

Cotswold District Council Planning Committee

GWR Statement 09/03/2016 (Ref 15/00786/FUL):

Kemble station plays an important role as a rail head for a large rural catchment dominated by Cirencester, which of course has no direct rail access despite its size. Thus car parking is critical at the station if residents and businesses are to use our services to reach London. The station has experienced significant growth, more than doubling in usage since 2002, but in recent year's car park capacity and disruption from the redoubling works have increasingly slowed growth.

The redoubling of the line to Kemble and electrification between London and Swindon will enable major service improvements in 2018. This will include hourly London services throughout the day operated by brand new Super Express Trains. The new trains and service improvements are expected to increase demand by almost a fifth.

However, with more than 80% of the stations population catchment over 5kms from the station, residents and businesses are heavily dependent on the car to access it. The station car park is typically 95% full at peak times during mid-week, albeit there is of course day to day variations particularly on Mondays and Fridays during holiday periods.

Consequently, access to the improved train services will be severely limited by the availability of parking at the station, effectively restricting the opportunity for the community to benefit as a result. Moreover, with anecdotal evidence of on street parking by rail users causing a nuisance to residents there is a clear risk that the improved train service will actually cause more disruption for local residents.

Additional car parking at the station is therefore essential to address these issues. In doing so any scheme must address this for the long term to minimise disruption to local residents and station users. Long term demand growth, released by additional parking capacity, must therefore be accommodated in addition to the more immediate growth generated by service improvements. Forecasts have identified a net requirement in excess of 300 parking spaces as necessary to accommodate this future demand. This is in addition to improvements at other nearby stations which are also being actively pursued by GWR.

A number of sites have been considered at Kemble but all come with significant drawbacks, mostly unable to provide anywhere near sufficient parking. A multi storey scheme, with two decks over the existing car park, was considered but this would have significant visual impact, being completely out of character for the area, and cause major disruption to residents and station users during construction. The proposed development is the only realistic means of delivering the additional parking capacity in a manner appropriate for Kemble.

Since the original application, we have engaged closely with the planning officers and Parish Council over the past 12 months and have made a number of revisions to the proposal to meet local requirements.

This includes:

- major revisions to the proposal to provide a new pedestrian footpath to the station as requested by the Parish Council,
- additional planting and landscaping and a reduction in lighting column height as far as possible to reduce visual impact to local residents and nearby heritage assets including the station itself,
- an amended layout to reduce the ecological impact specifically on bats,
- a new direct highway access from the A429 to modern standards and designed to facilitate all types of vehicles accessing Station Road.

Time Elapsed here

We therefore feel that this is an appropriate development in this location.

There is a clear need for a car park of this scale and this is really the only realistic option to provide this. We have shown willingness to amend the proposals and provide clear mitigations to address access, visual impact and ecological issues. The proposal, now before you, addresses these issues and we therefore believe that it is appropriate and acceptable in both scale and form and thus worthy of consent.

CD.0691/J Agent's Representation

APPLICATION 15/04477

ERECTION OF 4 No STABLES, HAY STORAGE BARN, AND TURNOUT AREA

Good morning all. My name is Stuart Bond and I am the principle at Absolute Architecture Ltd Chartered Architects. We have been commissioned to prepare and submit the application before you.

The application is for the erection of four stables, a modest hay store and the formation of a level turnout area.

Glebe farm extends to 15 acres and is owned by the applicant and is her private family home. The applicant is a world class horsewoman and has competed at the very highest level and the farm is home to the applicant's 15 horses which are ALL privately owned ,, all of the horse passports are here should anyone require evidence of this.

Indeed, the applicant does have business interests and her company is based in Nailsworth, Gloucestershire. The company activities involve the applicant judging Olympic standard events all over the world as well as training of riders and horses at her clients own properties,, her client base is worldwide and she is currently training in North America. The applicant does not run a business from these premises.

The application is partially retrospective and in two parts.

Firstly the stables are erected on skids which gives them the appearance of mobile structures. They are not intended to be mobile but the fact that this is how they are constructed led the applicant to believe that permission was not required. The stables are arranged in an L shaped configuration and the corner has also been roofed to form an open fronted hay store.

The location of these stables sit well with the 11 existing stables on the site and an indigenous hedge has been planted to the North West. The scale and location

of these stables is such that does not detract from,, or alter in any way the character or scale of the existing yard.

Secondly the applicant wishes to construct a level turnout area. The whole site is on the side of Saintbury Hill and as such is all sloping land. There is an issue with this topography in winter months when horses are turned out on the sloping ground which has become waterlogged or worse still, ice bound. The turnout area has been excavated into the hillside in order to reduce visual impact whilst still providing protection for the animals. Your landscape officer highlights that the turnout area has been commenced in a discreet location and cannot currently be seen from the public right of way. The report does add that when finished, views of it in use may be possible, however as a turnout area these views will be purely of the horses and the simple fencing.

Work had commenced on this area without the knowledge that consent was required. As soon as this error was pointed out, work has ceased.

The application has been prepared and submitted as soon as a breach was highlighted, and continued dialogue with your officers have led to all relevant information being made available and met favourably by your planning officers.

Your heritage officer concludes that the proposal would cause 'no harm to the character of the listed buildings or their setting, or to the character and appearance of the conservation area.'

Furthermore, in Highway terms the proposal is not considered to generate excessive amounts of traffic that would severely affect the operation of the local highway network.

The application is supported by your Planning officer, landscape officer, conservation officer and highways department and we therefore urge you to concur with your officers in voting for approval.

~~✂~~ Time elapsed here

As a footnote, comments have been raised suggesting that the application form misleads the reader. Question 24 on the form that relates to the authorities site

visit and asks if the site can be seen from public land, in order for the officers to fully assess the site. This question was answered no, because all of the affected areas cannot be seen from public land and we therefore considered it important for your officers to gain access in order to fully appraise the site. This question is purely for the planning officer to make arrangements to view the site not intended as an assessment of the visual impact of the proposal.

I would be pleased to take any questions.

CT. 7047/Q - Agent's Representation

Presentation to Cotswold Planning Committee, 90 March 2016
Item 3: 14/02614/FUL
Hartley Lane, Coberley

- Thank you for allowing me to speak.
- This is a contentious proposal, but the scale of opposition in the on line campaign has been disproportionate, and some of the comments unacceptable.
- Is that opposition about planning, or is it rooted in prejudice?
- Through my work I know many Gypsies & there are some who would not be easy neighbours.
- The problem is that all are tarred by the same brush, and the stereotypes are unfair for people like my clients who are decent, good living, business men I am proud to represent.
- The application is for a short period until December next year.
- The previous application was approved for three years in December 14. It was then in error built larger than the plans.
- We have gone through a process of developing revised proposals which are now acceptable to your landscape adviser.
- The question is whether the scheme in front of you impacts more than that approved. The footprint is 14% bigger - 2,200 as against 1,900 square metres, but the impacts no worse.
- The mobile home on the northern pitch has gone – replaced by a caravan. There is now a hedge with trees on the east side. There will be a feature tree at the entrance reducing views in from Hartley Lane.
- The additional harm compared with the approved scheme would be tiny.
- You then have to consider whether any additional harm, which would only last till next December, is justified by the factors on the other side, including need for sites, and the personal needs of the applicants.
- Here we would stress that the acute shortage of accommodation is because councils have failed to allocate sites, despite Government policies requiring them to do so for more than 20 years. Which leaves Travellers no alternative but to find sites themselves.
- While a national policy change has weakened the case for Gypsy sites in AONB, that policy should not be read in

isolation. The Council is required to have a supply of sites and with so much of the district AONB or in the south at risk of flood, where Traveller sites are not allowed, your sites will almost certainly need to be in AONB.

- To sum up. Not developing the site in accordance with the approved plan was regrettable. We have worked to achieve a scheme which will have no worse impacts. On that basis we would question whether a refusal could be reasonable.
- My clients look to you for a fair decision, unswayed by lobbying and prejudice.
- Thank you

CT. 2412/8
Agent's Representations



Thank you Chair,

I am Andrew Pywell, the applicant's planning consultant and speak to you today on behalf of the applicant team.

Overall, we welcome the officer's report which confirms that the proposal represents a considerable enhancement of the current building, is acceptable in all other respects and thereby meets the requirements of all relevant national and local planning policies. However, I should like to take this opportunity to address some key points which members should bear in mind when determining the application.

We note that the application was called to Committee by the Ward Councillor due to 'the recent planning history' and 'the impact that the proposal will have on residents living within The Walled Garden'.

In terms of the recent planning history, this simply serves to illustrate how the scale and impact of the current proposal has been much reduced and, as confirmed by officers, specifically addresses each of the issues which contributed to the failure of the previous scheme.

In particular, those impacts which related to the amenities of those living within The Walled Garden have now been overcome. Specifically, the office windows which face onto the car park serving The Walled Garden are all obscure glazed whilst the proposed rooflights will not offer views which affect residential amenity or privacy. It is also important to understand that the building lies to the north of The Walled Garden and, as confirmed by the submitted shadow plans, any slight increase in shadows cast as a result of the proposed alterations will generally fall away from The Walled Garden and across the pavement and road to the front of Southway House. For this and the other reasons set out at length within the Committee report, your officers firmly conclude that this revised proposal will have no materially harmful impact upon those residents living within The Walled Garden.

As a final point, it is important for Members to understand that this is not some speculative proposal. Lumley Insurance is another local success story and currently employs some 27 local people; which is up from 5 just 10 years ago. However, if it is to stay in the town, the proposed extension is now vital to the company's ongoing success and the associated economic benefits that will arise from it – which includes the ability for it to take on additional trainees. Since Southway House lies within the

CD.9510 Town Council Representation

Moreton in Marsh Town Council

Response to Planning Application 15/03099/FUL

Moreton in Marsh Town Council wishes to object to the above application.

The site lies outside the town's development boundary. Unlike the Hospital which was permitted as an essential community facility, this development has not been proved that there is not an alternative more suitable site else where.

The proposed development lies within the AONB and shows little regard to it's setting. The scale of the building is too large for the site. The design of the building bears no relationship to buildings within the wider vicinity. From a landscaping perspective, a larger site is needed to mitigate the visual impact of such a large development.

The National Planning Policy Framework attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. This scheme does not constitute high quality design.

Contrary to the Design & access statement:

- A) There are no gaps in the building to retain views through the site. Thus obscures the important views of the escarpment when viewed from the A429.
- B) The site would be a prominent feature when viewed from Monarchs Way and Heart of England Way and those travelling along the ridge way from Longborough to Bourton on the Hill as well as from the A44.
- C) This development would have an irreversible and significant adverse impact on the character of the vicinity.

This proposed development does not comply with the NPPF Sec 11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment item 115, in that it does not conserve landscape or scenic beauty.

There is very limited pedestrian access to the East side of the A429 and there is no footpath on the West side, which makes the site unsustainable from a pedestrian access view point to the centre of Moreton in Marsh.

Due to the large amount of glass in the design, light pollution is a serious concern effecting both road users and residence in the vicinity.

To close this is not a proposed development that would enhance the southern approach to the town.

Full Application 15/02895/Full Ct. B21/4

Statement from Poulton Parish Council

Parish Council Representation

With regard to the application for a dwelling on the land adjacent to Alberta in Bell Lane, Poulton the council has been consistent in its objection to this proposal. The orientation of the development needs to be reversed so that the terrace area, accessed through the doors from the kitchen, does not look directly on to the terrace area and garden of the neighbouring property Little Orchard. This will greatly and unnecessarily impinge on the privacy of that house. We are informed that the owners of Alberta have no objection to such an alteration as their property is protected from such an intrusion by a wide mature hedge, a garage and garden shed. If the applicant is not prepared to compromise on such an amendment then we feel that the application should be refused.

We should also point out that the proposed property is too large on such a small site and although this might be acceptable in an urban situation in a Cotswold village it will increase the building density and harm the rural environment. This seems to be a deleterious trend in planning approvals in villages from which Poulton is suffering especially at the Bell Lane – London Road junction.

A further issue which will be affected by this new development is the fact it adds pressure on an already inadequate sewerage system. Properties at the London Road junction are affected by sewage overflow. The chairman of this council was called to visit a property in this area suffering from restricted sewerage use during the moderate, and not heavy, rainfall of a few weeks ago. One new property in Bell Lane is already being added to the system and another is to be added shortly as the owner has decided to stop using the associated septic tank. Other properties in Bell Lane may follow likewise.

The addition of yet another property to this inadequate network is not advisable as it will impact on other people's quality of life. An increase in the incidence of sewage ingress as a result of unrestrained development is not acceptable in a modern society.

We recommend that ^hhis application should be refused.

8/3/16

CHANDANIER

CT. 1321/K

Agent's Representation

PLAN|A

Thank you Chair,

I speak on behalf of the applicants who have owned the application site for well over 40 years and who first obtained planning permission for the development of a single dwelling on it back in 1972.

In general, my clients welcome the officer's report, which comprehensively addresses all relevant issues and planning considerations associated with the proposal. However, I should like to take this opportunity to highlight a couple of points relevant to your consideration of the current proposal:-

- Firstly, the site occupies a gap within a continuously built up frontage of two-storey development which occupies the western side of Bell Lane within the vicinity of the site. The site is generally acknowledged as an 'infill plot' and this proposal relates to the development of a 3 bedroomed house which is proportionate in size and scale to the site and to those houses within the immediate vicinity. Although Members will have noted that the proposals before you incorporate a 4th bedroom on the ground floor, it should be noted that this additional bedroom is specifically intended for occupation by the applicant's disabled daughter and that any future occupier would no doubt convert this for use as part of the ground floor living space.
- Secondly, it is important to note that there are no concerns relating to the development of a single house in principle. Although some objections have been raised in respect of the proposal, these relate exclusively to detailed design issues associated with the alleged impact of the proposed development on the amenities and privacy of neighbouring occupiers. All associated design issues have been discussed at length with your planning and conservation officers and, in each case, the applicant has brought forward amendments to address all relevant concerns. As is clear from their report, the planning officer has objectively considered each of the identified material planning considerations and is now satisfied that the proposal has appropriately addressed each one.

In conclusion, this proposal represents the development of a long-established infill plot within Poulton. There is no issue in terms of the principle of development and the applicant has worked hard with your planning and conservation officers to ensure an appropriate balance between the residential amenities of both existing and future occupiers. As a consequence, officers conclude that the proposal will cause no significant or demonstrable harm and it thereby meets the relevant national and local planning policy tests. Accordingly, I would urge the Committee to accept your officers' recommendation for approval subject to the identified conditions, which provide adequate safeguards and controls to mitigate the very limited impacts associated with the proposed development.

Thank you.

CD. 4550/A Town Council Representations

Agenda Item 09 -Item 07

The application site lies approximately 35m to the east of Well Lane. Vehicular and pedestrian access from the aforementioned highway to the application site is via an unadopted, unmetalled lane that measures approximately 2.5m to 2.7m wide for its first 30m. The western part of the lane lies between a high stone boundary forming the boundary of the Royal British Legion and the side elevation of a dwelling (Greystones Cottage).

Given the narrow width of Camp Gardens Stow Town Council would like the Construction Plan to specify that all construction traffic and tradesmen should only access the site via a temporary roadway across the adjacent field.

We would also wish to see the remaining allotment land protected from future development and retained as green space

CD.1543/4 - Town Council Representation

Agenda Item 09 – Item 09 Brocks Menswear

I would like to address the Panglossian contribution from the Highways Officer.

Firstly he opines that one parking space per high cost two bedroom apartment is an acceptable level within the central area of Stow.

I do not know how familiar this Officer is with the denizens of central Stow – I suspect not very.

I am so familiar and I can tell you that my wife and I are regarded as somewhat eccentric in that we own only one car.

I do not know how familiar this Officer is with the bus services which he describes as providing links to surrounding towns as an alternative to private vehicle use. The fact of the matter is that there is a service running at one and a half hour intervals to Moreton, Bourton and Cheltenham. Anyone wanting to visit any other destination by bus would need to make heroic efforts.

Perhaps having a brief contact with reality the Officer refers to restricted on street parking being available if additional parking is required. He omits to say that most of that is time limited to a two hour stay and that parking provision in the town is widely recognized as severely overstretched. *The Officer also feels to note that the section of Sheep Street outside the courtyard has double yellow lines*
The proposed development is in the courtyard of Huntington Antiques which has been subject to a series of change of use and infill planning applications.

My inexpert view is that given the number of users of the site particularly if one includes the two units now proposed available parking does not even meet the Officer's own view of what is acceptable in central Stow.

I urge you to reject the application

15/02361/FUL
CD. 1543 /M

BROOKS Menswear, The Old Forge,
Church St, Stow-on-the-Wold.

Agent's Representation

Many thanks for allowing me the time to speak this morning. My name is Laura Warden and I represent Mr Golding of Huntington Antiques who owns this site.

From reading the committee report and background papers it is clear that there are 2 main issues which are causing concern locally, the parking on site and the impact on neighbouring property. I wish to address these issues separately.

The proposal seeks to replace a number of redundant garages currently used for storage. The principle of losing the garages was established by a previous application for redeveloping this site, which was granted permission in 2013, and earlier still in the 1990s. The two proposed dwellings would each have a parking space and an area of secure cycle parking on site. As the site is centrally located within Stow and there is access on foot to a full range of facilities, this is considered to be suitable provision for the occupants. The spaces are of the correct size and access and ingress can be achieved in forward gear. It is noted that the highway authority raises no objections to the proposals or the level of car parking proposed.

The second issue concerns the impact on neighbouring properties. Great care has been taken to ensure that the proposal does not have an unacceptable impact upon the neighbours. The proposal removes the

unattractive garages and replaces them with two, one and a half storey stone built cottages-with the edge of the two storey element located 4m away from the common boundary to the neighbours gardens and a minimum of 7m away from the ridge level. Two small and low single storey gables will project up to a new boundary wall. The visual appearance alone will be an improvement when considered against the existing development on site, both to the conservation area as well as the neighbours. The orientation of windows seeks to ensure that there are no windows at first floor level that can look into the neighbouring properties due to their height and the use of the spaces which they light-being a bathroom and a landing. A very clear and detailed description of the impact is included in your planning officers report, which also concludes that the impact will be minimal on adjoining neighbours amenity.

As such we support the officers recommendation for approval. The proposal will create two small dwellings within a highly sustainable location, will improve the visual appearance of the conservation area and the adjoining listed buildings and have overall a positive impact on the outlook for neighbours.

Thank you

CT, 2609/2 Objector's Representation

Mr. Chairman, Councillors, we live adjacent to Colt Cars.

For twenty years we lived peacefully at the end of City Bank Road until Colt erected racking twenty months ago. It is now akin to living in a scrap yard and the enjoyment we and our neighbours shared in a residential area is shattered.

The Officer states that the racking is not incongruous and blends in well with the North elevation. Why then can't it blend in well with the identical South elevation where the only people to be affected would be Colt themselves?

The Officer's calculation that eighty five parking spaces are required from an availability of 160 leaving as many as 75 spare just doesn't wash. Colt themselves have recently had to create extra parking spaces for over thirty cars on metal decking..... I believe even the Sites Inspection team on their last visit had problems parking as do local residents who will only be disenfranchised further.

It's summer and you've friends over for lunch on the lawn but only ten metres away towering over you and dominating the garden will be over four metres high racking with flashing lights and bleep, bleep, bleep of fork lift trucks loading and unloading stock with its ever changing appearance.

In recommending approval the Officer considers this 60% longer proposal complies with Local Plan Policies and the N.P.P.F. He says it causes insignificant noise (policy 5). He says it respects the character and local distinctiveness of the area (policy 42). He says it contributes to making places better for people (clause 56) and he says it improves the quality of an area (clause 64).....it sounds very much as if a Cotswold stone church is being planned.....not tatty old pallet racking.

Is it compliant with Local Plan Policies and N.P.P.F.? No ! It is not !

Remember the Planning Act is surely there to protect both environmentally and socially for the few equally as for the many and powerful.

We urge the committee to refuse the application on the visual aspect, the loss of parking spaces and unacceptable noise. Thank you.

8TH. MARCH 2016.

JOHN PEACOCK : SPEECH TO PLANNING COMMITTEE ON
MARCH 9TH. 2016, OBJECTING TO 16/00009/FUL,
AGENDA 09, ITEM 12. CT. 2609Z -
COLT CAR COMPANY.

"SNAIKS",
CITY BANK ROAD,
CIRENCESTER,
GLT. 1LG.

GOTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

- 8 MAR 2016

Off Ref:
Ack:

CT. 1247/1; CT. 2609/2; and CT. 9147
Town Council Representatives

Good Afternoon

Please find attached three submissions by Cirencester Town Council to which Councillor S Tarr will be speaking on at the Cotswold District Council's Planning Committee Meeting on 9th March 2016.

The submissions are Colt Car Co (16/00009/FUL), 2A Gallows Pound Lane (15/05502/FUL) and 24 Bowling Green Crescent (15/05549/FUL).

Submission of Cirencester Town Council – Colt Car Co (16/00009/FUL)

Committee members will be aware that local residents have maintained their opposition to this latest application which is to reduce the height, but to extend the length, of the racking to retain the same level of body shell storage capacity at the rear of the warehouse building.

Reasons why the application should be refused include noise, light and visual harm, all of which were cited as reasons for objecting to the original application which was refused, having regard to the fact that, although the racking has been reduced from 6.0 to 4.1m in height, it is still clearly very intrusive rising a full 8 feet above the circa 2.0m high boundary wall very close to residential properties. Moreover, the racking will be extended from 18.9m to 29.7m to increase the length of its intrusion and nuisance on neighbouring properties and in doing so will enclose a fire door in the north elevation that will impact adversely on the safe area for exit and assembly in the event of a fire or other emergency.

It is noted that the applicant's agent attempts to mitigate these intrusions in his written submission but in the view of the Town Council local residents have just cause to object to this latest planning application which has been submitted in the company's attempts to legitimise and retain this racking in resisting enforcement action from being taken on the original very late and protracted retrospective application which has been refused.

It is noted that there are alternative locations on site which the company has chosen not to use in following a course of action which appears to place the interests of its corporate business image viewed from the site entrance above the interests of local residents in whose locality the site is situated and with whom it shares a residential boundary.

This is plainly not good enough, the application does not meet the requirements of Local Planning Policies or those of the NPPF and so for these reasons the Town Council recommends that this application should be **REFUSED** and enforcement action commenced if the company is unwilling to comply with that refusal.

Submission of Cirencester Town Council – 2A Gallows Pound Lane, Cirencester (15/05502/FUL)

Because of time constraints in which to submit comments, this application was considered by officers under permitted delegations with the input of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee who agreed officers' recommendations to **refuse** this application.

After careful consideration, based on an objective assessment of this partial retrospective application, it remains the view of the Town Council that the block wall (the upper part of which is painted) together with the balustrade that is to be added which would take it to a

total height of 4.53m, would be too high and overbearing in presenting visual harm to the site and its surroundings.

The Town Council therefore agrees with the conclusion of the planning case officer that having regard to the expanse of block work, in addition to the proposed balustrading, the height and massing of the retaining wall, together with the materials used, would have an adverse impact upon the visual amenities of Gallows Pound Lane. The proposal fails to respect the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the area and is therefore contrary to Policy 42 of the Cotswold District Local Plan.

For this reason the Town Council **objects** to the retention of the retaining wall in its present form whilst acknowledging that a number of different options exist for **enforcement** assuming this application is **refused**.

Submission of Cirencester Town Council - 24 Bowling Green Crescent, Cirencester (15/05549/FUL)

Because of time constraints in which to submit comments, this application was considered by officers under permitted delegations with the input of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee who agreed officers' recommendations to **refuse** this application.

After careful consideration, based on an objective re-assessment of this application, it remains the view of the Town Council that this application, in addressing the physical constraints of the site, should be refused on grounds of overdevelopment noting that the proposed extensions, which are substantial in bulk and dimensioning relative to the main dwelling and garden, are likely to have an impact on neighbouring properties resulting in some loss of privacy, sunlight and overshadowing, despite claims to the contrary.

For these reasons the Town Council recommends that this application is **refused** noting that the proposed single storey extensions (which comprise a lean-to and a conservatory that protrude from the rear elevation) if drawn marginally smaller would not require planning permission in providing an alternative solution that may meet the applicant's needs.

However, should the application be permitted as an alternative to refusal (which may open up the possibility of the applicant proceeding on the basis of more modest extensions that would not require planning permission), then it is recommended that consent is conditioned to require building regulations approval for the re-routing of the water supply and sewer facility serving adjacent properties which currently run beneath the proposed building extension.

CD-9412/F Parish Council Representation

I am representing Upper Slaughter Parish Council. Apart from the objection to this application by the Parish Council, there are many other objectors, as you will see in your papers.

There have been a number of applications in the last two years relating to this property resulting in the complete refurbishment of Apricot Cottage. During the refurbishment programme, without any warning or planning notification, a large greenhouse/shed combination was constructed in the garden.

It appears that the Applicant made the first application relating to this garden structure and other minor amendments in January 2015. It was not validated or declared 'clean' for five months. In the meantime, however, the applicant had gone ahead with the various points listed in the application, including the greenhouse/shed, obviously without planning consent and without giving the Parish Council or village residents a chance to comment.

The Parish Council and several adjacent property owners objected specifically to the garden greenhouse/shed combination, presenting a number of formal letters to CDC during June/July of last year.

The owner of Jasmine Cottage, situated immediately adjoining the Applicants property, applied some time ago to construct a wooden garden shed and was advised by CDC that this would not be in keeping with the style of the other buildings or in accordance with the relevant sections of the NPPF or the Local Plan, and that he should construct a shed in stone and traditional materials which he duly did, agreeing with the Conservation Officer and complying with the Cotswold Design Code. This seems completely at variance with the Planning Officer's recommendation to permit the structure now erected in the garden of Apricot Cottage.

In November 2015, we were advised that the applicant had submitted an amended plan incorporating some very minor changes to the structure in question. Objections were made to these revised proposals, as they did not address the primary objections to the scale, size and siting of the structure.

In December we were advised through our Ward Councillor, that the conservation officer (who had advised refusal to the initial application), was now minded to approve the slightly amended version. At this point our Ward Councillor informed the Case Officer that he felt unable to permit delegated authority, and formally requested a meeting before this committee.

Since the feeling within the Parish continues to be that the structure should be removed, we herewith ask the Planning Committee to refuse this application. We also ask that the committee carry out a site visit to assist their decision, as the visual impact of this structure can clearly be seen to be out of keeping with the character of the rest of the village and not in accordance with the relevant sections of the NPPF and the Local Plan.

CS. 9412/F Agent's Representation

JACKSON
ARCHITECTS LTD
Tithe House, Thurlbear, Taunton, Somerset. TA3 5BW

Ref: JJ/815
March 9, 2016

Re: Proposed detached garage, construction of greenhouse and shed, installation of external boiler and oil tank, installation of a roof light, replacement roof to privy and guttering to rear and associated landscaping 15/00353/FUL

Installation of a roof light, internal alterations, replacement roof to privy and guttering to rear. 15/00354/LBC

Thank you, Chairman.

I am Jason Jackson of Jackson Architects. We have overseen the conversion of the two cottages into one house, the construction of a large extension and garage. This application was submitted to cover minor changes to those approved schemes.

However, the main reason the application has come before the committee is because of the proposed new garden shed and greenhouse which has, regrettably, already been erected.

I won't go into the detail but suffice to say that there was a breakdown in communication – we suspect was a spam filter intercepting a critical email - which meant that the application we made in April 2015 was received, but not registered, even though it appeared to us it had. CDC were experiencing significant delays at the time, but our continuing discussions with the conservation officer suggested everything would be approved in time so the shed was ordered to arrive in late summer.

I would like to stress that Mr Jude has nothing to do with the error so the bad feeling within the village is most regrettable. It is genuinely not his fault.

The garden at Apricot Cottage is central to the village and overlooked by 8 other properties. It was a complete mess before with lots of weeds, rubbish, collapsed dry stone walls, and derelict sheds all over the place. Mr Jude has carried out a lot of work to make the gardens a beautiful addition to the village.
(I've circulated some photos to show the before and after)

Apricot Cottage is now a substantial 7 bedroom house, with a very large garden, I would argue it clearly needs a garden store and greenhouse, to service it.

Location:


Because the garden is overlooked by most of its neighbours, a shed will always be visible, regardless of its siting. Various locations were discussed but its current position frames the vegetable garden and screens many of the neighbours from things like compost bins and the bonfire. Mr Jude and his landscape designers have been careful to plant perimeter screening using fan trained trees to provide an attractive and seasonally changing view of the garden.

Outbuilding Design:

Traditionally outbuildings would be simple in form; clean simple roof line (no rooflights, finials, clocktowers(!) etc), low eaves and modest building width. The shed, as built, meets these basic requirements.

However, we agree that the general design of the shed isn't quite right and have proposed some fairly simple changes.

1. Building a natural stone plinth to the greenhouse.
2. Changing the modern vertical cladding for horizontal waney edged boarding which will be left to weather naturally.
3. Enclosing the walk through between the shed and greenhouse to create 2 distinct elements (timber clad shed and lightweight greenhouse) for a simpler and more traditional design.
4. We will keep the cedar shingle roof, which has already weathered to a soft grey, and has a similar pitch to the nearby stone potato store.

 We have worked closely, as we always do, with the Conservation officer, Laurie Davis, to develop these changes and they have her support. The landscaping, including the new shed, represent a significant improvement to the setting of this listed building and the conservation area in general.

I urge the committee to overlook the fuss surrounding what is, after all, just a simple garden shed and consider the proposed design on its merits.

** Time elapsed here*