

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

13TH APRIL 2016

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
RW Dutton	Tina Stevenson

Substitutes:

Jenny Forde

Observers:

Julian Beale (until 11.10 a.m.) RG Keeling (until 11.05 a.m.)

Apologies:

PCB Coleman

PL.119 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor Alison Coggins declared an interest in respect of application CD.3125/D, because she had previously had a professional working relationship with the Agent.

Councillor MGE MacKenzie-Charrington declared an interest in respect of application CD.1328/P, because he had met the Applicant socially. Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington was invited to comment on this application in his capacity as the Ward Member. He then left the Meeting while this item was being determined.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

PL.120 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor Jenny Forde substituted for Councillor PCB Coleman.

PL.121 MINUTES

RESOLVED that, subject to the re-numbering of the Minutes following Minute PL.115, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 9th March 2016 be approved as a correct record.

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

PL.122 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

(i) The Chairman introduced Mrs. A Steward of the Local Government Association, and welcomed her to the Meeting. The Chairman requested that Members attend a short briefing session following the close of the Meeting at which Mrs. Steward would give a review of the Meeting.

(ii) On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman thanked the Senior Planning Enforcement/Case Officer for his work in achieving compliance with the Committee's decision at 19 London Road, Poulton.

PL.123 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.124 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been submitted by Members.

PL.125 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.126 REVISED SCHEME OF DELEGATION

The Committee considered a report suggesting revisions to the Scheme of Delegation, which had been adopted by the former Planning Committee at its Meeting on 13th August 2014 (Minute P.44 referred). Details of an additional revision were circulated at the Meeting.

Arising on the circulated report:-

(i) Delegated Decision-Making - Recording Decisions

It was AGREED that the suggested revisions in respect of the recording of decisions relating to delegated decision-making be approved, as suggested.

(ii) Dealing with Planning and Other Related Applications

It had been suggested that the Chairman of the Planning and Licensing Committee be authorised to decide whether or not applications referred to the Committee for determination by Members should, in fact, be determined in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation. The suggestion had been made because it had been considered that, occasionally, applications were referred to the Committee for determination on grounds other than for planning considerations.

Some Members expressed the view that the suggested revision could result in the Chairman of the Committee coming under undue pressure, and could give an impression that the opinions of Ward Members was being ignored. However, those Members further considered that, if a Ward Member referred an application to the Committee for determination, s/he should make every effort to attend the Meeting when the application was being considered.

It was AGREED that this revision should be deleted.

(iii) Consultations with Ward Members on County Rights of Way and Highway Matters

It was reported that this item represented a duplicate consultation, and it was AGREED that the Scheme of Delegation be amended, as suggested. However, it was noted that such Ward Member consultations would be carried out in relation to contentious applications.

(iv) Other Types of Application, Notification and Consultations

It was reported that the suggested revision reflected the fact that Government advice stated that a request for a non-material amendment was not an application for planning permission and that, therefore, the normal provisions for notification did not apply. It was considered that this advice reflected the very minor nature of the types of changes allowed under the non-material amendment procedure and it was AGREED that the Scheme of Delegation be amended, as suggested, subject to deletion of the word 'will' in the final line of paragraph (vi) and its substitution by the word 'may', and to the renumbering of that paragraph to '(iv)'.

(v) Other Minor Amendments

It was AGREED that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing should be authorised to make minor amendments to the approved Scheme of Delegation, but that such authority should be exercised in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing. It was requested that Members received periodic updates of any such amendments.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the Scheme of Delegation relating to the Planning and Licensing Committee be approved and adopted, as amended;**
- (b) the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing, be authorised to make minor amendments to the approved Scheme of Delegation, and to provide periodic updates of any such amendments to Members.**

Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

PL.127 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.9412/F

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 at Apricot Cottage, Upper Slaughter -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the elevations of the greenhouse and shed; the covered walkway; trees; and materials. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the existing building from various vantage points and views of the street scene prior to, and following, commencement of the works.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee.

The Chairman referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing held in respect of this application and invited those Members who had attended that Briefing to express their views. The Members considered the amendments suggested in respect of the scheme to be an improvement over the submitted scheme.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and suggested that the Committee should reflect on the relevant policies in its consideration of this application. The Ward Member contended that the application did not accord with a number of policies, including in relation the impact on the setting of Listed Buildings and designated heritage assets. The Ward Member questioned whether the benefit accruing to the public from this application outweighed the harm that it would cause to designated heritage assets

and expressed the view that it would have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area and the protection of the landscape. The Ward Member concluded by suggesting that this application should be refused if it did not satisfy all relevant policies.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the Conservation Officer had been consulted on this application and supported the amended scheme; the Tree Officer had been consulted; the Council had worked proactively with the Applicant, as it was required to do; and it was unlikely that the circumstances relating to a similar development on an adjacent site had been identical to the circumstances on this site.

A Member expressed the view that, while the development had radically changed the garden, it was acceptable. It was suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, the suggested Conditions should be amended to require development to be started within a period of three months of the date of the Decision Notice, rather than three years.

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

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and explained that a wooden car port, on another site in the vicinity of this site, had been permitted some eighteen months ago. The Ward Member stated that the objections related to the massing of the building and concluded by suggesting that a smaller building constructed from stone might be acceptable on this site.

Approved, as recommended.

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

CD.3125/D

Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of new replacement dwelling at Hillcrest Bungalow, Keytes Lane, Bourton-on-the-Hill -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to land levels within the site; elevations; and the height of the existing and proposed buildings in relation to neighbouring properties. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the existing building on the site; land levels; views into and of the site from various vantage points; and views of a neighbouring property from within the site.

A Member of the Parish Council was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and drew attention to land levels within the site, its location within the Conservation Area, surrounding residential properties, and screening. The Ward Member referred to the concerns expressed on behalf of the Parish Council in relation to the height of the proposed building and contended that it would be more prominent than the existing dwelling and would appear to be overbearing and dominant. The Ward Member concluded by expressing the view that the proposed development would disturb the existing height hierarchy in the village.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, as land levels increased through the site, the existing building appeared to be higher at one end than at the other; the proposed development would be on a level site and would be set into the ground by 1 metre; overall, it would be 2 metres higher at ridge height; in the view of Officers, the proposed development accorded with policy; the Council was not able to control the retention of hedges; the proposed building would not be visible from the Longborough Road; and land levels rose steadily through the village in the direction of the A44.

A Proposition that this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the impact of the proposed development on the landscape, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Conservation Area, was duly Seconded. On being put to the vote, that Proposition was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 3, against 10, abstentions 1, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.

A Member contended that there were other existing properties in the vicinity of this site which appeared to be higher than this proposed development would be. The Member expressed the view that the proposed development was acceptable in the context of the village and that this development would be acceptable.

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

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 12, against 2, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.

CD.1328/P

Demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of a staff cottage, storage barn and stable block at Laurence House, Wyck Rissington -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to access; an area of adjacent land which was in the ownership of the Applicant; existing buildings which were proposed for retention and those proposed for demolition; and the location of the proposed units. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, photographs illustrating views of the existing buildings on the site, and a three-dimensional drawing of the proposed development.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and commented that the gardens which were often open to the public also attracted visitors from abroad. The Ward Member contended that the Applicant's circumstances required full-time gardening and housekeeping services which, he contended, should be accommodated on the site. The Ward Member considered the application to be a rational one, which would provide a modest unit of staff accommodation adjacent to a garage and stables, which would be in keeping with the nature of the property. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that this application had been supported by the Parish Council and that, in his opinion, it constituted a sensible approach. The Ward Member commented that the proposed development would be within the garden curtilage

of the principal building. He did not consider that it would be overbearing and he concluded by suggesting that this application should be approved.

Note:

At this juncture, having previously declared an interest in this application, the Ward Member left the Meeting while this item was being determined.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as the staff cottage would be situated within the residential curtilage of the principal dwelling, permission would be required to separate its use from that of the principal dwelling; in the opinion of Officers, there was no justification for approving this application as no equine or agricultural businesses operated from the site; the site was not considered to be a 'brown field' one; the application did not constitute a Change of Use as it was for residential use within a residential curtilage; in the view of Officers, there was no justification for another permanent dwelling on this site; the proposed staff accommodation would be served by a separate access to that serving the principal dwelling; no information had been submitted in relation to existing staff accommodation at this site; four different staff roles had been suggested without any explanation of who might undertake those roles; there had previously been an ancillary unit of accommodation within this site; the concern of Officers related to the potential use of the proposed unit of accommodation for independent living, given it was located some distance from the principal dwelling and would have its own access and amenity space; the location was not sustainable in terms of the normal strategy; and there was no justification to provide on-site staff accommodation at this location

Some Members reminded the Committee that the proposed unit of accommodation was intended for use by people who would be employed by the Applicant to work at his principal residence, and they considered it would be difficult to support a refusal on this occasion. Other Members reminded the Committee that each application should be considered on its merits. Those Members reiterated that there were no commercial reasons for providing on-site staff accommodation and suggested that the Applicant could seek off-site staff accommodation in the locality. They did not consider the proposed roles to be complementary in terms of the skills they would require and they contended that the accommodation would be tantamount to a separate unit with its own access.

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

Refused, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 9, against 4, abstentions 1, interest declared 1, absent 0.

CD.8481/J**Proposed permanent rural workers dwelling at The Old Quarry, Broadwell -**

Consideration of this application had been deferred for further information, before the start of the Meeting.

CD.8481/H**Retention of residential caravan for overnight accommodation for stockperson at The Old Quarry, Fosseyway, Broadwell -**

Consideration of this application had been deferred for further information, before the start of the Meeting.

CD.8891/C**Erection of one dwelling at land opposite The Old Post Office, Arlington, Bibury -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since the 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 proposed elevations; a vehicle turning area; parking provision; and floor plans. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the access; within, and from within the site; and an illustrative view of the site post-development. It was reported that the proposed development relied heavily on screening to be provided by an existing hedgerow. It was noted that the hedge was not of a native species and that the Council would not be able to require its future retention. The proposed development would be visible above the hedge and such visibility would be prominent and have a significant adverse impact on nearby Listed Buildings and the setting of the Conservation Area.

An Objector and a representative of the Applicants were invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Services Manager read out comments submitted by the Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee and had been unable to attend the Meeting. The Ward Member stated that he had discussed this application with both the Applicants and Officers, and he reminded the Committee that a previous application on this site had been refused for the reasons detailed in the circulated report. The Ward Member considered the current application proposed a slightly smaller building in a different angled location within the same site as the previous application. It had raised some controversy, but had also received some support from local residents. The Ward Member considered that the Applicants had attempted to present a more sympathetic development than had previously been submitted, and he concluded by stating that he had referred it in order to give the Committee the opportunity to opine on the revised scheme.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that Officers considered the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact

on Listed Buildings in the vicinity of this site and on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area; the site was situated on the historic edge of the village and the open countryside; any development on this site could have an adverse impact because it was a prominent site, which was visible from within the surrounding area; different circumstances had applied to development previously proposed on an adjacent site and on another site in the vicinity of this current site; the Council was not able to pre-judge what applications might be submitted in the future; in its determination of applications, the Committee should consider the public benefit that could accrue from a proposal against any adverse impact; if the Committee was minded to refuse this application, as recommended, Members were able to comment on any desire to protect the open aspect of the site; the Parish Council had not expressed support for, nor objected to, the proposed development; in the opinion of Officers, no significant public benefits would accrue from this proposal; there had been limited dialogue with the Applicants; and the suggested refusal reasons had taken account of the changes between this current proposal and the previously-refused scheme.

A number of Members contended that the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact. Another Member pointed out that there were a number of new developments in close proximity to this site, and expressed the view that there was an eclectic mix of developments in Bibury.

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

Refused, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 13, against 1, abstentions 1, absent 0.

CT.4436/B

Erection of one house and garage; construction of a vehicular access and driveway at The Long House, Tarlton, Cirencester -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since the 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 submitted site plan; its proximity to adjacent properties; access; elevations; the floor plan; and the proposed planting of an Oak tree. The Case Officer reported that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, such approval would be subject to the potential amendment of the suggested Condition relating to the provision of visibility splays. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views of the site from various locations, views from within the site, views of the existing boundary treatment, and views from within the site of an adjacent dwelling.

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

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and amplified aspects of the reasons why he had referred this

application to the Committee for determination. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that, if it was minded to approve this application as recommended, the Council would not be able to condition retention of the existing hedge, it was situated in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Conservation Area, and that the Council had a five-year supply of housing land. The Ward Member contended that the site was unsustainable and concluded by expressing the view that this application should be refused.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that this site was considered to be sustainable in terms of Policy 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, due to its grouping with other settlements; whilst the introduction of new facilities and housing could move a settlement towards sustainability, it was unlikely that new facilities would be provided in advance of a significant volume of new housing; a previous proposal on this site had been considered to be prominent due to its suggested situation within the site; as the current application had re-orientated the dwelling to the south of that previously proposed, it was considered that its prominence had been reduced; the planting of an Oak tree had been suggested in order to secure the future enhancement of the Conservation Area; and, in the opinion of Officers, this site was sustainable in terms of its proximity to nearby settlements, the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on designated heritage assets, and it was proportionate to the site.

A Member referred to two other applications, which had been considered by the Committee earlier in this Meeting and expressed the view that all three were clearly different. Another Member stated that he supported the views expressed by the Parish Council and that, as such, he was not in favour of the Officer Recommendation.

The Planning and Development Manager explained that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, it would have to be advertised as a departure from the approved Development Plan.

A Proposition, that this application be approved subject to clarification of the issue relating to visibility splays and to its advertisement as a departure to the approved Development Plan, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and he contended that the assertion that this site was sustainable due to the grouping of villages was, in his opinion, a spurious one. He reiterated his view that this was not a sustainable site, reminding the Committee that it was located in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Conservation Area, and he stated that the suggested position of the proposed building was an improvement over the position suggested in the previous application. He concluded by contending that, if the existing hedge was removed at some time in the future, the proposed development would be very visible.

Approved, subject to clarification of the issue relating to visibility splays and to the advertisement of this application as a departure from the approved Development Plan.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 4, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.

CT.4264/S

Erection of a single-storey garden room at Keble House, London Road, Fairford -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since the 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 of the existing house.

One of the Applicants and a representative of the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and referred to the history of development on this site. The Ward Member explained that the ground floor accommodation did not replicate the accommodation available on the upper storeys of the house, and expressed the view that the proposed development constituted a discrete addition which would be situated in a concealed courtyard and attached to a modern kitchen extension. The Ward Member concluded by stating that, in her opinion, the proposed development would not harm the historic fabric of the existing building but would enhance the enjoyment and modern lifestyle of the house, and allow it to evolve into the twenty-first century.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, while the proposed development would not have any impact on the historic fabric of the building, the Committee should consider the entire building and balance the potential harm against any public benefit and viability issues in its determination of this application; Officers had expressed concern over the dimensions of the proposed room, its engagement with the existing kitchen and its encroachment into the garden space; in the opinion of Officers, a small extension to the existing kitchen to provide a kitchen/dining area could be acceptable; the application should be considered on its merits, as submitted; the Applicants had suggested a reduction of 50 cms in the dimensions of the proposed room but Officers considered a reduction of 50% to be more acceptable; and, in the opinion of Officers, an aluminium framed structure of the same dimensions as were currently being proposed would not be acceptable.

A number of Members expressed support for this application. Those Members considered that it would not be obtrusive in its proposed location, the fabric of the building could be restored in the event that the structure was removed at some time in the future, and that the proposal would not harm the existing building.

Other Members expressed their preference for a more substantial structure, commenting that the current proposal would relate awkwardly to the building.

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

Approved, subject to appropriate Conditions to be specified by the Case Officer, including in respect of materials and finishes.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 3, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because a majority of the Committee considered that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the existing building.

CT.4264/R

Erection of a single-storey garden room at Keble House, London Road, Fairford -

There were no updates from the Case Officer.

One of the Applicants and a representative of the Agent were invited to address the Committee, but they stated that they had made all of their representations in relation to the previous application relating to this site (application CT.4264/S above referred).

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, but stated that she had made all of her representations in relation to the previous application relating to this site (application CT.4264/S above referred).

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

Approved, subject to appropriate Conditions to be specified by the Case Officer, including in respect of materials and finishes.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 3, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because a majority of the Committee considered that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the existing building.

CT.2596/2/Y

Erection of single-storey front extension and insertion of x4 first floor and x1 second floor side-facing windows at 8 Blake Road, Cirencester -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since the 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 existing and proposed elevations; permitted developments; an adjacent area of land in the ownership of The Crown, which was maintained by the Town Council; and access.

An Objector was 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 this site was part of

the former Abbey grounds, which was a Scheduled Ancient Monument. It was also adjacent to the Conservation Area and in close proximity to some Grade I and Grade II Listed Buildings. The Ward Member explained that the property was part of a 1960s housing development, which had been built to house Police and military personnel. He drew attention to its historic setting, and commented that only modest extensions had been added to date, with none of the other houses having dormer windows. The Ward Member stated that the property was visible from the Grade I Listed Norman Arch and he referred to the open green spaces and footpaths which were a characteristic of the whole development. The Ward Member reiterated that the area of open space in the ownership of The Crown was maintained by the Town Council, and he referred to incidences of flooding in the vicinity of the site and issues relating to on-street parking. The Ward Member explained that there was an existing culvert under the rear garden of the property which, he contended, was subject to seepage, and he expressed concern over the cumulative impact of development on this site. The Ward Member stated that none of the other properties had doors in their side elevations opening onto green spaces and he contended that this proposal represented a considerable change for this area of the town. The Ward Member further contended that this constituted a contentious development; the dormer windows would impose on the setting of the Listed Buildings; proposed an unprecedented number of additional windows; and was not intended to accommodate a growing family for the Applicants, and he concluded by suggesting that the application should be refused.

In response to various questions by Members, it was reported that there was an existing rear access to the property; the Applicants would need to obtain consent from the Environment Agency in respect of the outfall pipe and from the Ministry of Defence to achieve any access over land in the ownership of The Crown; in the event that the Committee was minded to refuse this application for reasons relating to the insertion of the proposed windows, the Applicants had a plausible fall-back position in that they could insert opaque glass in the window openings; a clearer view of the rear of the Objector's property could be achieved from the adjacent highway than could be achieved from the Applicants' property; the proposal was for a single-storey front extension and the insertion of five windows; if the Committee was minded to refuse this application for reasons relating to over-development of the site, it could consider the impact on the plot and any resulting harm, as well as the impact of other works; in the opinion of Officers, the proposed single-storey front extension would not have any adverse impact on the nearby Listed Buildings; the proposed door in the side elevation constituted permitted development; private legal rights and ownership disputes were not material planning considerations; and the erection of a porch on land not in the Applicants' ownership did not constitute 'permitted' development.

A number of Members considered that this application should be refused for reasons to be specified by the Case Officer, relating to the impact on the uniform character of the houses, the proposed front extension would be incongruous and harmful and could result in the loss of other features as a result, to the detriment of the overall look of the property when combined with other changes, and that the further disfigurement of this property should be limited.

A Proposition, that this application be refused for the reasons stated above, was duly Seconded.

Refused, for reasons to be specified by the Case Officer, as outlined above.

Record of Voting - for 14, against 0, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer Recommendation for the reasons stated.

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 at the Meeting in respect of applications CD.9412/F, CD.1328/P, CD.8891/C and CT.2596/2/Y.

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

Councillor RG Keeling was invited to speak on application CD.9412/F.

(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>CD.9412/F</u>)	Mr. J Jackson (Agent)
<u>CD.3125/D</u>)	Councillor T Martin (Parish Council)
<u>CD.1328/P</u>)	Mr. D Keyte (Agent)
<u>CD.8891/C</u>)	Mr. M Fletcher (Objector)
)	Mrs. S Lambert
)	(representing the Applicants)
<u>CT.4436/B</u>)	Councillor MT Grimes (Parish Council)
)	Mr. A Miles (Agent)
<u>CT.4264/S</u>)	Mrs. A Meaden (Applicant)/Mrs. K Bell
)	(Agent) *
<u>CT.4264/R</u>)	Mrs. A Meaden (Applicant)/Mrs. K Bell
)	(Agent) *
<u>CT.2596/2/Y</u>)	Mr. C Arnold (Objector)

* Mesdames Meaden and Bell shared these speaking slots.

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.128 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 4th May 2016

No applications were deferred for Sites Inspection Briefings.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

No advance Sites Inspection Briefings had been notified.

PL.129 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 11.00 a.m. and 11.10 a.m., and closed at 12.55 p.m.

Chairman

(END)