

## 15/04833/FUL Hillcrest Bungalow

---

We are most grateful to the Committee for the opportunity to express the view of the Parish Council of Bourton on the Hill upon this application.

I am Parish Councillor Tom Martin in company with Parish Councillor Mrs Elizabeth Bowden. As an Elected Member of the old Humberside County Council and having chaired most of the County Committees I am aware of most of the protocols to be observed today.

We wish to present our objection, and to observe the response of this committee so that we can report to our Parish.

We object to the plans as proposed because of the Cloud of doubt hovering over the finished Ridge height which seems to vary in different claims between an increase of 2.5 metres, approximately 2.0 metres, and 2.0 metres above existing bungalow Ridge. Clarification from Members or Officers would be appreciated.

The site is within the Conservation Area and is surrounded by Listed Buildings within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Pilgrim Cottage adjacent to the site dates from 16<sup>th</sup> Century.

The replacement of an out of keeping bungalow is welcomed- however the Parish Council questions whether sufficient care has been taken and proposed, to ensure that the replacement building fully respects the unique qualities of the Village Conservation Classification--- Rendering, if applied, would be in breach of Section 7 of National Planning Policy. ✂ TIME ELAPSED HERE

The village has been developed over Centuries on a strong gradient. If the Ridge height is increased by 2.5 metres it will be to the detriment of immediate neighbours as would any increase of “approximately” 2.0 metres. We do not like the use of the elastic word “approximate”.

Policy 15 of the Cotswold District Plan states that, in a Conservation Area, special attention must be given so that any new/altered building makes a positive contribution to the carefully constructed harmony of neighbouring dwellings.

It is the opinion of the Parish Council that, because of the slope of the site there is an opportunity to excavate for lower foundations, a less steep drive approach and a finished Ridge Height/Roofline closer to the existing.

## CD, 8891/c - Objector's Representations

Thank you chair, good morning Members.

I've been asked to speak to you today by more than 20 households, plus the key businesses of Arlington Bibury, who wish to see this AONB site protected from development.

These concerned villagers oppose this revised proposal for a residential new-build so close to the conservation zone border, because of the adverse impact it would have on the amenity of a setting that is so important to the Cotswolds, and to our village way of life.

William Morris described Bibury as 'The Most beautiful village in England' and for good reason. Today, it has over 90 Listed houses and has retained an open countryside context for almost 175 years.

Within just a few metres of the proposed development site there is a cluster of beautiful Grade II-Listed cottages. My family and I own Long Cottage, which dates back to 1875.

These Listed homes face an open aspect to the south that is one of the last remaining visual links between a 19th Century settlement and the open valley that enhances its beauty and charm...

This is where a new-build large house is being proposed. Right between houses afforded the highest levels of protection from English Heritage and the open countryside that provides their historical context.

This is not a site that should *ever* be developed. This is a site that should be protected alongside the existing character and appearance of the Bibury Conservation Area.

In fact *this* Planning Committee voted overwhelming to protect this site almost a year ago to the day on Conservation grounds (in accordance with Policy 15 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.)

Some of you will remember the decision - taken on the advice of an independent English Heritage Conservation Officer who was asked to share his expertise and opinion with the Committee.

As a result, this Committee's decision wasn't about the size, scale or positioning of a new-build modern house. It was a vote against any and all residential development so close to the Bibury Conservation Area on AONB protected land, next to Listed houses of important historic value.

This site should *remain* protected under Paragraph 115 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Cotswold District Local Plan has Policy 15 to ensure that you *can* protect sites like this from inappropriate development, that will ultimately erode their surroundings.

Arlington is already making an additional contribution to the 7 years of allocated District housing land, despite not being one of the 17 identified Cotswold sites earmarked for residential development. In February, The Princess Royal open an Affordable Housing complex, consisting of 11 properties just up the road from the site.

There is a big difference between affordable housing in appropriate settings and permitting an out-of-character new-build, right on the Conservation Zone border, which would disrupt an irreplaceable Listed setting.

Once again, Ms Baker the Case Officer is recommending Refusal, once again, Bibury Parish Council felt unable to support the applicant's proposal and once again, on behalf of Arlington Bibury, I respectfully ask that you reinforce the decision of your Committee in 2015 and continue to protect the Open character of this part of Bibury's AONB by voting for Refusal.

CT. 4436/B Parish Council Representation

**Item no 7 13.04.2016**

**15/02459/FUL**

**The Long House, Tarlton GL7 6PA**

**Mark Grimes for Rodmarton Parish Council**

The case officer has produced a diligent and comprehensive report for the committee. Although not explicit in the report we deduce that the case officer considers that the out of date CDC local plan policy has become subservient to NPPF policy which potentially exposes the application site to greater vulnerability from this speculative a planning application than might have been the case had a new local plan been in place.

Rodmarton Parish Council requests that this planning application should be refused; a summary of the parish council's reasons is included with in the case officer's report.

The case officer concedes that footnote 9 of NPPF confirms that the first consideration should be the impact on heritage assets and the AONB, if it is considered that there is harm then then application should be refused.

The essence of the conservation area in Tarlton stems from wide open fields and large gardens. This was recognised in the conservation area statement included within the 1999 local plan where the open spaces throughout the village were considered to be an essential part of its rural character. The leafy break between the water tower and the Old Chapel (which includes the application site) was considered worthy of particular protection from development. Although this conservation area statement no longer has any statutory impact it does provide a useful summary of the particular characteristics which gave rise to the conservation area designation. RPC considers that these essential characteristics are harmed by the proposed development.

Tarlton has no facilities which could confer the status of a sustainable location. A pub in Coates and a school in Rodmarton are the nearest facilities. The degree to which the pub in Coates would benefit from a new dwelling in Tarlton is likely to be negligible and the likelihood of children from the proposed new executive style farmhouse attending the all be it very good school at Rodmarton seems remote and certainly neither would be justification for the proposal. RPC considers that the application site has no sustainable characteristics.

NPPF requires that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The application does not meet this objective.

RPC is pleased that despite its concerns County Highways have not objected to the application, however, it is noted that the suggested condition for creation of a visibility splay requires the removal of a significant portion of the boundary hedge which will expose the application site to increased view from the public realm.

RPC accepts that on paper this application may be difficult for the Planning Committee to judge, we urge the committee to make a site visit so that a properly informed decision can be reached. RPC is very mindful that this application has implications for numerous other sites of similar nature.

\* TIME ELAPSED HERE

# CT. 4436/B - Agent's Representation

## Item No 07, Planning Committee 13<sup>th</sup> April 2016 Erection of a house at The Long House, Tarlton

Good morning,

The officer, in her comprehensive report, has set out the reasons why planning permission should be granted and, in particular, how the adopted Local Plan has been held by recent appeal Inspectors to be out of date. In such circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the presumption in favour of proposals such as this. Accordingly, I shall respond to the objections that have been raised.

The development will be sustainable as defined by the NPPF – it will contribute towards building a strong economy; will support local facilities; will be of high quality design and will not harm the environment.

I do not know of any basis which requires the applicant to establish that there is a local need for the development – that was a requirement of Policy 19 of the Local Plan that has been held to be out of date and for major development in the AONB, which does not apply to an application for one dwelling.

The fact that there is a five year supply of housing does not preclude the grant of further permissions. The Inspector at Mickleton, referred to in the officer's report, who was the first to recently acknowledge that CDC had a five year housing supply, but it did not prevent him from granting planning permission as he stated that there is a need to boost the supply of housing.

So far as the conservation aspects are concerned, I disagree with the contention that the site is an important open space ~~as no public benefit from it is derived~~. It is an area enclosed by vegetation and the application proposes the planting of an Oak in the north eastern corner,



which will terminate the views from Sandpool Lane from a location within the Conservation Area that I would suggest adjoins an important open area.

Discussions with the Conservation Officer during the course of the application led to the re-siting of the proposed house to a position where it would not cause any harm to the Conservation Area. I am not saying that the house will not be seen or that it will be hidden by existing boundary treatments but it will be appropriate to its location and accord with its context. It will not be too large as its frontage will be two thirds of the length of The Long House and similar in plan form, to Messenger Cottage. The house will be appropriate to its location, as recognised by the specialist Conservation Officer and will meet the statutory duty in that it will preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The officer has set out why the proposal accords with National Planning Guidance with regard to facilities in groups of settlement and I concur with the points that have been made. The proposal will create jobs in construction, put money into the local economy, has scope for providing pupils to the local school and will do so in a way that is compliant with planning policies and guidance.

I commend your officer's report to you and trust that you will resolve to grant planning permission.

Thank You

Andrew Miles, Director, LPC(Trull) Ltd, agent for applicant

CT, 4264/S + CT, 4264/R - Applicant's  
Representation

Cotswold District Council Planning Committee  
April 13<sup>th</sup> 2016

Comments with regards to:

- Full Application for Erection of a single storey garden room at Keble House London Road Fairford Gloucestershire GL7 4AW for Mr & Mrs Meaden. Our Ref:15/05041/FUL CT.4264/R
- Listed Building Consent for Erection of a single storey garden room at Keble House London Road Fairford Gloucestershire GL7 4AW for Mr & Mrs Meaden. Ref:15/05042/LBC CT.4264/S

-----  
**Alex Meaden. Applicant.**

Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this council meeting.

I want to briefly give you some background and assure the committee that we have every intention of respecting the historical character of the house.

In terms of residents of the house, we ourselves are a family of 5. My mother will soon be living with us, as well as an au pair. In addition to this, my husband's parents live in a cottage in the village so are regular visitors, and we have family stay frequently. Our house has 6 bedrooms in the main house, and another two in the adjoining cottage, which we are bringing back into the house. However, we have only 3, relatively small, reception rooms - a family room, a sitting room and a study. The dining table is currently in the kitchen and cannot seat many people.

What we have proposed is a garden room, which would be a dining area for us. Keble House began as a croft house in the C15th, with additions in both the early and later years of the C18th, and again in 1986 with the kitchen extension. We see this as a further adaptation of the house to modern living.

We are very aware of the property's listed status and would not want to alter or extend the property in any detrimental way. I would welcome a site visit from anybody who would like to come so that you could see for yourselves that our proposal would be an enhancement to the house.

# CT. 2596/2/7 Objector's Representation

Thank you for the opportunity to draw your attention to three objections that I would like to share with you.

1. The applicant has no title to the land on the south west side. At no point has any permission been sought for a new side main access to the south west. The side door is undeclared in all written applications - but has slid on to drawings. The doorway is already cut out. Hinges for a canopy and plans for a path are in place. This change of use is a planning issue. The preservation of green spaces, the environment, and public amenity are key planning issues that should not be ignored. An opportunity for the applicant to claim acceptance by default or by neglect of attention should be prevented.

The Town Council, as the 'de facto' responsible body, has maintained the adjoining green area for public use and enjoyment for decades. 23 residents have already registered their opposition to any private development or use 'now - or in the future'. (Mr Field and the Crown Estate have the originals on file).

The officer's report makes no mention of the Town Council's strongly stated opposition to this development 'with the attendant risk of the applicant (or successors in title) laying claim to the land through precedent and use'. Indeed the Town Council's objections on grounds of 'loss of amenity', 'intrude upon public enjoyment of the green open space', 'overdevelopment', 'unwelcome precedent', 'unbalance the appearance' etc ~~are ignored in the Officer's report to this Committee.~~ I would urge the Planning Committee to read the Town Council's submission in full as it is of material importance in deciding this application.

2. The front extension eliminates the front entrance and converts the porch in to a study. It is over-large, occupies 2.23 metres of the 2.36 available and so comes within 0.13 metres of the public path ~~(not 0.40 metres as claimed by the officer (page 152 section (a))~~. This makes it it the largest protrusion by far both to front and in width when compared with houses in the neighbouring terraces.

The flat roof and proposed Juliet balcony above the porch area also render it out of keeping with the terrace of houses adjoining and opposite. A similarly over-sized proposal was recommended by Officers for refusal in May 2015 and the applicant withdrew the application. It would be inconsistent if this extension were now accepted.

3. The Juliet balcony bar has recently been removed from the folding 4 panel door that leads on to the large flat roof area of the rear extension (page 158). It should be made clear that no permission for a balcony, balustrade or sitting out area has been granted as part of this application - or as a result of officers failing to spot or mention this.

## RELATED ISSUE IF TIME PERMITS :-

~~[4. Flooding is a concern for all residents and for both local Councils. It would be appropriate for the Council to seek a written assurance from the Environment Agency that building over the large culvert outfall pipe (recently leaking) which runs directly under the proposed build-over for the rear extension is a satisfactory and prudent proposal.]~~

CHRISTOPHER ARNOLD  
1 BLAKE RD  
CIRENCESTER GL7 2EG