

Item No 01:15/01348/FUL – Granny Annexe at 24 Chester Crescent, Cirencester: Update for consideration at the 13th January meeting of the Planning Committee

1. View of Cirencester Town Council: The Town Council lifts its previous objection to this planning application (see Appendix attached submitted to the 9th December meeting of the Planning Committee) but remains concerned that minor modifications to the Granny Annexe do not entirely reflect the street scene; secondly that the Annexe is capable of conversion to a separate dwelling.

2. To the applicant's credit, presumably with the advice of the planning case officer, the high level window on the Chester Street elevation has been relocated to a new elevation and the modern style door has been replaced with a traditional timber door that is marginally more in keeping with the street scene. However, the sidewall of the Annexe (the construction of which will result in the loss of tall Leylandii hedging) does present a very stark image to the Chester Street scene in a designated conservation area and is to be regretted in this respect. Secondly, the physical separation of the Annexe from the main house and its side door opening on to Chester Street does open up the possibility that at some future date it could be sold as a separate dwelling with on-street parking and this should be guarded against with a planning condition as proposed by the planning case officer.

3. Recommendation: the Planning Committee is invited to **Allow** this planning application, strictly conditioned that the Annex remains a permanent feature of the applicant's main dwelling at 24 Chester Street. The Town Council would ask for strict enforcement of this planning condition and would resist any application for a Certificate of Lawful Use should it be breached. The planning application file should be noted in this respect.

Stuart Tarr
Chairman of the Planning Committee
Cirencester Town Council
4th January 2016

Appendix to 4th January submission

Item No 07:15/01348/FUL - 24 Chester Crescent, Cirencester: 9th December meeting of the Planning Committee

1. View of Cirencester Town Council - Objection: The building is not in keeping with the street scene.

2. 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.

3. 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

13th January meeting of the Planning Committee: Item No 02: 15/04670/FUL (CT.5335/H) 105 Cricklade Street, Cirencester

1. View of Cirencester Town Council: Members lift their previous objection to this retrospective planning application with reservations that the conversion of three separate apartments into 5-bedroom multi-occupancy accommodation with shared communal facilities in the town centre conservation area may result in increased pressure on town centre car parking and noise nuisance to neighbours.

2. Members also regret the loss of retail premises in the town centre, as running counter to the town's unique small business retail offer attractive to visitors, but have noted that a previous application to convert the then retail shop premises into three apartments was allowed without objection from the Town Council and that this application is an extension of that.

3. The retrospection of this latest planning application, and the absence of reasons to explain the delay in applying for planning consent deferred by the applicant to post-works completion, is also noted – again with regret.

4. In summary members accept that the grounds on which to object to this planning application, noting the history of a previous planning application to allow premises conversion from retail to residential use, are very thin. However, before proceeding to planning consent the Town Council would ask the Planning Case Officer to revisit the issue of car parking and the Environmental Health Officer's opinion that there will be no potential noise nuisance resulting from the conversion of 3 apartments into multiple occupation with a shared communal living area on which an objection has been received. It is noted that both opinions are assertion not evidenced in fact.

5. Recommendation: the Planning Committee is invited to Defer this planning application to give the Planning Case Officer and Environmental Health Officer a further opportunity to investigate and report on the issues of parking and potential noise nuisance. If, however, the planning committee is minded to Permit this application then the Town Council would ask that it is conditioned to restrict (if that is possible) the number of occupants' vehicles to equal the number of off-road car parking spaces that the accommodation provides and to require additional sound-proofing against the possibility of potential noise nuisance.

**Stuart Tarr
Chairman of the Planning Committee
Cirencester Town Council
4th January 2016**

CT.1571/N - Objector's Representation

The Pigeon House

Listed Buildings Consent

Presentation to the Planning Committee on January 13th 2016.
Application 15/04236/LBC

My name is Richard Watling. My wife and I own the Grange immediately next door to Pigeon House and so are the ones most affected by the development of the barn.

Let me say firstly that we are happy that the barn is to be preserved. It has historic value and enhances this important and attractive part of the old centre of Kemble.

Our objection is based on the harm that will be caused by the siting of the roof lights on the northern side. This plan would substantially damage an original untouched natural Cotswold tiled roof, and spoil the surrounding view which consists of a cascade of similar structures leading to and including Pigeon House itself which is also Grade II listed.

This historic view is important not just from our perspective but because it is clearly visible from the road.

We therefore take issue with the view of the Conservation officer that this elevation is of lesser importance than the front or southern side, which is visible only from within the Pigeon House grounds and at distance of 30-40 meters or more from other neighbours, but not from the road.

Its clear to us that the northern elevation, which is still completely original, would be more damaged than the southern one, which is in any event going to be compromised by the two large glazed doors and the four glazed windows. It is hard to reconcile a view that those changes are acceptable but that the two relatively small roof lights that were planned are not.

Turning to the issue of the Barn in its overall context, Policy 15 of the Cotswold District Local Plan states that development must preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area as a whole or any part of that area.

The site of this development is significant not only because it lies within a Conservation area but also because it is in the old village centre in the middle of the cluster of historic buildings created by the church, the manor house and their former farm buildings. Great care has been taken over the years to preserve this aspect as the area has steadily been developed.

The view from the north puts the Barn and especially its roof in the context of all these buildings, including the church spire. Our contention is that this point has not been taken into account fully, if at all. The breaching of the roof with the roof

lights would irrevocably damage that historic view and be contrary to Policy 15 of the Cotswold District Local Plan.

In summary we believe that the changes proposed in the amended plan would

- Substantially and irrevocably damage an original natural stone roof
- Harm an important historic view in a key part of the Conservation area contrary to the policy in the local plan
- And are frankly wholly unnecessary.

This is not a dispute between neighbours. We would have been content with the original plan that had been discussed openly and amicably with Mr and Mrs Berry.

I urge the committee to consider these challenges with the evidence, very carefully and to reject the amended plan for the reasons stated.

Richard Watling
Kemble Grange
January 12th 2016

The Grange
Kemble

CT. 1571/M - Objector's Representation

Planning Committee Meeting January 13th 2016

Presentation of objection to the development of the Barn at Pigeon House
Application 15/04235/FUL

My name is Richard Watling. My wife and I are the owners of Kemble Grange, which is right next door to Pigeon House. We are therefore the neighbours most affected by the development.

I am here to express our strong objection to the amended plan to develop the Barn, on the grounds of loss of amenity and privacy. In a sentence our property would be completely overlooked.

The Barn is about 3 meters from our boundary. It's a very tall building and has a commanding view of the entire garden, the house and the cottage annexe to its side.

The three roof-lights in the amended plan would look directly down to the bedroom and bathroom windows and all the living rooms of the main house through the french windows; they would overlook our entire garden and external dining area at a distance of around 20 meters or less. This is really very close when you think that is about the same distance that you must prove you can read a car registration plate from to get a driving licence. We don't think, as the Planning officer does, that it is enough to prevent a loss of privacy.

The roof lights would also have a direct and unimpeded view of the 2 bedrooms, living room and bathroom in our cottage annexe, which lies next to the Grange and straight in front of the Barn.

We therefore contend that this amended plan is a wholly unacceptable intrusion on our privacy and our right to a family life.

Unfortunately the height of the windows is not a sufficient mitigation of the issue. 1.75 meters is 5 feet 9 inches. My height is 1.78 meters and I think I am of average height. The windows could easily be looked through by a tall person or by using a modest step-up. Not only that but we would suffer noise from open windows and be overheard in our own garden.

To quote the objection from Kemble Parish Council this amended plan would lead to "a complete loss of privacy for the owners".

Finally this is not just about today, it is also about the future. We are alarmed at the prospect that this could lead to separation of the Barn into an independent dwelling, a thought that is considered in the report. This would lead to many other serious implications for the peaceful enjoyment of our property. Accepting this amended application would create a precedent, in granting the right to overlook our property, which we would be very unhappy about indeed.

In summary therefore we urge the committee to refuse the full planning application on the grounds of

- 1 The complete loss of amenity and privacy that we would suffer.
- 2 The precedent that it would create for future development

Richard Watling
Kemble Grange
January 12th 2016