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing undertaken in respect of this application and invited those Members who had attended that Briefing to express their views. A majority of those Members considered that the proposed development to be well-screened and unlikely to have any adverse impact on the Conservation Area. One Member expressed concern over other developments which were apparent on the site.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the site was not visible from the village; a further two applications relating to development within this site had been received; in the opinion of Officers, the Committee had sufficient information to determine both this, and the subsequent application on this Schedule of Applications (CD.8481/G referred); Officers had been mindful of the Environment Agency's licensing requirements in their assessment of these applications; it was considered that a borehole being dug within the site would not impact on the proposed developments; as this site was evolving and there was potential for development to encroach on the existing turning area, the County Highways Officer had suggested that an extra Condition relating to the provision of a turning area be attached to any Decision Notice(s) in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this and the subsequent application as recommended, in order to ensure that a turning area was retained at this site in perpetuity; and such turning area was unlikely to be located in an area where it would impinge on any future applications at this site.

A Member commented that work appeared to have commenced on the construction of additional buildings at this site. It was considered that the proposed development would be of benefit to local farmers and that there were few similar facilities available in the area. A Proposition that this application be approved subject to an extra Condition relating to the turning area, was duly Seconded.

**Approved as recommended, subject to an extra Condition relating to the turning area.**

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

**CD.8481/G**

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

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee but explained that she had made all of her representations in relation to the previous application (CD.8481/F referred).

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee and had been unable to attend the Meeting, had submitted comments and a copy of those comments had been included with the extra representations which had been circulated to the Committee and made available to members of the public.

A Member commented that the proposed development would be of benefit to the local economy and local farmers, and that there were few similar facilities available in the area. A Proposition that this application be approved subject to an extra Condition relating to the turning area, was duly Seconded.

**Approved as recommended, subject to an extra Condition relating to the turning area.**

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

**CD.0479/J**

**Demolition of existing garage and forecourt and the development of 7 dwellings at Granbrook Garage, 78 Granbrook Lane, Mickleton -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its proximity to the Conservation Area, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a public right of way; the previous extension of the existing garage into the AONB; those areas of the site which were considered to be 'brown' and 'green' field, both within and outside the AONB; and an indicative layout. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views into the site from various vantage points, and views from within the site.



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

One of the Ward Members, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and explained that he was also representing the views of his fellow Ward Member who had been unable to attend the Meeting. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the southern area of this site was in the AONB. The Ward Member expressed his view that the village would be subject to a significant volume of development over the next five years, and contended that there was no justifiable reason to approve this application. The Ward Member considered that this proposal would destroy an area of valuable countryside and would have a damaging impact on tourism in Mickleton and the surrounding area. The Ward Member stated that he concurred with the views expressed by the Parish Council that any development here should be aligned with the existing Cedar Road development, and that it should not encroach into the AONB. The Ward Member considered that the existing paddocks should be retained as agricultural land, and he concluded by urging the Committee to refuse this application.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that Officers considered that an appeal against the refusal of this application was likely to be successful in light of the Inspector's opinion that ninety houses at a site at Broadmarston Road, Mickleton would not have any adverse impact on the AONB; it was believed that the garage at this site had ceased trading approximately four months ago; ground investigation reports had been submitted which suggested that any contamination at this site could be mitigated; the Committee could consider the impact on the AONB, the history of the site and its established use in its determination of this application; the proposed development was considered to be consistent with surrounding developments in terms of design and materials; the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was, effectively, a snap-shot in time of available land; the SHLAA figures had not been subjected to testing; in the view of Officers, the encroachment into the AONB was not considered to be 'prominent' due to existing developments on two sides of this site; if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, a contribution of £25,000 would be made towards the provision of off-site affordable housing, either elsewhere in Mickleton or in a neighbouring parish, which was considered to be satisfactory on this occasion; the proposed mix of units and materials were considered appropriate for an edge-of-settlement location; the two adjacent agricultural paddocks did not form part of the application site; an application would be required if a change of use of those paddocks was proposed; there was a distinction between the 'Green Belt' and the AONB; the suggested affordable housing contribution had been considered to be appropriate on this occasion by the District Valuer and by Officers; there was currently no specific policy relating to the viability of business opportunities on this site; in 2004 a Change of Use to residential had been allowed on this site; and approximately half of the units in the recently-permitted developments in Mickleton would be one or two-bedroom units.

A Proposition that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, was duly Seconded. On being put to the vote, that Proposition was LOST. The voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 6, against 8, abstentions 1, absent 0.

It was considered that the proposed development would be encouraged in the absence of the previously-permitted developments within Mickleton and that it would result in the enhancement of this site; and a further Proposition that this application be approved, as recommended, was duly Seconded.

In response to a further question, it was reported that, in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application, it would not be reasonable to attach a Condition relating to 'gateway' work to any Decision Notice. The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and he reiterated his view that the AONB should be protected.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 11, against 4, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

**CD.2288/S**

**Proposed Tea Room ancillary to Nursery at Tops Nursery, Broadway Road, Mickleton -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views into the site. In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that the existing glass houses were 4.2 metres high; and that the proposed tiled roof building would have a steeper pitch than the existing glass and corrugated roofed buildings on the site.

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

**Approved, as recommended,**

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

**CT.8347/1/A**

**Erection of a guest/granny annexe at 24 Chester Crescent, Cirencester -**

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.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of the site and the existing boundary wall from Chester Street and views of the existing buildings within the site.

A Member of the Town Council and 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 he amplified the reasons why he had referred this application to the Committee for determination. The Ward Member stated that he supported

the efforts of the Applicant to tidy up the site but expressed concerns over the proposal to create a door and window in the north-east elevation. The Ward Member concluded by suggesting that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the 'for sale' sign, which had appeared in one of the photographs displayed by the Case Officer did not relate to this site; the proposed unit would not be self-contained; if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, Conditions requiring its occupation to be ancillary to 24 Chester Crescent and the re-use of stone from the existing boundary wall with new stone to match would be attached to any Decision Notice and the built structure would need to be of an exceptional quality; permission would be required to change the proposed building to a separate dwelling; in the opinion of Officers, the proposed door and window in the north-east elevation were modest and would not be precluded by the location of this site in the Conservation Area; there was no evidence of previous domestic terraced houses on this site; the proposed structure would be 4.8 metres to the ridge and 3 metres to the eaves, which was considered to be acceptable in this location; historically, there had been an outbuilding and a wall on this site; the proposed development would be dependent on, but not physically linked to, 24 Chester Crescent; the Committee could not insist on the planting of replacement trees in the event that the existing trees were removed; and the proposed door in the north-east elevation was considered to be appropriate.

A number of Members expressed support in principle for this application, noting the Applicant's desire to provide accommodation for an elderly parent. A Member expressed the view that the proposed development would not enhance the street scene and suggested that consideration be given to omitting the proposed door and window from the north-east elevation and, instead, consideration be given to including a door in the south-east elevation, opening onto an existing passageway. Another Member expressed support for this application because it would provide ancillary accommodation for an elderly member of the Applicant's family, and Proposed the Officer Recommendation. That Proposition was not Seconded.

Other Members reiterated their support in principle for this application, but expressed concern over the proposed design. Those Members considered that the proposal should reflect a more traditional treatment, that the door and window in the north-east elevation should be deleted and that, in the event that this application was deferred for further negotiations in those respects, it should be referred back to the Committee for determination.

A Proposition that consideration of this application be deferred for further negotiation, was Seconded.

**Deferred, for further negotiation.**

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

**CD.2846/B**

**Erection of a replacement poultry building at Dovers Orchard Farm, Hoo Lane, Chipping Campden -**

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.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to an extant permission granted in 2011 for a replacement building; access; and the proximity of the site to an existing residential development in Cotswold Way. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of the existing building.

One of the Ward Members, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and explained that he was also representing the views of his fellow Ward Member who had been unable to attend the Meeting. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that this site was adjacent to The Cotswold Way and an established residential development. He contended that it was also in close proximity to some of the best countryside and views in the District and that a significant number of representations objecting to the proposal had been submitted. The Ward Member expressed the view that the proposed building would be larger than the existing building and concluded by suggesting that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the proposed building would be lower and less visible than the existing building; it was considered that a new, modern, purpose-built building would mitigate against noise and odour; as use of this site for poultry was pre-existing, the issues of removal of manure and run-off should already be being addressed; and if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, Conditions relating to the prior submission of a noise assessment and details of external lighting could be attached to any Decision Notice.

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

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

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

**Record of Voting - for 8, against 6, abstentions 1, absent 0.**

Notes:

- (i) it was considered that an odour assessment should be submitted prior to the determination of this application;*
- (ii) subsequent to the Meeting, the proposed Sites Inspection Briefing was deferred until Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016, in order to allow sufficient time for the Applicant to submit the odour assessment referred to in Note (i) above.*

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.8481/F, CD.8481/G, CD.0479/J and CD.2846/B.

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

Councillor Mark F Annett was invited to speak on applications CD.0479/J and CD.2846/B.

Councillor JA Harris was invited to speak on application CT.8347/1/A.

(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>CD.2581/H</u>	)	Councillor P Craig (Parish Council)
	)	Mr. R Willott (Objector)
	)	Mr. R Bellamy (Applicant)
<u>CD.9514</u>	)	Councillor G Day (Parish Council)
	)	Ms C Allen (Objector)
	)	Mr. R Jackson (Supporter)
	)	Mr. S Shamash (Applicant)
<u>CD.8481/F</u>	)	Miss S Moore (Agent)
<u>CD.8481/G</u>	)	Miss S Moore (Agent)
<u>CD.0479/J</u>	)	Councillor C Morecroft OBE
	)	(Parish Council)
	)	Ms Y Davis (Objector)
	)	Mrs. M Rogers (Agent)
<u>CT.8347/1/A</u>	)	Councillor S Tarr (Town Council)
	)	Mr. R Blackaller (Applicant)

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.85 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 6<sup>th</sup> January 2016

It was noted that all Members of the Committee had been invited to attend the Sites Inspection Briefing on Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> January 2016 as an approved duty.

Note:

Subsequent to the Meeting, the proposed Sites Inspection Briefing was deferred until Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016, in order to allow sufficient time for the Applicant to submit an odour assessment.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

No advance Sites Inspection Briefing had been notified.

P.86 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 11.20 a.m. and 11.30 a.m., and closed at 1.30 p.m.

Chairman

(END)